

ANNOTATED AGENDA

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

AUGUST 23, 1983

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

ROLL CALL: PRESENT: BUGBEE, COLEMAN, GUTHRIE, MACK, JOHNSTON, and
TRACY - (TRACY NOT PRESENT FOR ITEMS 1 - 9)

EXCUSED: KENNEDY

ANNOUNCEMENT: Satisfaction of Open Meeting Law and Reading of
Standard Conditions.

MINUTES: Approval of the June 28, 1983 City Planning
Commission minutes.

ACTION: APPROVED
GUTHRIE/UNANIMOUS

NEW BUSINESS:

1. TENTATIVE MAP Property generally located north of Searles Avenue,
between 22nd Street and 23rd Street, R-3 Zone.
PARK NORTH Owner: M & M Builders
VILLAS Subdivider: Jose Morata
No. of Acres: 2.6 No. of Lots: 14

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. 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 (12) months of the approval of the tentative map or an extension of time, up to one year, is not granted for the tentative map, a new tentative map must be filed.
2. Approval of variance application V-83-83.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval for V-83-83.
4. Street names to be provided in accord with the City's Street Name Policy.
5. Subject to all conditions of City departments and State Subdivision Statutes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

2. FINAL MAP Property generally located north of Searles Avenue,
between 22nd Street and 23rd Street, R-3 Zone.
PARK NORTH Owner: M & M Builders
VILLAS Subdivider: Jose Morata
No. of Acres: 2.6 No. of Lots: 14

ACTION: APPROVED
GUTHRIE/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Approval of the tentative map.
2. Conformance with the tentative map.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

3. FINAL MAP

LEWIS HOMES -
STONEGATE NO. 3

Property generally located on the northwest corner
of Alta Drive and Rainbow Boulevard, R-1 Zone.
Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes of Nevada
No. of Acres: 17.5 No. of Lots: 75

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Conformance with the tentative map.
2. Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

4. FINAL MAP

WOODCREST #1
AMENDED PLAT

Property generally located on the southwest corner of
Alexander Road and Torrey Pines Drive, R-E Zone.
(under Resolution of Intent to R-E, R-D, R-1 and R-CL).
Owner: Nevada Savings and Loan Association
Subdivider: Collins Brothers
No. of Acres: 39.5 No. of Lots: 172

ACTION: APPROVED
MACK/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. The 10' drainage easement on the south side of Lots 12 and 33, Block 1,
to be vacated prior to the sale and/or development of these lots.
2. Conformance with the tentative map.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

5. EXTENSION OF
TIME

TENTATIVE MAP
FORESTCREST

Request of COLLINS BROTHERS for an Extension of Time
on property generally located on the south side of
Alta Drive, west of Buffalo Drive, R-1 Zone (under
Resolution of Intent to R-CL).

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITION:

1. Extension of Time shall be limited to a one year time period.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
THIS ACTION BY THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IS FINAL

6. A-8-83(A)

ACTION: APPROVED
MACK/UNANIMOUS

Petition of Annexation submitted by DONALD DRAPER
to annex property generally located on the northwest
corner of Buffalo Drive and Alta Drive, containing
approximately 5 acres.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

7. Z-67-83

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/3-2
(COLEMAN & GUTHRIE - NO)

Application of CLIFFORD AND JANE CARTER for reclassi-
fication of property generally located on the north
side of Del Rey Avenue, 330' east of Rainbow Boulevard,
from N-U to R-3.

Proposed Use: Medium High Density Residential
(Apartments)

CONDITIONS:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Approval of the final site design, building siting and elevations by the Department of Community Planning and Development, utilizing joint access to parking to the rear of the buildings.
3. Dedication of 30' of right-of-way for Del Rey Avenue as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
4. Install street improvements on Del Rey Avenue as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
5. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler system shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
6. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit, license or prior to occupancy.
7. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
8. Approval of the parking and driveway plans by the Traffic Engineer.
9. Repair any damage to the existing street improvements resulting from this development as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
10. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.
11. Satisfaction of City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

PROTESTS: 0

8. TENTATIVE MAP

DEL REY PLAZA

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

Property generally located on the north side of Del Rey Avenue, east of Rainbow Boulevard, N-U Zone (proposed R-3).

Owner: Clifford and Jane Carter

Subdivider: Robert McNutt

No. of Acres: 5.2 No. of Lots: 22

CONDITIONS:

1. 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 (12) months of the approval of the tentative map or an extension of time, up to one year, is not granted for the tentative map, a new tentative map must be filed.
2. Approval of zoning application Z-67-83.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval for Z-67-83.
4. Provide a hydrology report as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
5. If a wall is constructed on an exterior boundary street, the Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions shall contain wording to the effect that each property owner of a lot backing up to said wall shall be responsible for the continued maintenance of the exterior side of the wall and the ground area at the exterior base of the wall.

8. TENTATIVE MAP - DEL REY PLAZA (Continued)

6. A waiver be permitted for the length of the cul-de-sac street.
7. Street names to be provided in accord with the City's Street Name Policy.
8. Subject to all conditions of City departments and State Subdivision Statutes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

9. Z-68-83 Application of WILLIAM RAY ANDERSON for reclassification of property located at 1404 South Eastern Avenue, from R-1 to P-R.
ACTION: APPROVED Proposed Use: Offices
 MACK/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide five parking spaces and the elimination of the proposed northerly curb cut on Eastern Avenue as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
3. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler system shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
4. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit, license or prior to occupancy.
5. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
6. Satisfaction of City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
7. Approval of the parking and driveway plans by the Traffic Engineer.
8. Repair any damage to the existing street improvements resulting from this development as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
9. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL PROTESTS: 0
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

10. Z-69-83 Application of ELIZABETH EMRY for reclassification of property generally located on the northwest corner of Bonneville Avenue and 8th Street (530 South 8th Street), from R-1 to P-R.
WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT Proposed Use: Offices

11. Z-70-83 Application of RICHARD N. AND GUNILLA I. KING for reclassification of property located at 2511 West Bonanza Road, from R-1 to P-R.
ACTION: DENIED Proposed Use: Offices
 COLEMAN/UNANIMOUS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL PROTESTS: 1
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

12. Z-46-83

PLOT PLAN
REVIEW

Request of ROGER A. MAUER for a Plot Plan Review to allow a proposed office building six (6) feet from the new rear property line (north line) and to pave the six (6) foot utility easement area to the north on property generally located on the north side of Charleston Boulevard, between Moonlight Drive and Prince Lane, R-3 Zone (Limited Multiple Residence) (under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial)).

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Conformance to the amended plot plan.
2. Pave the north 6' of the property.
3. Conformance to the original conditions of approval for Z-46-83 except Conditions 2 and 6 as modified above.
4. Recording of the Order of Vacation for VAC-6-83.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 7, 1983

PROTESTS: 0

13. Z-67-80

EXTENSION OF
TIME

Request of DOUGLAS E. SIMMS for an Extension of Time on property generally located on the northwest corner of Stewart Avenue and Lamb Boulevard, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to C-1).

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Extension of Time shall expire September 10, 1984.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

14. Z-32-80

EXTENSION
OF TIME

Request of LAS VEGAS BOARD OF REALTORS for an Extension of Time on property generally located on north side of East Sahara Avenue, between Burnham Avenue and Spencer Street, C-1 Zone.

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Extension of Time shall expire September 25, 1984.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

15. RW-6-83

REQUEST FOR
RAZOR WIRE

Request of SPECIALTY SALES COMPANY to allow one strand of razor wire on top of the existing six (6) foot chain link fence on property generally located on the northwest corner of Regulus Avenue and Procyon Avenue, M Zone.

ACTION: APPROVED
GUTHRIE/UNANIMOUS

15. RW-6-83 (Continued)

CONDITIONS:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. The razor wire shall be a minimum of 6' high and located entirely within the property lines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
THIS ACTION BY THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IS FINAL

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS:

General Plan Update - Presentation by the City's Consultant, The Planning Center.

Drafted goals and objectives accepted as presented.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Z-31-73(15) | Request of JUDY DAWSON for a Plot Plan Review on property located at 1515 South Maryland Parkway, R-1 Zone (under Resolution of Intent to P-R). |
| PLOT PLAN
REVIEW | |

ACTION: APPROVED
COLEMAN/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Conformance to the elevations and amended plot plan.
2. Increase the curb cut width to a minimum of 16'.
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, license or prior to occupancy.
5. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
6. Satisfaction of City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
7. Approval of the parking and driveway plans by the Traffic Engineer.
8. Repair any damage to the existing street improvements resulting from this development as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
9. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

2. AR-6-83

AESTHETIC
REVIEW

Request of MARNELL CORRAO ASSOCIATES ON BEHALF OF CALIFORNIA HOTEL AND CASINO for an Aesthetic Review to allow a proposed hotel and casino expansion and a six-level parking garage to the existing facility on property generally located on the northeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street, C-2 Zone.

