

S. ✓

A G E N D A
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
JUNE 23, 1977

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

ROLL CALL:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. V-53-71 Request of JAMES AND ADA JEAN PERRY for an Extension of Time on an approved Variance to allow three horses on property located at 4919 East Owens Avenue in Zoning District R-2, where no horses are permitted. (Variance was granted to allow three horses until April 24, 1977.)
Extension of Time
(Abeyance Item from 5/26/77)
- 2. V-34-77 Application of KONG WAI SHEK for a Variance to allow an existing room addition to within 2'2" of the side property line where five feet (5') is required on property located at 1019 Franklin Avenue on the north side of Franklin Avenue between 10th Street and Maryland Parkway in Zoning District R-1.
(Abeyance Item from 5/26/77)

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. V-42-77 Application of LOLA PIVAVAROFF for a Variance to allow a patio cover to the north side property line where a five ft. (5') setback is required, and a covered storage area to the south property line where a seven ft. (7') setback is required on property located at 2220 Santa Paula Drive in Zoning District R-1.
- 2. U-33-77(HO) Application of JOYCE STRAUS for a Home Occupation Permit to allow the design and production of works of art on property located at 409 Rosemary Lane in Zoning District R-E.
- 3. V-43-77 Application of DONALD R. MORGAN, JR. for a Variance to allow a patio cover to within two and a half feet (2½') of the east side property line where eight feet (8') is required on property located at 3908 Gaviota Avenue in Zoning District R-1.
- 4. V-44-77 Application of AL P. BRENDE, JR. for a Variance to allow a six ft. (6') high wall consisting of two ft. (2') masonry and four ft. (4') wrought iron in the front yard area where a four ft. (4') high, top two ft. (2'), fifty percent (50%) open fence is allowed on property generally located on the northeast corner of Dalmatian Lane and Albacore Drive in Zoning District R-1.
- 5. V-45-77 Application of DALE A. RODELA for a Variance to allow a third dwelling where only two dwelling units are permitted on property located at 1502-1504 Rexford Place in Zoning District R-2.
- 6. V-46-77 Application of JAMES PAPPA for a Variance to allow a carport to within two feet (2') of the front property line where twenty feet (20') is required and to within one foot (1') of the south side property line where seven feet (7') is required on property located at 1712 Loch Lomond Way in Zoning District R-1.

7. U-41-77(HO) Application of EVA M. DEVERE for a Home Occupation Permit. Eva M. Devere has closed her antique store business and stored the remaining inventory in her house located at 3708 West Bonanza Road in Zoning District R-1. She is requesting permission, on a temporary basis, to have customers come to her house to pick up antiques that were previously purchased on a "lay-a-way" basis and further to continue doing appraisals and to sell antiques at antique shows.
8. V-47-77 Application of ASHWORTH & CO., A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, for a Variance to allow the Silver Street frontage of 149 ft. to be the legal lot front rather than the 142 ft. frontage on Pine; allow a 34.16 ft. rear yard where fifty feet (50') is required, and to allow an outdoor fireplace grill in the required side yard where accessory structures are not permitted, on property located at the northeast corner of Silver Avenue and Pine Street in Zoning District R-E.
9. V-48-77 Application of BILLY J. SLOAT for a Variance to allow four dwelling units on each lot where only three units per lot are allowed on property located at the west side of 13th Street 400 ft. south of Mesquite in Zoning District R-3.
10. V-49-77 Application of JOHN AND DORIS MARTINEZ for a Variance to allow an addition to within forty-six feet (46') of the rear property line where fifty feet (50') is required on property located at 1202 Vista Drive in Zoning District R-E.
11. V-50-77 Application of PHYLLIS JEAN McGUIRE for a Variance to allow a fifteen ft. (15') high concrete block fence along the north property line where a maximum height of six feet (6') is allowed on property located at 100 Rancho Circle in Zoning District R-A.
12. U-62-72 Request of HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, for a Review of the number of children permitted from twenty-one to thirty-two on an approved Use Permit to allow the operation of a day-care center on property located at 2810 Ambler Street in Zoning District R-2.
Review
13. U-47-63 Request of FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH for an Extension of Time on an approved Use Permit to allow the continuation of a child care nursery and also allow a caretaker's residence on property located at 300 South 9th Street in Zoning District R-4.
Extension of Time
14. U-42-77(HO) Application of MARION PARKER at 2201 Glen Heather Way in Zoning District R-1 for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow the making of macrame items for sale at off-premise locations.

S U P P L E M E N T A L A G E N D A

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

JUNE 23, 1977

1. U-44-77(HO) Application of JEWEL MOORE at 5716 Pinecone Place in Zoning District R-1 for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow the off-premise sale of ceramic items and paintings.
2. U-45-77(HO) Application of RICHARD PALMER FOR GARY A. GRAY at 867 N. Lamb, Space 147, in Zoning District R-T for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow the design of stained/leaded glass windows for off-premise sale.
3. U-46-77(HO) Application of DOREEN SHERRY FOX at 2350C Canfield Drive in Zoning District R-3 PUD for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow an off-premise musical production business.
4. V-35-70 Request of DR. JACK TIPPETTS for a Review of Conditions to rescind condition #2 on the original approved Variance to allow a general business office and the retail sale of business machines and supplies on property located at 525 South 13th Street in Zoning District R-4.
Review of
Conditions

M I N U T E S
BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT
JUNE 23, 1977

CALL TO ORDER: A regular meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment was called to order by Chairman Duncan at 7:30 P.M. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

PRESENT: Chairman Duncan, Mrs. Segretti, Mr. Miller, and Mrs. Emmett.