ACTION: APPROVED
TRACY/5-0-1
(JOHNSTON ABSTAINED)

CONDITIONS:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.
2. Vacation of the alley.
3. Approval of an encroachment for the landscaping on the Ogden Avenue sidewalk as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
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 system 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, license or prior to occupancy.
6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
7. Satisfaction of City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
8. Approval of the parking and driveway plans by the Traffic Engineer.
9. Repair any damage to the existing street improvements resulting from this development as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
10. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
TO BE HEARD BY CITY COUNCIL: SEPTEMBER 7, 1983

3. Z-3-63

PLOT PLAN
REVIEW

Request of DENNIS AND PAM COUEVAS ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL AND RACHEL CLINE for a Plot Plan Review to allow a one-story fourplex on property located at 394 Maydelle Place, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-3).

ACTION: APPROVED
COLEMAN/UNANIMOUS

CONDITIONS:

1. Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide a 5' planter along the street frontage.
2. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler system shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
3. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit, license or prior to occupancy.
4. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.

3. Z-3-63 (Continued)

5. Satisfaction of City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
6. Approval of the parking and driveway plans by the Traffic Engineer.
7. Repair any damage to the existing street improvements resulting from this development as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
8. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
THIS ACTION BY THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IS FINAL

- | | |
|--|--|
| 4. AV-5-83

ADMINISTRATIVE
VARIANCE | Request of DALE AND HELEN LARSON for an Administrative Variance to allow the existing addition on property located at 2112 Wengert Avenue, R-1 Zone. |
|--|--|

ACTION: APPROVED
JOHNSTON/UNANIMOUS

CONDITION:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL
THIS ACTION BY THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IS FINAL



ANNOTATED AGENDA
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
AUGUST 23, 1983

MINUTES:

June 28, 1983

APPROVED - GUTHRIE/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

NEW BUSINESS:

1. TENTATIVE MAP
PARK NORTH
VILLAS

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Approval of Variance request
V-83-83.
2. Conformance to the conditions
of approval for V-83-83.

2. FINAL MAP
PARK NORTH
VILLAS

APPROVED - GUTHRIE/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Approval of the tentative map.
2. Conformance with the tentative
map.
3. Conformance to the conditions
of approval for the tentative
map.

3. FINAL MAP
LEWIS HOMES -
STONEGATE NO. 3

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Conformance with the tentative
map.
2. Conformance to the conditions
of approval for the tentative
map.

4. FINAL MAP
WOODCREST #1
AMENDED PLAT

APPROVED - MACK/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Ten foot drainage easement
on the south side of Lot 12
and 33, Block 1, be vacated
prior to the sale and/or
development of these lots.
2. Conformance to the tentative
map.
3. Conformance to the conditions
of approval for the tentative
map.

5. EXTENSION
OF TIME

TENTATIVE MAP
FORESTCREST

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITION: 1. One year extension.

6. A-8-83(A)

APPROVED - MACK/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

7. Z-67-83

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee
NOES: Coleman, Guthrie

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Application amended to
8 units per acre.
2. Resolution of Intent with
a twelve month time limit.
3. Redesign the site plan to
include the 8 units per
acre concept.
4. Dedication of 30 feet of
right-of-way for Del Rey
Avenue as required by
Engineering Services.
5. Install street improvements
on Del Rey Avenue as required
by Engineering Services.
6. Standard conditions 2 - 8.

PROTESTS: 0

8. TENTATIVE MAP
DEL REY PLAZA

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Coleman, Guthrie
NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Approval of zoning request
Z-67-83.
2. Conformance to the conditions
of approval for Z-67-83.
3. Provide a hydrology report
required by the Dept. of
Engineering Services.
4. Wall statement.
5. Approval of waiver for length
of cul-de-sac.

9. Z-68-83

APPROVED - MACK/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman

NOES: None

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit.
 2. Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide 5 parking spaces and eliminate the proposed northerly curb cut on Eastern Avenue.
 3. Landscape north portion as required by Community Planning and Development.
 4. Standard conditions 2 through 8

PROTESTS: 0

10. Z-69-83

WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

11. Z-70-83

DENIED - COLEMAN/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Bugbee, Guthrie, Coleman

NOES: None

APPROVALS: 12 signatures

PROTESTS: Jack Benedict, 308 Ramsey Street

12. Z-46-83

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Bugbee, Guthrie, Coleman

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

NOES: None

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Conformance to the amended plot plan.
 2. Pave the north 6 feet of the property.
 3. Conformance to the original conditions of Z-46-83 except 2 and 6 as modified above.
 4. Recording of the Order of Vacation (VAC-6-83).

PROTESTS: 0

13. Z-67-80

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Bugbee, Guthrie, Coleman

EXTENSION OF
TIME

NOES: None

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.
 2. Resolution of Intent shall expire September 10, 1984.

14. Z-32-80

EXTENSION OF
TIME

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Guthrie, Coleman, Bugbee
NOES: None

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Resolution of Intent shall expire September 25, 1984.
 2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

15. RW-6-83

REQUEST FOR
RAZOR WIRE

APPROVED - GUTHRIE/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Bugbee, Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Conformance to the plot plan.
 2. Razor wire shall be a minimum of 6 feet high and kept entirely within the property.

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS:

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE: Discussion took place

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA:

1. Z-31-73(15)

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED - COLEMAN/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Bugbee, Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.
 2. Increase the curb cut width to a minimum of 16 feet.
 3. Standard conditions 2 thru 8.

2. AR-6-83

AESTHETIC REVIEW

APPROVED - TRACY/AYES: Tracy, Mack, Bugbee,
Guthrie, Coleman
NOES: None
ABSTAINED: Johnston

- SPECIAL CONDITIONS:
1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.
 2. Vacation of the alley.
 3. Approval of an encroachment for the landscaping on the Ogden Avenue sidewalk as required by Engineering Services.
 4. Standard conditions 2 thru 8.

3. Z-3-63

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED - COLEMAN/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Guthrie, Coleman, Bugbee

NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: 1. Conformance to the plot plan
amended to provide a 5 foot
planter along the street
frontage.
2. Standard conditions 2 thru 8.

4. AV-5-83

ADMINISTRATIVE
VARIANCE

APPROVED - JOHNSTON/AYES: Tracy, Johnston, Mack,
Guthrie, Coleman, Bugbee

NOES: None

SPECIAL CONDITION: 1. Conformance to the plot
plan and elevations.

MINUTES

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

AUGUST 23, 1983

CALL TO ORDER:

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

PRESENT:

Chairman Bugbee
Mrs. Tracy
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Mack
Mrs. Guthrie
Mrs. Coleman

EXCUSED:

Mr. Kennedy

STAFF PRESENT:

Harold P. Foster, Director, Department of Community
Planning and Development
Howard Null, Chief, Planning Division
Robert C. Clemmer, Acting Chief, Zoning Division
Harry VonBusch, Planning Assistant
Val Steed, Deputy City Attorney
Linda Owens, Recording Secretary

ANNOUNCEMENT:

MR. FOSTER stated the agenda for this regular meeting of the City Planning Commission has been posted and mailed in accordance with NRS Chapter 241 and affidavits are on file in the office of the Department of Community Planning and Development.

REZONING CONDITIONS:

MR. FOSTER read the normal conditions that would apply to any approved rezoning items heard at this meeting.

MINUTES:

MR. GUTHRIE made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Minutes for the June 28, 1983 City Planning Commission meeting as mailed. Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. TENTATIVE MAP

PARK NORTH
VILLAS

APPROVED

Property generally located north of Searles Avenue between 22nd Street and 23rd Street, R-3 Zone.

Owner: M & M Builders

Subdivider: Jose Morata

No. of Acres: 2.6

No. of Lots: 14

MR. NULL stated these are existing fourplexes. The applicant is proposing to provide each unit with a lot. There is a need for a 10 foot front yard Variance. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Approval of Variance request V-83-83, 2) Conformance to the conditions of approval for V-83-83, and the normal conditions.

JOSE MORATA, 517 South Casino Center Boulevard, appeared for the application. He is in agreement with staff's conditions.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Tentative Map for Park North Villas, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

1. TENTATIVE MAP
(Continued)

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983.

2. FINAL MAP
PARK NORTH
VILLAS
APPROVED

Property generally located north of Searles Avenue between 22nd Street and 23rd Street, R-3 Zone.