EXCUSED: Mr. Canul

STAFF PRESENT: Don J. Saylor, AIP, Director of the Department of Community Planning and Development
Don W. Brown, Supervisor of Zoning
Ira John Gardner, Planning Assistant
Barbara J. Lindsey, Recording Secretary

OLD BUSINESS:

1. V-53-71 ABEYANCE Request of JAMES AND ADA JEAN PERRY for an Extension of Time on an approved Variance to allow three horses on property located at 4919 East Owens Avenue in Zoning District R-2, where no horses are permitted. (Variance was granted to allow three horses until April 24, 1977.)
Extension of Time
(Abeyance Item from 5/26/77)

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating last month there was an application for an extension of time, and the suggestion to the applicant was that they get together with the neighbors along Owens and Marion and solve the question of the horses. He stated there now has been an application submitted for rezoning of that area from R-2 to R-E and it would be staff's recommendation that we table this until the Planning Commission and City Commission act on this rezoning.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if Mrs. Potter was present?

MR. BROWN stated Mrs. Potter is the one that submitted an application with quite a few names on Owens Avenue for rezoning.

MR. MILLER made a Motion to hold this item, V-53-71, in ABEYANCE pending the decision of both the Planning and City Commission Boards on the application for rezoning from R-2 to R-E.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion to hold this item in ABEYANCE carried unanimously.

2. V-34-77 APPROVED Application of KONG WAI SHEK for a Variance to allow an existing room addition to within 2'2" of the side property line where five feet (5') is required on property located at 1019 Franklin Avenue on the north side of Franklin Avenue between 10th Street and Maryland Parkway in Zoning District R-1 (Single Family Residence). The above property is legally described as Lot 21, Block 11 of Huntridge Subdivision 1 and Lot 21, Block 11 of Huntridge Subdivision 5.
(Abeyance Item from 5/26/77)

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating the gentleman asked for an addition on the north side and as a result staff found a portion of the existing building that has been encroaching into the side yard on the west. He stated there were objectors from the five lots directly behind him and across the street on Norman Avenue; there were another six objectors with two letters of opposition on 10th and directly across the street and to the east we have one in favor.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked how long the room had been in existence?

MR. BROWN stated he didn't know and perhaps the applicant could answer that question.

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

MR. GUYLLAUME, appeared representing the applicant. He stated the addition has been there approximately as long as the house. He said even the Building Department does not know how long this building has been in existence, but probably since the Second World War.

MR. MILLER asked if there were any windows on this side looking into the neighbor's yard?

MR. GUYLLAUME stated there were no windows and there is a six ft. wood fence in the back. He stated that the neighbor on this side is in favor of this application.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if staff has a recommendation on this?

MR. BROWN stated, "not particularly, no."

MR. MILLER asked how long the applicant has been living here?

MR. GUYLLAUME stated about a year; however, he stated he was currently living here as Mr. Shek is in the east. He said the wear on the structure is almost the same as the wear on the house.

MR. BROWN stated the property owner directly to the west is one of the proponents. He said there were two in favor of this variance and the resident to the west is one of them.

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

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-34-77, subject to the following conditions:

1. Signing of an Assessment District Agreement for future street lighting as required by the Department of Public Services.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
3. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. V-42-77

DENIED

Application of LOLA PIVAVAROFF for a Variance to allow a patio cover to the north side property line where a five ft. (5') setback is required, and a covered storage area to the south property line where a seven ft. (7') setback is required

on property located at 2220 Santa Paula Drive in Zoning District R-1 (Single Family Residence). The above property is legally described as Lot 36, Block 1, Paradise Village Tract #2.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating the applicant wants to encroach to the lot lines on both sides. He stated there were about six illegal uses of storage sheds and carports encroaching into the side yards in this area. He stated staff sees nothing unique about this situation that would cause us to recommend approval for encroaching on the side lot lines. He mentioned one of the protestors stated there would be a fire hazard. He said the Fire Department has signed off on the application and one of the fire chiefs said they would not go through from Santa Clara to Santa Paula, and the fact that the applicant's property would be encroaching into the lot line on both sides has no effect because the Fire Department cannot and does not want to get in this way.

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

VERLE McCAULEY appeared representing her mother, Lola Pivavaroff. She proceeded to read a letter from the immediate neighbors to the north, Mr. and Mrs. Miller, stating they are in approval of this application. She stated the following properties have illegal structures to the property lines: 2217, 2301, 2300, 2305, 2313, 2309, 2320, 2304, 2201, 2019, and 2017 Santa Paula.

MR. R. D. JEFFERS, appeared in favor and stated he was a resident in the neighborhood and lives across the street north of the applicant.