Owner: M & M Builders

Subdivider: Jose Morata

No. of Acres: 2.6 No. of Lots: 14

MR. NULL stated this final map is in substantial conformity with the tentative map. Staff would recommend approval with the following conditions: 1) Approval of the tentative map, 2) Conformance with the tentative map, and 3) Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

JOSE MORATA, 517 South Casino Center Boulevard, appeared for the application. He is in agreement with staff's conditions.

MR. GUTHRIE made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Final Map for Park North Villas, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

3. FINAL MAP
LEWIS HOMES -
STONEGATE NO. 3
APPROVED

Property generally located on the northwest corner of Alta Drive and Rainbow Boulevard, R-1 Zone.

Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes of Nevada

No. of Acres: 17.5 No. of Lots: 75

MR. NULL stated this final map is in substantial conformity with the tentative map. Staff would recommend approval with the following conditions: 1) Conformance with the tentative map, and 2) Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

JAMES RUSSELL, 1100 East Sahara Avenue, appeared for the applicants. They are in accord with staff's recommendations.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Final Map for Lewis Homes, Stonegate No. 3, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

4. FINAL MAP

WOODCREST NO. 1
AMENDED PLAT

APPROVED

Property generally located on the southwest corner of Alexander Road and Torrey Pines Drive, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-E, R-D, R-1 and R-CL).

Owner: Nevada Savings and Loan Association

Subdivider: Collins Brothers

No. of Acres: 39.5 No. of Lots: 172

MR. NULL stated this final map is in substantial conformity with the tentative map. Staff would recommend approval. The amendment consists of moving an existing drainage easement from the south side of Lots 33 and 12 of Block 1 to a westward position on the east side of Lot 34 and the south side of Lot 13. Staff would have the following conditions: 1) Ten foot drainage easement on the south side of Lots 12 and 33, Block 1, be vacated prior to the sale and/or development of these lots, 2) Conformance to the tentative map, and 3) Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

DEAN CRANELBARROW, ESI, 7022 West Charleston Boulevard, appeared to represent Collins Brothers. They are in agreement with staff's conditions.

PETER BULGAR, 6120 Gowan, appeared stating his property was flooded during the recent heavy rain in the area. He requested the City to check into the drainage situation in his area.

MR. NULL said the City Engineer requires a flood report from the applicant.

MR. FOSTER said the Department of Community Planning and Development will contact the Department of Engineering Services to see what they can do to alleviate the flooding in this area. He felt this proposed subdivision would help to eliminate the flooding conditions because there will be more streets to direct the water.

LORAIN ELMS, 6170 West Duncan Road, appeared stating she felt the streets in this subdivision have not been constructed according to the original conditions.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE directed staff to check into the streets in this subdivision to see if they are according to the plans.

MR. MACK made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Final Map for Woodcrest No. 1, Amended Plat, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

5. EXTENSION OF
TIME

TENTATIVE MAP

FORESTCREST

APPROVED

Request of COLLINS BROTHERS for an Extension of Time on property generally located on the south side of Alta Drive, west of Buffalo Drive, R-1 Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-CL).

MR. NULL stated this is an extension of time for the tentative map. The first unit was recorded in October of 1982. Staff would recommend a one-year extension.

VIRGINIA BAXBY, VTN-NEVADA, 2800 West Sahara Avenue, appeared for the applicant.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Extension of Time on the Tentative Map for Forestcrest, subject to a one-year extension.

5. EXTENSION OF
TIME

(Continued)

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

[Signature]
Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983.

6. A-8-83(A)

APPROVED

Petition of Annexation submitted by DONALD DRAPER to annex property generally located on the northwest corner of Buffalo Drive and Alta Drive, containing approximately 5 acres.

MR. NULL stated this annexation consists of approximately 5 acres with Alta Drive on the south and Buffalo Drive on the east. This property has R-E County zoning and N-U would be the City equivalent. Staff would recommend approval.

JOHN BORONE, 2301 East Sunset Road, appeared to represent the applicant. They plan to petition for a zone change on this property in approximately 30 days.

MR. MACK made a Motion for APPROVAL of A-8-83(A).

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

[Signature]
Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

7. Z-67-83

APPROVED

Application of CLIFFORD AND JANE CARTER for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of Del Rey Avenue, 330 feet east of Rainbow Boulevard, from N-U to R-3.
Proposed Use: Medium High Density Residential
(Apartments)

MR. FOSTER stated this request is on a five-acre parcel that was just annexed into the City this month. The applicant is proposing a series of fourplexes containing 22 lots and 88 units. This is one cul-de-sac with the lots fronting on it and access to Del Rey on the south. To the east multi-family is proposed. To the southeast is R-PD18 zoning which has not been developed yet. Staff feels there is going to be higher density in this area and would recommend the interior lots be around 8 units per acre with higher density on the parcels to the northwest along the major streets. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) The application be amended to 8 units per acre, 2) Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit, 3) Redesign the site plan to include the 8 units per acre, 4) Dedication of 30 feet of right-of-way for Del Rey Avenue as required by Engineering Services, 5) Install street improvements on Del Rey Avenue as required by Engineering Services, and 6) Standard conditions 2 through 8. Staff does not have any protests on record.

BOB MC NUTT, Engineer, 50 South Jones Boulevard, appeared for the applicants. They feel the density in this project does

7. Z-67-83

(Continued)

not exceed the designed population for this area. This project would be 16 dwelling units per acre on 5 acres.

No one appeared in opposition.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-67-83, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack
"NOES" Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

Motion for APPROVAL carried by a 3/2 vote.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

8. TENTATIVE MAP
DEL REY PLAZA
APPROVED

Property generally located on the north side of Del Rey Avenue, east of Rainbow Boulevard, N-U Zone (proposed R-3).

Owner: Clifford and Jane Carter

Subdivider: Robert McNutt

No. of Acres: 5.2 No. of Lots: 22

MR. NULL stated this is the tentative map for Item 7, Z-67-83, above. Staff would recommend the following conditions: 1) Approval of zoning request Z-67-83, 2) Conformance to the conditions of approval for Z-67-83, 3) Provide a hydrology report as required by the Department of Engineering Services, and 4) Wall statement. With these conditions, and the normal conditions, staff would recommend approval. Also, a waiver will be necessary for the length of the cul-de-sac. Staff would recommend approval of the waiver.

BOB MC NUTT, Engineer, 50 South Jones Boulevard, appeared for the applicants. They concur with staff's recommendations.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Tentative Map for Del Rey Plaza, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

9. Z-68-83

APPROVED

Application of WILLIAM RAY ANDERSON for reclassification of property located at 1404 South Eastern Avenue, from R-1 (Single-Family Residence) to P-R (Professional Offices).
Proposed Use: Offices

MR. FOSTER stated this segment of Eastern Avenue is transitioning to P-R zoning. The applicant is proposing to pave most of the area in front of the building along Eastern and along Bracken. Staff feels there should be landscaping along the north portion and more along Bracken and the parking area to the south and not install the driveway, but provide 5 parking spaces along Bracken. The ordinance requires a minimum of 6 spaces, but the Planning Commission can reduce the number of parking spaces. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit, 2) Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide 5 parking

9. Z-68-83

(Continued)

spaces and eliminate the proposed northerly curb cut on Eastern Avenue, 3) Landscape the north portion as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development, and 4) Standard conditions 2 through 8. Staff does not have any protests on record.

WILLIAM RAY ANDERSON, 1404 Eastern Avenue, appeared for the application. He agrees to staff's conditions.

No one was present in opposition.

MR. MACK made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-68-83, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman
"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

10. Z-69-83

WITHDRAWN

Application of ELIZABETH EMRY for reclassification of property generally located on the northwest corner of Bonneville Avenue and 8th Street (530 South 8th Street), from R-1 (Single-Family Residence) to P-R (Professional Offices).

Proposed Use: Offices.

MR. FOSTER stated this item has been withdrawn by the applicant.

11. Z-70-83

DENIED

Application of RICHARD N. AND GUNILLA I. KING for reclassification of property located at 2511 West Bonanza Road, from R-1 (Single-Family Residence) to P-R (Professional Offices).

Proposed Use: Offices

MR. FOSTER stated this property is located on the south side of Bonanza Road and abuts commercial to the east. There is also commercial to the north. On the south side of Bonanza and west of the commercial is a residential subdivision with all of the lots siding onto Bonanza and backing up to commercial. On this particular property there are two home occupations that have been approved in the past, one for a bookkeeping operation and one for a fire alarm sales office. This application is for offices. They would have two parking spaces off Ramsey and one off Bonanza. Six parking spaces would be required on this, but it appears there is only enough room for 5 spaces. Staff would recommend denial due to the fact that this is a subdivision where the lots front each other and if P-R started, there may be additional requests with no logical stopping point. Staff does not have any protests on record.