ROSE CAVALIER, 2300 Santa Clara, appeared in protest. She said she lives south of the property. She stated she had informed the applicant it was against the law when they wanted to put up the structure and they ignored me. She said they went ahead and put the building up. She said she was the next door neighbor and she showed pictures to the Board of her property which they have destroyed by putting this structure up. She said she had been served with a notice stating she had to take her patio down because it was in violation of the law and she did take it down and had to move it over to conform to the law.

MRS. BESSENT, 2301 Santa Clara, appeared in protest. She said she lives behind Mrs. Cavalier and is concerned about a fire hazard as there are no fire plugs on her block.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated they were here tonight to either approve or deny a variance for this patio.

JOHN McCAULEY, 2220 Santa Paula, appeared and stated the structure is not built on the wall. He stated the water does not drain over to the property next door.

MR. MILLER asked how long ago this structure was built?

MR. McCAULEY replied about three months ago. He said they put an extension on the wall and then made an extension from the patio.

MR. BROWN stated two lots to the south, the people are against this application and there are three in opposition on Santa Clara.

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

MR. MILLER made a Motion for DENIAL of V-42-77 because the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the granting of a variance were not met.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for DENIAL carried unanimously.

2. U-33-77(HO)

APPROVED

Application of JOYCE STRAUS for a Home Occupation Permit to allow the design and production of works of art on property located at 409 Rosemary Lane in Zoning District R-E (Residence Estates). The above property is legally described as Lot 8, Block 1, Rancho Estates.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating there were no letters of opposition and staff would recommend approval.

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

JOYCE STRAUS, 409 Rosemary Lane, appeared and stated she does not have any employees and perhaps one person at a time would come to her house and ask her to design a work of art.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked what type of materials are involved in this?

MRS. STRAUS stated dyes and fabric and she added these materials were not inflammable.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if she understood the advertising limitation?

MRS. STRAUS replied yes and she doesn't plan to advertise. She said her work will be mentioned through word of mouth.

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

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for APPROVAL of U-33-77(HO), subject to the following conditions:

1. All advertising shall conform to the criteria for a Home Occupation Permit.
2. If a complaint is received regarding this operation, the surrounding property owners shall be notified and the Board will conduct a review and the approval may be rescinded.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

3. V-43-77

APPROVED

Application of DONALD R. MORGAN, JR. for a Variance to allow a patio cover to within two and a half feet (2½') of the east side property line where eight feet (8') is required on property located at 3908 Gaviota Avenue in Zoning District R-1 (Single Family Residence). The above property is legally described as Lot 13, Block 4, Park Bonanza East Unit #2.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating that in checking the property staff saw nothing unique about this lot to warrant our recommending intrusion into the side yard and staff would recommend denial.

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

MR. DONALD MORGAN, 3908 Gaviota Avenue, appeared and stated he went to build the patio here because it is the only practical place to build it. He said it will be an aluminum structure and should not be a fire hazard. He said he would like to shield his kitchen window from the sun. He added to build the structure to within five feet of the property line, which is the City's code, would be almost useless.

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

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for DENIAL of V-43-77.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - no
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - no

Motion for DENIAL failed to carry because of a split vote, and therefore, did not achieve any action. Therefore, MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-43-77, subject to the following conditions:

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

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - no
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried by a 3-1 vote.

4. V-44-77
ABEYANCE

Application of AL P. BRENDE, JR. for a Variance to allow a six ft. (6') high wall consisting of two ft. (2') masonry and four ft. (4') wrought iron in the front yard area where a four ft. (4') high, top two ft. (2'), fifty percent (50%) open fence is allowed on property generally located on the northeast corner of Dalmatian Lane and Albacore Drive in Zoning District R-1 (Single Family Residence). The above property is a portion of the North Half (N $\frac{1}{2}$) of the Northeast Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, M.D.M.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating this is a huge lot and huge structure.

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

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion to hold this item in ABEYANCE because there was no one present to represent the applicant.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion to hold this item, V-44-77, in ABEYANCE carried unanimously.

5. V-45-77
DENIED

Application of DALE A. RODELA for a Variance to allow a third dwelling where only two dwelling units are permitted on property located at 1502-1504 Rexford Place in Zoning District R-2 (Two Family Residence). The above property is legally described as Lot 9, Paradise Grove.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating staff does not see anything too unique about this. He pointed out this third dwelling will not include a kitchen and pointed out on the map how the applicant proposes to board up the door from the other two dwelling units.

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

MR. DALE RODELA, 4277 S. Hazelcrest, appeared and stated when he bought this duplex it was sold to him as a triplex. He stated there are only two meters serving the two dwelling units, therefore, he has to pay the power bill on this third unit. He said he has found that people have a tendency to use a little more than they should when he is paying the bill. He said this will in no way alter the outside structure. He said this structure was represented to him by the realtor as a triplex. This third unit will not have a kitchen, just a hot plate and a small refrigerator. He said it is like a studio apartment without the cooking facilities.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if he would want to build a kitchen on this later?

MR. RODELA stated no, there is not room.

MR. MILLER asked if staff cares about this one way or the other?

MR. BROWN stated staff is not enthusiastic about recommending approval.

MR. MILLER stated he thought we should give the applicant some relief because if we don't grant this, he will continue paying the power bill; if we approve it, he will not.