JAY DOWNEY, 637 East Sahara Avenue, appeared for the applicants. The owner of this property has had a CPA home occupation permit for the last 20 years and the use will remain the same. The reason for this application is that the owner wants to buy a new home and keep this residence for his business. He presented signatures of twelve residents in the area stating their approval. Directly to the rear is a self-service station and convenience store and across the street to the north is the back end of a

11. Z-70-83

(Continued)

shopping center. They feel this use would be compatible for the area. This property is on a corner. None of his clients come to this house.

JACK BENEDICT, 308 Ramsey Street, appeared in protest. This is a residential area. He objected to persons parking in the street to go to the CPA business.

MR. FOSTER explained that the conditions of the home occupation permit are that customers cannot be coming to the house, no external evidence of the business, no signs or hauling goods to a from the property.

JAY DOWNEY appeared in rebuttal. He reiterated that the CPA business has been there for 20 years.

MRS. COLEMAN made a Motion for DENIAL of Z-70-83.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman
"NOES" None

Motion for DENIAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

12. Z-46-83

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED

Request of ROBER A. MAUER for a Plot Plan Review to allow a proposed office building six feet (6') from the new rear property line (north line) and to pave the six foot (6') utility easement area to the north on property generally located on the north side of Charleston Boulevard between Moonlight Drive and Prince Lane, R-3 Zone (Limited Multiple Residence) (under Resolution of Intent to C-1, Limited Commercial). ←

MR. FOSTER stated C-1 zoning was approved on this property earlier this year. The plot plan originally proposed the buildings to be to the rear property line, but there was a 20 foot easement. There has been an application to vacate the south 14 feet of the easement because only the north 6 feet is needed for utility purposes. This request is to revise the plot plan to shift the two buildings back into the south 14 feet of the utility area, leaving a 6 foot setback from the buildings to the north property line. There are single-family homes abutting the north property line. Staff notified the property owners to the north and have not received any protests. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to the amended plot plan, 2) Pave the north 6 feet of the property, 3) Conformance to the original conditions of Z-46-83, except conditions 2 and 6 as modified above, and 4) Recording of the Order of Vacation (VAC-6-83), which is in the process of being done. ←

ROGER A. MAUER, 4000 West Mountain View Boulevard, appeared for the application. This will be a one-story building for a dental office. He is requesting a 6 foot setback because the power company is requiring 5 feet. ←

MR. MACK felt there could be a security problem in the 6 feet as well as a collection of trash.

12. Z-46-83

(Continued)

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-46-83, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman
"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

13. Z-67-80

EXTENSION
OF TIME

APPROVED

Request of DOUGLAS E. SIMMS for an Extension of Time on property generally located on the northwest corner of Stewart Avenue and Lamb Boulevard, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to C-1).

MR. FOSTER stated this is approximately a half mile north on Lamb Boulevard at Stewart Avenue. There is a small shopping center being proposed on the site. This is the third request for an extension of time due to financing. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval, and 2) Resolution of Time shall expire on September 10, 1984. *John*

JOHN HOMER, Real Corporation, 228 South 4th Street, appeared for the applicant. He owners of the property have contacted Lewis to develop the shopping center.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-67-80, Extension of Time, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman
"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

14. Z-32-80

EXTENSION
OF TIME

APPROVED

Request of LAS VEGAS BOARD OF REALTORS for an Extension of Time on property generally located on the north side of East Sahara Avenue, between Burnham Avenue and Spencer Street, C-1 Zone.

MR. FOSTER stated a portion of this property was developed for a Honda dealership. The balance of the property is still under Resolution of Intent. This is the second request for an Extension of Time. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Resolution of Intent shall expire September 25, 1984, and 2) Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

RON RUDIN, 5112 West Charleston Boulevard, appeared on behalf of the Las Vegas Board of Realtors.

14. Z-32-80

(Continued)

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-32-80, Extension of Time, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

15. RW-6-83

REQUEST FOR
RAZOR WIRE

APPROVED

Request of SPECIALTY SALES COMPANY to allow one strand of razor wire on top of the existing six foot (6') chain line fence on property generally located on the northwest corner of Regulus Avenue and Procyon Avenue, M Zone.

MR. FOSTER stated this is in the Valley View/Desert Inn area. They are requesting razor wire on the west, north and interior of an existing warehouse and office facility. Staff feels it is compatible to the area and would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to the plot plan that has been submitted, and 2) Razor wire shall be a minimum of 6 feet high and kept entirely within the property.

RONALD LIGHTHEART, 4339 Calimera, appeared to represent Specialty Sales Company. They agree with staff's conditions.

MR. GUTHRIE made a Motion for APPROVAL of RW-6-83, Request for Razor Wire, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this is final action.

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS:

General Plan Update - Presentation by the City's Consultant, The Planning Center.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA:

1. Z-31-73(15)

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED

Request of JUDY DAWSON for a Plot Plan Review on property located at 1515 South Maryland Parkway, R-1 Zone (under Resolution of Intent to P-R).

MR. FOSTER stated this is located on the east side of Maryland Parkway about 5 blocks north of Oakey Boulevard. The property is under a Resolution of Intent and is being converted to an office. This will be a one story 1,460 square foot office. They are proposing an addition to the existing residence on the property. Parking is in the rear through a covered carport from the front. Staff is recommending approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to the plot plan and elevations, 2) Increase the curb cut width to a minimum of 16 feet, and 3) Standard conditions 2 through 8.

JAY DOWNEY, 637 East Sahara Avenue, appeared for the applicant. They agree to staff's conditions.

MRS. COLEMAN made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-31-78(15), Plot Plan Review, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

2. AR-6-83

AESTHETIC REVIEW

APPROVED

Request of MARNELL CORRAO ASSOCIATES ON BEHALF OF CALIFORNIA HOTEL AND CASINO for an Aesthetic Review to allow a proposed hotel and casino expansion and a six-level parking garage to the existing facility on property generally located on the northeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street, C-2 Zone.

MR. FOSTER stated this will be a major addition to the existing hotel and casino facility. It will incorporate the entire block, except for the service station on the northwest corner. There will be a six-story parking structure on the northeast portion and the fourteen-story addition will be on the south portion. The aesthetics are compatible with the existing facility. They are proposing landscaping along the street frontage which will be in the right-of-way and requires an encroachment permit. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to the plot plan and elevations, 2) Vacation of existing north/south alley, 3) Approval of an encroachment agreement for the landscaping on the Ogden Avenue sidewalk as required by the Department of Engineering Services, 4) Standard conditions 2 through 8.

ALAN AKERSCHOEK, 4495 South Polaris Avenue, appeared on behalf of Marnell Corrao Associates. The addition will be \$25 million and the garage \$3.6 million.

MRS. TRACY made a Motion for APPROVAL of AR-6-83, Aesthetic Review, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Mack,
Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

"ABSTAINED" Mr. Johnston

2. AR-6-83

Motion for APPROVAL carried by a 5/0/1 vote.

(Continued)

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this item would be heard by the City Council on September 21, 1983 at 2:00 P.M.

3. Z-3-63

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED

Request of DENNIS AND PAM COUEVAS ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL AND RACHEL CLINE for a Plot Plan Review to allow a one-story fourplex on property located at 394 Maydelle Place, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-3).

MR. FOSTER stated the building is 86 feet long on an 8,100 square foot lot. Because of the length of the building and accommodating the required parking in front of the building, that only leaves a 3 foot planter along the street frontage. Staff feels there should be a minimum of 5 feet in front. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide a 5 foot planter along the street frontage, and 2) Standard conditions 2 through 8.

MICHAEL CLINE, 7020 Gilespe, appeared for the application. He is in agreement with staff's conditions.

MRS. COLEMAN made a Motion for APPROVAL of Z-3-63, Plot Plan Review, subject to staff's recommendations.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this is final action.

4. AV-5-83

ADMINISTRATIVE
VARIANCE

APPROVED

Request of DALE AND HELEN LARSON for an Administrative Variance to allow the existing addition on property located at 2112 Wengert Avenue, R-1 Zone.

MR. FOSTER stated this is a half block east of Eastern Avenue. It is for an addition that has existed for the past 17 years. Under the City ordinance, any addition that has existed for 10 years or more falls under the Administrative Variance provisions. Staff would recommend approval, subject to: 1) Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.

HELEN LARSON, 1400 Ardmore, appeared for the application. This is an enclosed addition to the side of the house.

MR. JOHNSTON made a Motion for APPROVAL of AV-5-83, Administrative Variance, subject to staff's conditions.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" Chairman Bugbee, Mrs. Tracy, Mr. Johnston,
Mr. Mack, Mr. Guthrie, Mrs. Coleman

"NOES" None

Motion for APPROVAL carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE announced this is final action.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the City Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

NAME

Lorraine Elms

ADDRESS

6170 W DUNCAN LUN 89108

NAME

ADDRESS

JOSE MORATA

James L. Russell
Du M

Virginia E. Cox
John Brown

Bob Mc Nutt

Alvin Ray Parker

Anthony
J. Benedict

Erge A. Mauer

John W. W. W.

Ronald Lightfoot

Alan A. Kershock

Michael Ellis

Wileen Larson

517 S CASINO CENTER

LAS VEGAS NV 89101

1100 E. Sahara

7022 W. CHARLESTON

1800 W. SAHARA AB

2301 E Sunset Rd #20

50 So Jones

1404 Eastern Ave

637 E Sahara

708 Ramona

4000 W. Mt View Blvd.

228 So. 4th St.

4339 CALIFORNIA LV

4495 S. Polaris

7020 Gillespie

1400 Ardmore

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date

August 17, 1983

TO:

HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

FROM:

ROBERT C. CLEMMER, ACTING CHIEF
ZONING DIVISION

SUBJECT:

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF
AUGUST 23, 1983

COPIES TO:

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE - LINDA
CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
CINDY
RICKNEW BUSINESS:

7. Z-67-83

This proposal is for 22 (7,000 sq. ft.+) lots for fourplex development. The lots are irregular lending themselves to custom designed fourplexes. There are no site plans or elevations as they will vary. The long cul-de-sac opens to Del Rey. The County approved 14 units per acre directly south. The Planning Commission approved 16 units per acre directly east on a County referral. The vacant property to the north is fronting Charleston Boulevard and has commercial potential. The property due west fronts Rainbow Blvd. and has medium high density potential. We recommended 8-9 units per acre directly east, but Planning Commission recommended 16 units per acre and the City Council on August 17, 1983 supported staff position of 8. In the long run this will probably be an urban neighborhood of 5,000 population.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of 8 units per acre subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Approval of the final site design, building siteing and elevations, by the Department of Community Planning and Development utilizing joint access to parking.
3. Dedication of 30' of right-of-way for Del Rey Avenue as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
4. Install street improvements on Del Rey Avenue as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
5. Standard conditions 2-8.

PROTESTS: O

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING. SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

9. Z-68-83

This proposal is in an area predetermined to transition to P-R. This is a one story 1,283 sq. ft. building to be used as an accountant's office. They propose black topping the whole lot to achieve 6 spaces, but the Planning Commission can allow 5 that can be achieved with the least loss of landscaping and not take the traffic further north than the existing curb cut on Eastern Avenue. An accountant's office can function okay with 5 spaces. Code requires a 6' wall on the east property line.

Staff would recommend APPROVAL subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide 5 parking spaces and the elimination of the proposed northerly curb cut on Eastern Avenue.
3. Standard conditions 2-8.

PROTESTS:

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM.

SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

10. Z-69-83

We are trying to reach Elizabeth Emry to resign an application for a Variance by the 29th for the September 22nd B.Z.A. which is the City Council advocated direction in this area. (Notices sent). Withdrawn. Variance filed. Notified property owners of withdrawal and Varaince emminence.

11. Z-70-83

Two home occupations have been allowed for Mr. King, i.e. bookkeeping, fire alarm sales under U-9-66(HO), U-35-68(HO) respectively, U-39-72(HO) a home occupation for real estate sales was denied by the B.Z.A. and City Council.

Also, Z-109-79 for a change to P-R was denied by staff, Planning Commission and City Commission December 5, 1979. The site could not provide the required six spaces. Staff feels that circumstances have not changed and this is contrary to the established zoning pattern in the area. Planning Commission can reduce the parking, but the proposed use is not known.

Staff recommends DENIAL. If approved subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide six off-street parking spaces.
3. Provision of a 6' block wall along the south property line except in the front yard where it shall be 4' high with the top 2' fifty-percent open.
4. Standard conditions 2-8.

PROTESTS:

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM.

SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

12. Z-46-83

This is a rehearing to allow the proposed building 6' from the north property line when originally 20' was required due to the 20' easement. 14' of the easement has been approved for Vacation (VAC-6-83). The Alta-Valley View review allowed the building close to the R-1 yet staff feels a compatible separation would be in the 20' or more range. In this case, the 20' setback will reduce the parking capabilities and if the adjacent R-1 property owners are not objecting, staff would have no objection. The one property owner at the original hearing seemed more concerned that the rear 20' area be paved for maintenance than to the proximity. Amends two of the original conditions 2 & 6.

Staff has no objection. If approved subject to:

1. Conformance to the amended plot plan.
2. Pave the north 6' of the property.
3. Conformance to the original conditions of Z-46-83 except 2 & 6 as modified above.
4. Recording of the Order of Vacation (VAC-6-83).

PROTESTS:

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

13. Z-67-80

C-1 is an appropriate zone for this site. This is the third request for an Extension. Money market conditions cited.

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to:

1. Conformance to all Ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.
2. The Resolution of Intent shall expire September 10, 1984.

PROTESTS:

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

14. Z-32-80

The Honda dealership developed and completed Sept. 25, 1981. There has been one Extension of Time to 9/25/83.

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to:

1. This Resolution of Intent shall expire Sept. 25, 1984.
2. Conformance to all Ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

PROTESTS:

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

15. RW-6-83

This is an industrial area. Razor wire is permitted with Planning Commission approval. City Council not required unless appealed. Location shown is okay.

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. The razor wire shall be a minimum of 6' high and kept entirely within the property.

PROTESTS: N/A

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR P. C. FINAL ACTION.

SUPPLEMENTAL:

1. Z-31-73(15)

This building is one story, but appears two story with a high parapet to screen the existing ridge line. It appears less than residential in character. It contains 1,460 sq. ft. and 6 spaces are provided. The Maryland Parkway curb cut should be widened to a minimum of 16'. It is not known by the developer if the parapet will be carried all the way around or just retained on the sides to screen the street exposure. Resolution requires City Council approval. 17' height questionable as a condition of the Resolution is one story.

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations amended to reduce the overall height to 15' to provide residential character and carry the parapet construction entirely around the building to screen the roof mechanics.
2. Increase the curb cut width to a minimum of 16'.
3. Standard conditions 2-8.

PROTESTS: N/A

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983

2. AR-6-83

This proposal is for a 294,000 sq. ft. addition to the California Club with an additional 149,000 sq. ft. six level parking structure containing 450 spaces. It will include casino area and restaurant expansion on the first floor. Convention facilities on the second floor and 11 floors of guest suites (363 units) and penthouse for an overall height of 14 stories.

The aesthetics are fine with landscaping insets on Main Street, the parking structure is set back 6' from Stewart and 1st Streets for landscaping, but along Ogden, the landscaping will be on the sidewalk which requires

AR-6-83 (continued)

encroachment approval. One major problem is that the alley has not been vacated.

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.
2. Vacation of the alley.
3. Approval of an encroachment for the landscaping on the Ogden Avenue sidewalk as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
4. Standard conditions 2-8.

PROTESTS: N/A

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR CITY COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 21, 1983.

3. Z-3-63

This proposed fourplex on an 8,100 sq. ft. lot is not designed to fit the lot. It is a one story building 86' deep with the parking lot in front. The 5 spaces require a depth of 26' which coupled with the rear 20' setback only leaves 3' for landscaping which is below our standards. The Planning Commission could approve this amount of landscaping, but we should advocate a reduction of the building size at least several feet.

Staff would recommend APPROVAL subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan amended to provide a 5' planter along the street frontage.
2. Standard conditions 2 - 8.

PROTESTS: N/A

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR P.C. FINAL ACTION.

4. AV-5-83

19.88.280 allows that the Planning Commission may allow this existing room to remain as it has existed for over 17 years.

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.

PROTESTS: N/A

NOT A PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. SET FOR P. C. FINAL ACTION.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date

August 23, 1983

TO:

FOSTER

FROM:

NUI

SUBJECT:

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
August 23, 1983
Agenda Item Conditions

COPIES TO:

VAL STEED
CINDY EADE
LINDA OWENS

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Tentative Map - Park North Villas

- Approval of variance request V-83-83.
- Conformance to the conditions of approval for V-83-83.
Standard conditions 1-3

2. Final Map - Park North Villas

- Approval of the tentative map.
- Conformance with the tentative map.
- Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

3. Final Map - Lewis Homes - Stonegate No. 3

- Conformance with the tentative map.
- Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

4. Final Map - Woodcrest #1 Amended

- The 10' drainage easement on the south side of Lots 12 and 33, Block 1 to be vacated prior to the sale and/or development of these lots.
- Conformance with the tentative map.
- Conformance to the conditions of approval for the tentative map.