MR. SIDNEY GILLIGAN, appeared in favor. He stated he has the same problem on Rexford Place and wished the Board to recommend approval on this from R-2 to R-3.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated the Board was not here nor could they approve a zone change.

MR. GILLIGAN stated he has the same situation. He said he has three meters on his building. The Electrical Division said just to have the structure rewired and I would be in business.

MR. BROWN stated there was one letter in opposition on Housells.

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

MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-45-77.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - no
Chairman Duncan - no
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL failed to carry and therefore resulted in DENIAL of V-45-77.

MRS. SEGRETTI stated she would like to recommend to staff that the Building Department not be permitted to issue permits for new meters, etc. if they do not know about the zoning.

6. V-46-77
APPROVED

Application of JAMES PAPPA for a Variance to allow a carport to within two feet (2') of the front property line where twenty feet (20') is required and to within one foot (1') of the south side property line where seven feet (7') is required on property located at 1712 Loch Lomond Way in Zoning District R-1 (Single Family Residence). The above property is legally described as Lot 54, Block 4, Glen Heather Estates #4.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating while checking in the field, he went to the corner lot adjacent to this property to see if it would be closer to Loch Lomond. He said the corner structure is as far back or farther than the applicant's present house so the intrusion into the front yard is a gross encroachment and staff recommends denial.

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

MR. JAMES PAPPA, 1712 Loch Lomond, appeared and stated he built this carport for a motor home. He stated that all of the children play in the street; this is a cul-de-sac and he would like to get the vehicle out of the street, where it looks bad. He showed pictures to the Board. He said he went to the neighbors on the cul-de-sac and they are in favor and he had that in writing. He stated the carport is 3/4s of the way completed. He pointed out he did not have a permit for this. The side yards will stay open, he continued, and this will enhance the whole neighborhood as far as he and his neighbors are concerned.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if he was aware of the fact that he should have a permit?

MR. PAPPA said he figures that being an open structure, he would not need a permit.

MRS. EMMETT asked if he was doing the construction himself?

MR. PAPPA replied, "yes".

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if he could bring this back and would it make much of a change?

MR. PAPPA stated yes, he would have to tear part of it down and it would take away from the appearance. He stated he would rather move the structure back though then have to tear the whole thing down.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if this had been approved by the Fire Department on the side property line?

MR. BROWN stated yes; he stated he didn't think they were as concerned with that as the Building and Planning Departments are.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked how far from the corner he was?

MR. PAPPA stated one house from the corner.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if this obstructs any view as far as traffic is concerned?

MR. BROWN stated no it does not interfere with any side.

MR. GLENN SORRELLS, 1713 Loch Lomond, appeared in favor. He said the house is an asset to the neighborhood.

MR. TOM VERBLE, 1725 Loch Lomond, appeared in protest. He said Mr. Pappa did not say that when he puts the motorhome into the driveway, he is into the sidewalk one and a half feet. He said he was strictly against this. It is built about eleven feet high, he said; to get the motorhome in and takes away from the value of the homes around it.

MR. PAPPA reappeared and stated the motorhome does not stick out any more. He said he has torn all of his walkway up and fixed that problem.

MR. VERBLE stated this weekend the motorhome was sitting there and it was sticking out. He stated Mr. Pappe is building this to conform with the structure but it looks like a sore thumb. He said all of the neighbors did not agree with this but they did not want to come here and speak, so he did.

MR. BROWN stated there was one letter in opposition.

MR. PAPPA stated the motorhome does stick out about 1½ ft. right now but this is due to the fact that he has not poured the concrete in the front yet and so I cannot pull the motor home up.

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

MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-46-77, subject to the following conditions:

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

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

RECESS:

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN declared a fifteen minute recess at 8:45 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 9:00 P.M.

7. U-41-77(HO)

APPROVED FOR
SIX MONTHS

Application of EVA M. DEVERE for a Home Occupation Permit. Eva M. Devere has closed her antique store business and stored the remaining inventory in her house located at 3708 West Bonanza Road in Zoning District R-1 (Single Family Residence). She is requesting permission, on a temporary basis, to have customers come to her house to pick up antiques that were previously purchased on a "lay-a-way" basis. The above property is legally described as Lot 6, Block 1, Twin Lakes Estates #4.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating there are twelve objectors on file to this and no approvals.

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

EVA DEVERE, 3708 West Bonanza, appeared. She stated she opened an antique store in August on West Charleston. She said they listed everything in the phone book correctly except they used her home address. Therefore, she had to alarm her house and her office. Meanwhile, she stated, her son was ditching school and using her home for girls and whatever. She stated she has lay-a-ways that have not been picked up and the only thing she does at home is book work. She stated she does appraisals but not in her home. She said she would like this on a temporary basis until her 17 year old son decides what he is going to do, probably about ten months.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked when her son will be attending college?

MRS. DEVERE stated hopefully in September. She mentioned she was a widow and had to make a living.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if she had people coming to her house?

MRS. DEVERE stated yes, they come to pick up their lay-a-ways.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked how much traffic is caused from this?

MRS. DEVERE stated she didn't have that much traffic.

MRS. SEGRETTI asked if her house was still in the telephone directory as her business address?

MRS. DEVERE stated yes, and it is not her fault.

MR. MILLER asked if staff had any recommendation?

MR. BROWN stated as Mr. Saylor would say, we will rely on the Solomonic judgement of the Board.

MR. MILLER asked how accurately this could be policed?

MR. BROWN stated the Board could put a time limit on this and it would be checked out at that time.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if a six month period would be agreeable?

MRS. DEVERE stated she certainly could try and settle her problems in this period.

MR. BROWN stated there was one petition with ten names in opposition noting their location of the signers as being more than one block away and two letters.

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

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for APPROVAL of U-41-77(HO), subject to the following conditions:

1. All advertising shall conform to the criteria for a Home Occupation Permit.
2. If a complaint is received regarding this operation, the surrounding property owners shall be notified and the Board will conduct a review and the approval may be rescinded.
3. This home occupation permit shall be allowed for a maximum of six months, which will expire on December 23, 1977.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

8. U-42-77(HO) Application of MARION PARKER at 2201 Glen Heather Way in Zoning District R-1 for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow the making of macrame items for sale at off-premise locations.
9. U-44-77(HO) Application of JEWEL MOORE at 5716 Pinecone Place in Zoning District R-1 for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow the off-premise sale of ceramic items and paintings.
10. U-45-77(HO) Application of RICHARD PALMER FOR GARY A. GRAY at 867 N. Lamb, Space 147, in Zoning District R-T for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow the design of stained/leaded glass windows for off-premise sale.

11. U-46-77(HO)

Application of DOREEN SHERRY FOX at 2350C Canfield Drive in Zoning District R-3 PUD for a Home Occupation Permit - Allow an off-premise musical production business.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report on these items stating everything is in order with one comment on U-46-77(HO). He stated staff would caution the applicant that there should be no auditioning or recording in the home. Otherwise, he stated, they are in order.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked to hear from Doreen Sherry Fox.

DOREEN SHERRY FOX appeared.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if she understood there is to be no auditioning in the home.

MRS. FOX stated yes, all business is done off the premises.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if the other applicants were present. All were present excepting JEWEL MOORE.

ITEMS 8 THRU 11
APPROVED

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for APPROVAL of Items 8 thru 11, subject to the following conditions:

1. All advertising shall conform to the criteria for a Home Occupation Permit.
2. If a complaint is received regarding this operation, the surrounding property owners shall be notified and the Board will conduct a review and the approval may be rescinded.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

12. V-47-77

APPROVED

Application of ASHWORTH & CO., A LIMITED PARTNERSHIP for a Variance to allow the Silver Street frontage of 149 ft. to be the legal lot front rather than the 142 ft. frontage on Pine; allow a 34.16 ft. rear yard where fifty feet (50') is required, and to allow an outdoor fireplace grill in the required side yard where accessory structures are not permitted, on property located at the northeast corner of Silver Avenue and Pine Street in Zoning District R-E (Residence Estates). The above property is a portion of Block 6, Scotch Eighty Addition Resubdivision.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating the applicant wants to make Silver Avenue the front yard because there is only a seven ft. difference. Inasmuch as this is such a large lot, staff sees no real problem with recommending approval of this because we feel that the intent of the Ordinance would not be thwarted if this were granted.

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

MR. SCHWARTZ, appeared and stated he was the beneficial owner of the property. He said this request has been previously approved and we inadvertently allowed it to lapse. The prior owner, he stated, made the same request and when we bought it we inadvertently allowed it to lapse.

MR. SAYLOR stated it was approved in 1975 under the name of Paul Ferguson.

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

MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-47-77, subject to the following conditions:

1. Signing of an Assessment District Agreement for future improvements along both Silver Avenue and Pine Street as required by the Department of Public Services.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
3. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

13. V-48-77

APPROVED

Application of BILLY J. SLOAT for a Variance to allow four dwelling units on each lot where only three units per lot are allowed on property located at the west side of 13th Street 400 ft. south of Mesquite in Zoning District R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence). The above property is legally described as Lots 9 and 10, Block 2, 14th Street City Addition.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating the area abutting this property to the east is R-3 and across Maryland Parkway it is R-2. Staff feels the request is reasonable, although staff did not like the way the applicant had it laid out as far as ingress and egress, and so we are recommending that he have a 25 ft. ingress and egress. The applicant has agreed to do this, he stated, and we would recommend approval subject to the 25 ft. curb cut and installing a sidewalk along 13th Street.

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

MR. BILLY J. SLOAT, 617 Mayfield, appeared and stated there are fourplexes, two-story, in the area to the north and west. He said this is a very older area of Las Vegas and he thought this would help get some new development started here.

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

MRS. EMMETT made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-48-77, subject to the following conditions:

1. A 25 ft. curb cut shall be provided.
2. Installation of a concrete sidewalk on 13th Street frontage as required by the Department of Public Services.
3. An approved fire hydrant to be within 300 ft. of the apartment complex as required by the Department of Fire Services.
4. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development 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. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.
9. Conformance to the revised plot plan as recommended by staff.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
 Mrs. Segretti - yes
 Chairman Duncan - yes
 Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

13. V-49-77
 APPROVED

Application of JOHN AND DORIS MARTINEZ for a Variance to allow an addition to within forty-six feet (46') of the rear property line where fifty feet (50') is required on property located at 1202 Vista Drive in Zoning District R-E (Residence Estates). The above property is legally described as Lot 3, Block 2, Hinson Heights.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating this lot is 300 ft. deep and he wants to put an addition on the west side. He said there is a block wall to the north on the alley. Staff feels that the intent and purpose of the Ordinance would not be thwarted if this variance was allowed because of the depth of the lot.