5. Extension of Time - Forestcrest - Tentative Map

Staff recommends a one year extension. The first unit was recorded in October 1982.

6. A-8-83(A)

This tract has R-E County zoning; City equivalent is N-U. Staff recommends approval.

TO: FOSTER
August 23, 1983
Page Two

8. Tentative Map - Del Rey Plaza

- Approval of zoning request Z-67-83.
 - Conformance to the conditions of approval for Z-67-83.
 - Provide a hydrology report as required by the Department of Engineering Services.
 - Wall statement.
 - A waiver be permitted for the length of the cul-de-sac street.
- Standard conditions 1-3

HAN:cme

MR. FOSTER:

We have with us tonight the Consultants, which have been hired to work on the Update of the City's General Plan. They would like to bring you up to date and also review some of the goals and objectives, population, growth scenarios, and so forth. At this time, I'll just turn it over to Al Bell from The Planning Center, who is the Project Manager.

AL BELL:

Thank you, Harold. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I'm Al Bell from The Planning Center, Newport Beach. We have been working with your staff now on the Update of your General Plan for a number of weeks. We have found it a very fascinating project and we find Las Vegas a very fascinating city. There is a Citizens' Advisory Committee appointed by the City Council that consists of over 60 members of the community who are to advise us on their various interests in the Plan. There is also a Technical Advisory Committee made up of several key department heads in the City that have responsibility for the physical development of Las Vegas. Our first order of business was to try and set some direction for the preparation of the body of plan. You have the draft of that material now and the Goals and Objectives package that you received. On the surface they read as pretty general statements; one might even say they are hardly arguable, but we have sat through a number of hours of discussion about many of the points in that package, and as indicated by the items that are asterisked in the List of Goals and Objections, quite a number of them have been changed in the process. The reason we think they are significant is because, first of all, the subjects they define cover the scope of content of the General Plan. State law requires a certain coverage in your General Plan. It also permits that the General Plan can deal with anything that relates to the physical development of the city. So you can go on almost indefinitely. We do not think that is a good idea. What the Goals and Objectives do by their scope is structure the basic content of the Plan. Furthermore, when we get down to the point of developing and having reviewed the policies and programs that seemed to us to make the most sense to guide the future of the city, there is no question but we're going to get embroiled in a certain amount of controversy and conflict. Not everybody sees the future in the same way. When that happens, what we will end up having to do is go back to the Goals and Objectives materials and start over again to try to set a new direction, or a new set of policies, to carry out that direction. I anticipate that on some subjects we may have to go through that process more than once in order to get a proposal in front of your Commission and the City Council that will pass muster. The kind of General Plan that we recommend for the City of Las Vegas is one that doesn't exist very many places. It's being tried in a few areas, in particular, a couple of rather dynamic growth areas in California and we think it is very compatible with some of the ingredients in the Plan that you have had for some

AL BELL:

time; it goes beyond it and will help you in some accomplishments in the city that we think are kind of important. We envisioned the General Plan that consists essentially of three parts: One we call a Long-Range Plan. It looks well beyond the next twenty years towards the ultimate development of the city. We have some graphics that will help explain this in just a moment, but let me quickly summarize the three ingredients in the Plan that we envision. No one is wise enough to know exactly what is going to happen twenty years from now, let alone beyond that, but you can, in fact, establish the basic direction and have a frame of reference for shorter-range activities. This is particularly valuable in high-growth areas because a lot can happen in a very short period of time. We have seen communities virtually become strangled in their own success because they didn't think far enough ahead in terms of transportation, for example, and they just choked off their own economic development because of that. With the current fiscal situation that the cities face, it takes a much longer time now than it used to to conceive, plan, design, schedule, finance and build large-scale public facilities, such as freeways, arterial highways, bridge structures, and so forth. Consequently, it doesn't take really too much of a major project to get you well into that twenty-year period before you actually get it on the ground, assuming you decide you want it, and that's worse today than it used to be. So it isn't really too outrageous to think that far in the future. The second part of the Plan is called the Mid-Range Plan and, for practical purposes, we would suggest that that's really aimed at the year 2000. That sounds like a long ways away too, but it's only seventeen years. By the time the Plan gets adopted it will be sixteen years. The Mid-Range Plan will contain all of the subjects required by state law and policies and programs related to every objective that is contained in that package that you received. The policies and the programs are actions that are to be taken by the City of Las Vegas, either to do for itself the things that it feels have to be done in order to make the future happen the way you want it, or perhaps, to influence others, the County, the State, sometimes Federal Government, the Legislature. Short-Range Plan is the third part and in that portion of the plan we envision using areas within the city, not the total jurisdiction but areas within it. We call them "Community Profiles." We're working with the staff now in trying to decide exactly what size and configuration of area would be most appropriate. In that plan, the Short-Range Plan, we see some rather specific guidelines for land use proposals on vacant land that exists or on land that is presently developed or may redevelop within a short term. It is probably Part Three of the Plan that you will find most relevant to the work that you do on a regular basis. The Short-Term Plan, we think is very important because it takes all of these ideas that are contained in the broader portions of the Plan and boils them down to some specific

ALI BELL:

guidance that will be useful to you and the Council and to the public at large in making development decisions; and yet, if that guidance ends up being sound, we think it will add up in the long run to a future that makes sense for the city. We have explored a number of growth alternatives, both in amount and character of growth. One of the issues that we have been hearing about ever since we've been in town working on this is the one of economic diversification, getting other kinds of employment in Las Vegas besides the gaming/tourism business. We also have had some discussion with moving into some different type of housing markets than are typically located in Las Vegas, such as retirement developments and maybe more exclusive custom-home developments. We have also heard a lot about the idea of simply expanding the gaming and tourism businesses. At the last meeting of the Citizens' Advisory Committee they reached the conclusion, and I think it makes a certain amount of sense, that we should proceed in all of those directions, in addition to the normal amount of character growth that would take place in a city. At this point maybe I should show you a couple of our exhibits so that you have some sense of the scale which we are thinking.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE:

When you talk about 2000, what are you talking about in the total area of the city??

AL BELL:

Okay. As soon as we get it right side up I'll answer that question. You're familiar with the shape of the city and it's figuration, downtown located here, Rancho running out to the northwest, I-15 in this location. The dark yellow area is the existing city boundary. The light yellow area surrounded by the dot pattern is our primary study area. It's much larger, as you can see, than the existing city boundary. Under present circumstances, present law, the city is precluded from expanding in any direction but generally to the west and northwest, that being the case because the City of North Las Vegas is here, Sunrise Manor, Paradise, Winchester, Spring Valley, the unincorporated towns to the south. The actual boundary for potential expansion of the city has not been determined thus far; it probably won't be in our studies. What we will be proposing to you is policies that would guide the expansion of the city to whatever extent it occurs.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:

Excuse me, could I ask you what the southern boundary is? Is that Spring Mountain?

AL BELL:

This is Spring Mountain, yes, ma'am. The year 2000 projections that have typically been used in the past and which we are developing an update of encompass primarily the city

AL BELL:

boundary area and limited areas adjacent to it. If we could turn the map over now, we can refer to that-- the same exterior boundary, the dot pattern, but these are the, in very general terms, the geographic areas that we think make the most sense regarding the long-term expansion of the city under present limitations at least and which match the three parts of the Plan that I described earlier. The year 2000 forecasts normally include the existing city boundary and some adjacent county territory and they have varied all the way from something on the order of 260,000 to 270,000 population up to 315,000 for, as I say, the existing city and some limited adjacent county land. That includes, of course, all of the county islands within the city. Our thinking is that a range for that area of something on the order of 240,000 at the very low end and 300,000 at the very high end by the year 2000 makes the most sense. We will be refining that as we continue on through the study. Quite obviously when you extend beyond the existing city boundary, particularly beyond the Peccolè property here into an area owned by the Summa Corporation and federal land and isolated parcels up to the north, you encompass an area with a lot of development potential. We have not really developed population forecasts for that area, but just based on an assumed average density for similar land, you could easily be talking eventually about population levels in the neighborhood of 500,000, 600,000 or 700,000, if the city expands that far. I hasten to point out that the study area and the capacities that we're analyzing don't necessarily assume that all that territory is going to be in the City of Las Vegas. The growth that occurs in that area, whether it's in the county or the city, is going to have an impact on you, obviously. We think it's important to be aware of that and plan for it, irrespective of the jurisdiction. The community profiles that I mentioned would be developed within this darkest yellow area; land area within which we would anticipate development of vacant parcels or redevelopment of existing developed parcels by 1990, within the next seven years. There will be more land for potential development shown in the plan at all three stages than we would anticipate could be developed in those periods. The reason for that is very simple; to avoid the plan from becoming a straightjacket; to allow some flexibility of choice so that you can plan for growth and development, but not lock every decision into just certain fixed properties. We don't see any advantage to that in the Plan. The concerns that are most in our mind have to do with the capability of the City to develop public facilities and services to accommodate growth and to finance those. You are in the same boat with most other governments in that you have a lot of expectations but the financial resources are limited. We're going to be doing a lot of thinking about how you address that problem; what methods can be used to finance the streets and sewers and water systems and drainage channels and other facilities that are necessary to support growth and development. We brought the package in front of

AL BELL: you today, tonight, in order to determine, first of all, whether or not you have any questions or comments on the Plan process so far to determine whether you have any comments on the Goals and Objectives you'd like to pass on to the City Council because we will be taking it to them for their review and approval and to answer any questions generally that you might have about the General Plan Update. If you have some concerns about what you need in order to help you make better decisions, we would certainly be happy to hear about those because they'll help us in our thinking about what subsequently goes into the Plan.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I have a few thousand questions.