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

MR. BILL DECKER, 2612 Jansen, appeared representing the applicant. He said the house is less than 25 ft. wide. He stated in order to stay within the code now, we could only add ten feet onto the back of the house. He stated this addition will consist of two bedrooms, a bathroom and a kitchen. The old kitchen, he mentioned, would be removed.

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

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-49-77, subject to the following conditions:

1. Signing of an Assessment District Agreement for future sidewalk, curb, and gutter, as required by the Department of Public Services.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
3. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
 Mr. Miller - yes
 Chairman Duncan - yes
 Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

DENIED

Application of PHYLLIS JEAN McGUIRE for a Variance to allow a fifteen ft. (15') high concrete block fence along the north property line where a maximum height of six feet (6') is allowed on property located at 100 Rancho Circle in Zoning District R-A (Ranch Acres). The above property is a portion of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, M.D.M.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating the wall being requested is along Rancho Circle and north of the tennis court wall. He pointed out the request is for a fifteen ft. in height fence whereas the Ordinance only permits six ft. Mr. Brown proceeded to read the letter from Morton R. Galane indicating that the applicant was requesting the item be held in abeyance because the attorney could not be in town.

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

R. FRED ALEXANDER, 350 S. Rancho Drive, appeared representing the applicant. He stated they feel they need legal representation on this matter. He pointed out that due to Jude Primeaux's election they are without legal representation. Morton Galane's calendar did not allow him to be here, he stated; his calendar was rather full and they only had about a week and a half's notice which, because of the elction, was not enough notice to give the attorney.

MR. MILLER stated it is not a normal wall to go fifteen feet high but normally when a variance is requested for a higher wall, it is not done through legal representation. He said he thought that there would be enough expertise in this room to give both sides of the story.

MR. ALEXANDER stated he was not prepared in any way to defend the applicant.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if he was the contractor?

MR. ALEXANDER replied, "yes".

MR. MILLER asked if they decided to go on with this, if there was someone here that could answer questions?

MR. ALEXANDER stated no, he was not empowered in any way of handling this.

MRS. SEGRETTI stated that since he is the contractor that he would know the height of the wall and the specifications of the wall that is being requested.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked Mr. Alexander to be seated and asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in favor of this application. There being no one, he asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition.

MR. MILLER asked the protestors to stand for a head count for the record. Approximately 39 people stood in protest.

W. BRUCE BECKLEY of the firm of Beckley, Singleton, DeLanoy & Jemison, First National Bank Building, Las Vegas, Nevada, appeared in protest on behalf of some 28 property owners who own property in Rancho Circle and who reside there. "I have with me and would like to offer in evidence a list of the names of those people, a list of their signatures and their addresses." He submitted the list to the Board. "You will note that the last two names, Joseph G. and Millesent F. Roberts; their signatures appear there but I have been subsequently advised that although they continue to protest the application they desire to speak for themselves. At this point and before making any discussion of the matter whatsoever, there are certain things, that since there may very well be an appeal on this matter, I think should be made a matter of record before you so that they, in the event of an appeal, may in turn be considered by the Board of City Commissioners and beyond that possibly by the courts. At this time, I would like to

offer in evidence as the first exhibit a certified copy prepared by the County Assessor showing the Rancho Circle property together with the two lots which are the ones in issue and on which the variance is requested. Next, I should like to offer in evidence three Grant Bargain and Sale Deeds, the first two of which are the deeds by which the applicant took title to the two lots and parcels of property involved in the variance. The third of the deeds is one which contains the C.C.&R.'s for the entire Rancho Circle area. Next Mr. Chairman, I should like to offer in evidence an Affidavit of Elsie M. Thornburg, Associate Management Analyst, from the Clark County Assessor's Office to which are attached the two property records which relate to the two parcels of property owned by Mrs. McGuire and which are in issue here."

MR. ALEXANDER asked if Mr. Beckley's comments meant that the meeting is continuing and they are not going to be allowed legal counsel; that the matter will not be continued until the next meeting then?

MR. MILLER stated at this time the Board of Zoning Adjustment is going ahead with the issue.

MR. BECKLEY asked if he could have that clarified because he didn't propose to put on his case if the applicant is going to be permitted to put on his case later.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated, "no, sir".

MR. ALEXANDER asked if they could make this a matter of record then that the applicant has no legal counsel and is not prepared on account of the letter which was submitted.

MR. MILLER asked if he would like to take first crack at this?

MR. ALEXANDER stated no, he was not prepared to defend this, the applicant has to have legal counsel.

MR. SAYLOR made a suggestion just to keep the record straight on this. He said the Board had acknowledged the letter by the applicant asking that it be held in abeyance. He is assuming that the Board has decided that they are not going to hold it in abeyance; that they are going to hear tonight and act on it tonight. If that be the case, he said the Board should state, or the chairman should state that they have acknowledged the request for abeyance but the Board has decided to hear the application tonight.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated yes, let that be a matter of the record; that is the procedure.

MR. BECKLEY stated he would like his position made clear. He said he has no objection to anyone here speaking for the applicant. He just doesn't want it heard at some other time.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated that he would like to inform the applicant, Mr. Alexander, that whatever the action of this Board is tonight, the applicant has a right of an appeal to the City Commission.

MR. ALEXANDER stated that basically he would like to know why the hearing was continuing without letting the applicant have legal representation.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated they have acknowledged the letter and have chosen to go ahead with the hearing.

MR. BECKLEY stated, next, "Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer in evidence as I have said, the Affidavit of Elsie M. Thornberg of the Clark County Assessor's Office which has attached to it the official records showing the master property record assessment cards for the two parcels of property involved in the variance. Next, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer in evidence the Affidavit of Maxwell Kelch, who is a resident of Rancho Circle, one of the

protestants here, to which are attached photographs of the property located at 100 Rancho Circle and 300 Rancho Circle showing the construction which is presently going on at that location and that, of course, is also the location where the fifteen ft. wall is requested. Next, Mr. Chairman, I should like to offer in evidence the Affidavit of C. Eric Funston which includes additional photographs taken of the 100-300 Rancho Circle property. Next, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer in evidence the Affidavit of B. D. Perea the Vice-President and General Manager of Greyline Tours of Southern Nevada with respect to the dimensions of the buses which operate in this area. And lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer in evidence an artist sketch of the entrance to Rancho Circle which he feels is indicative of the appearance of the circle should a fifteen ft. wall be allowed in accord with the variance and that precedent established for the other lots in the area. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that all of the members of this Board are thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the Las Vegas City Code with regard to variances but it might not be amiss to briefly review some of those provisions which indicate what burden of proof is required from an applicant and the basis upon which a variance may be granted. I refer the Commission to Section 11-1-24, paragraph 'A' which indicates that only in cases of 'practical difficulties, unnecessary hardships or dictates inconsistent with the general purpose of' the Zoning Chapter, only in those situations, will a variance be required. Paragraph two of that sets forth the purpose of the variance and I think this is very important in considering this particular application. 'The sole purpose of any variance shall be to prevent discrimination, and no variance shall be granted which shall have the effect of granting a special privilege not shared by other property in the same vicinity and zoning district.' I think it takes not much argument to show that the purposes here of which we are not even advised would, rather than avoiding a special situation, create a special privilege with the applicant. Reading on in the code we learn that there are certain things which are required and which must be shown before this Board has authority to grant a variance. The code reads, 'Before any variance may be granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment, the applicant for said variance shall make a substantial showing that: 1. There are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and conditions applicable to the property involved, and that such circumstances and conditions do not apply generally to other properties in the same vicinity and zoning district.' Next, he must make a substantial showing that 'such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right which is possessed by other property in the same vicinity and zoning district and denied to the property in question.' Third and fourth he must show, 'the granting of such variance will not be materially detrimental to the public safety and welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the same vicinity and zoning district' and that, 'the granting of such variance will not adversely affect the Comprehensive General Plan.' I know that you are familiar with those and I'm not going to launch into any long legal discussion about them. We believe that there has been no showing of any nature to this Board as to why this variance should be granted; that none of these requirements are met and indeed that if the Board had to make a finding with what is before it, it would have to find the negative of each one of those requirements because we submit that there is now before you substantial evidence adverse to the applicant. We believe that it is obvious from the wording of the Code that the applicant has in no way met his burden of proof. We submit that not one of the six things which are required upon which this Board could base its finding and conclusions are present here. There is no present discrimination by the zoning law against the McGuire property. The applicant would be getting a special privilege or concession not granted to the other residents and owners in Rancho Circle. The extraordinary or exceptional circumstances required by the statutes do not exist in this case and the other residents of Rancho Circle do not have now a substantial property right which is denied to the applicant. Further, a variance would be detrimental to the public safety

and welfare and to other property in the area. With this record, we submit that this Board should not downgrade one of Las Vegas' most beautiful and attractive residential areas particularly when it will obviously be detrimental to public safety by creating a dangerous curb line structure detrimental to both the aesthetic and economic properties of the other property owners. Particularly, this should not be done where there is no substantial problem which will be solved other than to satisfy what seems to be nothing more than the whim of the applicant. Thank you very much."

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked Mr. Beckley if the two people who wanted to speak in opposition of this were present?

MR. BECKLEY stated he did not know if anyone else wishes to speak or not.

MR. JOSEPH G. ROBERTS, 711 Rancho Circle, appeared in protest. He stated the only thing he might want to remind these people is when he was here about a month ago talking about a little eight ft. fence; he though it was Mr. Miller that said in the conversation, somebody brought up that they might want a fifteen ft. fence next month jokingly.

MR. MILLER stated, he certainly was joking.

MR. ROBERTS said, "Mr. Miller says we wouldn't approve it and I believe Mrs. Segretti and yourself; you weren't here Mrs. Emmett, and the other gentleman all nodded their head in agreement that that was a joke. But if a 15 ft. fence was allowed, what would keep us from next month somebody asking for a 20 ft., maybe like San Quentin, which has a 22 ft. fence around San Quentin."