AL BELL: Alright.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I was interested in the annexation policies. Is it better to outline a definite sort of perimeter for a city to work within so that planning can be possible for sewer lines and streets and that sort of thing, instead of doing it piecemeal like we're doing it now? Can a city just go out and say "Well, we're going to round off our boundaries here and this is what we're going to service"?

HAROLD FOSTER: Let me just comment on that because State Statutes prohibit us from doing it, unless, well, we can initiate, but the area that we take in has to meet certain standards, and if it doesn't meet the standards, then we can't annex it. Like it has to have a population density of two persons per acre or one person per acre and 60% of the lots have to be in five acre parcels or less. Or, if you can't meet that criteria, 75% of the annexation area has to border the city, or I think you have to have, let's see, 100% of the property owners -- there's various criteria like that, but if it doesn't meet any of those, then you can't annex, you cannot initiate annexations, so there is a constraint in that respect.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Specifically speaking, our biggest move towards annexations and listening to the general direction, which is north and west, would be the Hughes site which is 25,000 acres and takes in an awful lot of mountains. That would depend on the property owner wanting to annex.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Of course, I've always felt that what ought to be done in this valley is when the population density reaches a certain, or population reaches a certain density, so many people an acre or square yard or square foot or square mile, that that population should then be annexed into the nearest urban government. That would take the County out of furnishing urban services. The only choice they'd have is that if they lie contiguous to two urban governments, they could vote to take a choice of which one they want to go to, but you'd never get that on. Another thing, if we use schools

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: as activity centers, what we use to designate population densities, what will be used as we're developing so fast in that northwest area? It's a rapidly developing area and sometimes the schools aren't even there. Are the sites all chosen for schools or are they going to come in later and say "Well, we've got a lot of population, now we're going to put in a school."

AL BELL: We'll be working with the School District to try to establish some mutual policies to provide for that. There are a lot of ways it can be done. The question is whether it is going to be acceptable to the School District and how can the methods that will get the schools there when they're needed impact the development, industry and costs.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: We're so pinpointed with federal land throughout that area that the school can petition the Federal Government for that particular purpose and get the land released.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: That's what they've done in the past, but, you know, how much of that is left in any size parcel?

AL BELL: There's still quite a bit of land out there.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: BLM land.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I have a question, too. I know you're talking about schools as the activity center. What I was going to ask you is for a definition of what you as a consultant have for the words "Activity Center." Is it always just the schools?

AL BELL: Would you repeat that question, please?

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I just want a definition for your activity centers that you're going to have at strategic locations. Is that always schools?

AL BELL: Well, at the neighborhood scale, in most cases, it would be a school. It might be a community facility, community center. It could be a park site. Most often it would be a school. On a larger scale the activity centers would be probably commercial developments.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: In your Objective 224, you say "a variety of living environments, urban, suburban and rural."

AL BELL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Can this kind of variety be preserved by preserving the present uses as a nucleus like our rural areas or ranch-estate areas? If they're preserved where they are now -- as it is now, we have constant encroachment into them. There's always one fight after another.

AL BELL:

Well, it can be. That doesn't make it easy. It's really a matter of will. It's a question of whether it's important to the city, or remains important to the city, to maintain that living environment. What needs to be done, of course, in part, to avoid erosion of existing areas is to have plenty of land for other kinds of developments, and you're in much better shape in Las Vegas in that regard than many communities are.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:

Yes, but we still give it -- are constantly intruded on them with high density involvement.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE:

What portion of your studies has taken in -- or have you taken into consideration in your studies our situation in the desert with water, a precious commodity?

AL BELL:

We have met with the Water District. We're exploring their policies and programs for distribution of water. We discussed with them the issue of overall supply, quality of water. Our information from the Water District and from the studies they've had done is that in terms of overall supply the city is in pretty good shape for well beyond the year 2000, given the forecast ranges that I discussed earlier. The distribution of water though is going to become more and more costly, and we may well conclude that we like to suggest some modifications to the distribution policies and programs that they have. We're not far enough along to be able to make any specific recommendations on that, but it's one of the primaries of the investigation in the Plan.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE:

You're aware that the 300,000 acre piece that we have committed from the river is dead until we find some alternative, alternate source of water. The nitrates now in our wells is creeping up. I think Mr. Pfaff has a graph on what's happening to the underground water. We only charge about 20,000 feet a year underground.

AL BELL:

The District is looking at some other possibilities, including very deep wells. One of the things about the future growth of Las Vegas that strikes us as being very significant is that even if you encounter difficulty in expanding because of water distribution limitations or you decide that you have to go slow in the valley for reasons of water supply, the growth rates, even on the low side of the curve that you would experience would still keep Las Vegas a very dynamic area. It would be growing much faster than a lot of metropolitan cities in the United States and even at the slowest rate that we've used in our projections, the city would double in population by about 2020. Right now it appears that at least up through the Mid-Range Plan water supply is not a fundamental

AL BELL: limitation, but you may have to handle its distribution differently. You may have to augment the system. You may have to get into more conservation programs. That was discussed and contained in your 1975 Plan, but it may become a real necessity at some point downstream.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Mr. Broadbent made a statement at the North Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce about two weeks ago indicating then that we could be in a critical water situation by the year 1997.

AL BELL: You have a problem, as I understand it, primarily during that period between now and the turn of the century with peating. There may need to be ways built into the system to give you some flexibility in handling peating.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: With our current water supply, assuming it's 300,000 naked feet, this is the entire valley from the river and utilizing plugging in the number per family, how far can we actually go on that supply?

AL BELL: How far could the city go?

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Yes.

AL BELL: Well, as I say.--

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Anyway, we're talking about numbers of people and water is the critical factor.

AL BELL: Eighty-five for the valley and Boulder. We've depended upon the Water District's assessment of the capacity of the overall supply and system and the projections that we're using are within those that they base their assessments on. We have no information from them to indicate that the city will be getting into trouble as long as we don't exceed the numbers that I mentioned. If it is a matter of your concern that that may be in question, it is certainly a very simple matter for us to pursue the subject a little bit further with them and see if there are some limitations that we have not yet discovered.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: I would like to request that you take your water study one step further and go to CRC, Colorado River Commission, and talk with our Acting Director, Jack Stonehocker, and tell him I sent you down, that this Commission sent you over, because they have records that coincide with Don Pfaff's, but they take a broader look.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I'm interested too, as long as you're on the subject of water, which is a little bit different, I think it's on your 3.2.1, talking about flood control. Are you using some of the projected flood control that have been suggested but never been implemented?

COMMISSIONER TRACY: Are you looking at those things and making some suggestions about what the City should really get into? I was particularly interested in short-term because it seems that within the last couple of weeks a number of areas have flooded and suffered damage that haven't normally had that kind of damage. There are certain areas that people sort of expect, but there were a lot of other areas that I think were sort of a surprise to folks. I just wondered, are you doing a lot of studying on things that have been suggested or better ways of utilizing whatever money is available to the City?