MR. MILLER stated he would like to ask a question of someone, anyone. There is an affidavit in front of him from the Tourline Services, LTR, pertaining to their buses, apparently how high they are. He had only heard rumors that the reason the wall is going up is because they can look over into their yard and asked if that was correct?

MR. BECKLEY stated, "I've heard rumors too but I find it difficult to believe that if the top point on the bus window is ten ft. that even if this were a good idea that you would have to go 15 ft. in order to keep them from looking."

MR. MILLER stated he was just looking for some reason for that.

MR. BECKLEY stated that was his reason for the affidavit.

MR. ALEXANDER asked if they were allowed a rebuttal?

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated, yes sir. He was just going to ask you for a rebuttal.

MR. ALEXANDER stated again just for the record, Attorney Beckley had presented their case very well. The applicants do not have the representation and again should be given a reason why they are not allowed to be represented. "Our case is very valid. The people chose the judge; we didn't do it and it left us in a very odd situation and it is really, I don't think it is at all fair that the Board continues or makes a decision without us being allowed to have representation. Everything that Attorney Beckley has said, we have presented nothing that he could make these remarks and say this is not right, we have never presented our side."

MR. MILLER stated, "Let me maybe clarify some of that. It is our prerogative, this Board's prerogative whether to hold something in abeyance or not hold it in abeyance. I think it is obvious #1 that it is going to the City Commission after it leaves here irregardless of what we do with it and this is not the final word here. The City Commission may not even be the final word."

MR. ALEXANDER stated, "I realize that, but I just want it made clear that we haven't representation very definitely and that it is a one sided situation. You are acting on only one side if you make a decision. That, I would like to have of the record, please."

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN stated, "so recorded".

MR. BECKLEY stated also for the record "may it show that Mr. Primeaux was elected judge over two weeks ago."

MR. ALEXANDER stated, "we informed the Board on the 15th of June, I talked to the Planning and Development and was referred to Barbara and told Barbara our problem at that time. She said that, "they could not do anything about it because everything had been published; and we had to come and shoot our best shots." So we did inform the Planning and Development the 15th of June.

MRS. SEGRETTE stated, "everybody that comes in here asking for a Variance, irregardless of who they are, where they come from or what the variance is, they come in here and take their best shot; some you win, some you lose."

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

MRS. SEGRETTE stated, "Mr. Chairman, I would like to state at this time all of the words, letters, telegrams, and phone calls have nothing to do with this motion that I am going to put in effect. The variance requested is not in accordance with the City's Ordinance and therefore, I move DENIAL for the variance request."

Voting was as follows:

Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for DENIAL carried unanimously.

16. U-62-72 APPROVED
Review

Request of HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, for a Review of the number of children permitted from twenty-one to thirty-two on an approved Use Permit to allow the operation of a day-care center on property located at 2810 Ambler Street in Zoning District R-2.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating everything seemed to be in order and recommended that the extension be given.

MRS. SEGRETTE asked when he said everything seems to be in order, did that mean the space for this number of children has been approved?

MR. BROWN stated, "yes".

MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of U-62-72, to allow an increase in the number of children from twenty-one to thirty-two.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

17. U-47-63
Extension of Time
APPROVED FOR
TWO (2) YEARS

Request of FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH for an Extension of Time on an approved Use Permit to allow the continuation of a child care nursery and also allow a caretaker's residence on property located at 300 South 9th Street in Zoning District R-4.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating everything seemed to be in order and recommended approval of this.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked how much extension of time?

MR. BROWN suggested one year.

MR. ROGER HALL, appeared representing the applicant. He said they have had a use permit on this property for approximately 14 years. He said they come before this Board approximately every two years. This is a non-profit child care nursery, he said, and they were always vandalized and that is the reason for the caretaker's residence.

MR. MILLER asked if one year would be sufficient?

MR. HALL stated we would like to extend it to two years if possible.

MR. BROWN stated staff would have no objection to two years.

MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of U-47-63 to grant the extension of time for a period of two years, which will expire on June 23, 1979.

Voting was as follows:

Mr. Miller - yes
Mrs. Segretti - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

18. V-35-70 APPROVED
Review of
Conditions

Request of DR. JACK TIPPETTS for a Review of Conditions to rescind condition #2 on the original approved Variance to allow a general business office and the retail sale of business machines and supplies on property located at 525 South 13th Street in Zoning District R-4.

MR. BROWN gave the staff report indicating this is a request to change the general business office allocation from a variance that was granted in 1972 to chiropractic office of Dr. Tippetts. Staff feels this is compatible with the area and recommends approval.

CHAIRMAN DUNCAN asked if the applicant was present.

DR. JACK TIPPETTS, 51 South Lucern, appeared.

MRS. SEGRETTI made a Motion for APPROVAL of V-35-70 to rescind condition #2 of the original Variance, subject to the following condition:

1. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.

Voting was as follows:


Mrs. Segretti - yes
Mr. Miller - yes
Chairman Duncan - yes
Mrs. Emmett - yes

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT


DON S. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

DJS:DWB:bjl