AL BELL: Yes. We will be looking at how you can get the most protection for the buck and where that can be spent. Obviously, in this environment you cannot afford some of the flood control measures that are practiced in other areas; it would bankrupt you, but you can protect yourself against the worst conditions and not at an outrageous cost. The problem when you get into short-term, we're talking six, seven years away, you will probably have a hard time doing anything on a large scale in that period. There may be some localized possibilities and that's one of the things we'll be looking at at the community profile scale. We'll start looking at what land can develop filling in where urbanization has already taken place; where redevelopment can occur very possibly in connection with some of that development. It would be possible to program some short-term or small-scale protection for some of the areas that you mentioned.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I'd like to see something that would enable -- and I'm not sure if it would come in the General Plan, but some suggestion for enabling the City Council or staff to be able to deal with, I guess it's the State as far as the highway system is concerned, because it concerns me a great deal, we have a number of city streets that have been around for a long time and they flood and they've flooded for years, but the new freeway, the Oran Gragson Freeway, which has only been completed within the last several years, to have the kind of flooding that they have, tells me that that is real poor planning because the engineers who worked on that should have well expected it. When you have to close a major section of that freeway whenever it rains, I think that's ludicrous for something that's that new. I would like to see something developed that gives either the City departments or some kind of plan of action that they can go through in order to deal with things like that, not necessarily always with the flooding.

AL BELL: That's one of the reasons, Commissioner Tracy, why we have tried to involve some key department heads in this process pretty actively.

- CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: So much of our flooding doesn't start in the city, it starts in the county. What has to be done is to go up there and build some checks and some rejection basins and places for it to hold it and stop the velocity because when it hits the city, it's going full force.
- COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: That's what Sauer did when he built that west ditch up there and it just channeled everything down to Flamingo Wash.
- COMMISSIONER TRACY: Absolutely, but the Oran Gragson area, all of that, all around there is city and that concerns me when something that new is planned so poorly.
- AL BELL: The point that you raised is why we have to look that far into the future as we suggested. It's going to take a long time to get the level of protection you need.
- COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I love the rural environment that we have here, the ability to live in larger areas with horses and all of that stuff. I notice in here.-- I don't guess it would come under transportation, but you have pedestrian paths and bicycle paths and everything, but there's no equestrian paths and I still think there should be some planning done while we still have the land to do it to connect these rural areas or the rural lifestyle with the horse bit and I think of Griffith Park where those homes back up to Griffith Park and they have been there for years and years and they are very valuable, simply because of the zoning and the fact that it can have horses that go right into an equestrian path right in the middle of Los Angeles. Well, if we don't plan for things like that now, we're never going to have them. and I really would like to see that included somewhere. I'm going to get through with the things I have and then shut up, would that be a good idea? How can we control quality housing, something that really looks nice and doesn't fall down next year?
- AL BELL: From a structural standpoint, you have the Building Codes to count on. From an appearance standpoint, I frankly don't think you are in a position to control it. You might be able to provide some incentives for better appearance in development. The problem that you face, of course, is that the more amenities that you attach to the housing development, the more it costs, the less responsive it is to the range of buyers or renters that need housing, so you eventually get yourself into a pretty tough situation. I think very frankly that a lot of traditional housing in Las Vegas for a long time to come is not going to look all that appealing. One of the things that can be done, however, is perhaps to develop some design guidelines that won't significantly increase the cost of housing, maybe in fact reduce some of the costs and try to sell that idea to the development industry as simply a better way to go. That mostly works, however, on relatively large-scale projects. It's hard to do on small acreage, infill acreage.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: When we have these developers come in with large pieces of land to redevelop with different densities of zoning, not redevelop, develop, and they want to impact on that community 500 or 1,000 families or something on small lots, I know that we had in the last Plan some kind of an incentive thing where they would for a denser zoning give us park land or something, but I think it's going to have to go further than that in order to force some open area for those residents for the future when we don't have the open land around them; some place they can go to get out in the open air and the freshness.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I have a question too about the transportation. Are you looking at studying between downtown and the Strip and the monorails and the accelerated moving sidewalks and that kind of thing? Are you doing any kind of suggestions on any of that?

AL BELL: We are reviewing what has been proposed and we will be making some kind of recommendation in the Plan, but we're not doing exhaustive studies of those systems on our own. We're leaning on the work that has already been done. We will be making some suggestions about policy on transit.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I was going to ask if you were doing mass transit.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Is there anything in your planning for the planning of what I would call "street plans"? I'm thinking again of Eastern where we had a transitional thing and it seemed to be better if we had had a street plan of landscaping that would have been uniform on each lot and you look down several blocks and it's all uniform. It looks much better than the spotty stuff that each of them is doing.

AL BELL: We do propose -- you will notice there is a fairly large section in the package, Goals and Objectives package, on community design. We will be suggesting some design guidelines for improving the appearance of your streetscapes. There again, you can only go so far until you start running into some cost problems. Furthermore, where you have a mix of existing development and infill vacant land and then comes back and develops, it's hard to go back and retrofit a pattern of landscaping on the existing development. In some cases, you just have to get by with those gaps. In other cases, it might be possible to work out a program of extending the landscaping where it's in the interest of the property owner. That's a hard thing to sell, though, in the short term. You usually have to wait until the property transitions and then bring it along. We will be making design guideline recommendations. That's part of what the community profile level of the

AL BELL: Plan will be about.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Thank you very much, I approve.

COMMISSIONER MACK: What is your idea tonight? What do you plan to talk about tonight? Are we doing that right now?

AL BELL: I'm hearing from you.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Okay, is that basically what you wanted to hear tonight?

AL BELL: I also wanted to find out if you had any comments or suggestions about the Goals and Objectives package when we take that to the City Council.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Okay. One of the things that I wanted to ask, based on something you said earlier and something that Maggi said regarding the design of homes, what do they do in a city like Rancho Bernardo where they require you to have a tile roof; a red tile roof? How far can we go in areas where we can decide that people have to plant a Cypress tree every 3 feet and/or have a red tile roof or a heavy shake roof or something of that nature? Can we get that into ordinance?

AL BELL: You can go a long ways in that direction. If you go too far, you'll no doubt be challenged and might even end up in court on it. It's been thirty years since the Supreme Court concluded that in fact a jurisdiction had the authority to impose requirements regarding appearance.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: The Supreme Court in New Jersey just recently overruled the Planning Commission on the same type of situation.

AL BELL: Yes. The problem with E, General Finding, of course, in the courts revolves around a particular circumstance. The principle, although it applies, has been challenged in other specific situations. The point is that a lot of jurisdictions regulate the appearance of developments. They regulate and place requirements on landscaping, on texture, even on color. Some jurisdictions go to architectural control districts where only certain style architecture is permitted. All of those things are done. It's a question of how far you wish to go in that direction and we are going to plumb the depths of our experience and imagination to come up with some ideas that we think will improve the appearance of things, but will not get to the point that has been reached in many communities, in Southern California, for example, where the design requirements and the aesthetic requirements add outrageously to the cost of housing. If you do want to get into the high end of the housing market in Las Vegas, that is, some really prestige communities, of course, then you can go that route, but you can't apply those standards generally or you'll just push the housing costs clear off the scale.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: If we could impose restrictions on federal grounds that we're coming in that there would be CC&R's on them as they came into the city, I think then the buyer would know in advance what he was up against when title passed.

AL BELL: It's a legal advantage, but --

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: You can't turn around and -- take Mrs. Coleman, for instance, who has a one acre parcel out here and put big restrictions against it without her approval of it.

COMMISSIONER MACK: What happens in the case of -- I noted in the package there -- the billboards and the signs? It said something about restrictions on billboards, I don't remember the exact wording on it, but I think this Board, as it's made up right now, is not too crazy about billboards in general. I don't know what we can do to eliminate them altogether; I mean, I don't think we can. I notice they said "except in the downtown area, or as relating to gaming interests, or something of that nature." One of the things that we discussed at one time, or I brought up, was "can we control what's on a board, what they actually put up there, what it looks like?" You know what I'm saying, basically, you can get a real ugly board and a real nice looking board and maybe you don't object to the nice looking board or even its particular type of construction.

AL BELL: You could specify standards. How far you can go in that direction though I think is mainly a function of how powerful the billboard interests are in this community. I don't know the answer to that. In some communities they've been phased out over an amortization period.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: The years before I was on Planning and I was on Beautification we started on the billboards and those were the days when they had several standards and the ladder hanging off and all kinds of things. Well, we did finally get through to them and through their own organization they did spruce themselves up somewhat. There are very few of those old billboards left. They laid low for a long time, but they started back on us now with raising the height and putting in more. At that same time when there was that pressure we got the distance of 200 feet, instead of 100, and things like that.

COMMISSIONER MACK: How does Scottsdale, Arizona do it? You don't see a billboard in the town. You don't see a sign or McDonald's archs anywhere. You don't see Wendy's with the big yellow plastic thing around them.

AL BELL: The same thing in Palm Springs.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Okay. How can we begin to get in that direction?

- AL BELL: You can write a tough sign ordinance that establishes very strict requirements; size, setback, height.
- COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Aren't we a little late?
- COMMISSIONER MACK: No, it's never too late. We're going to be growing so much.
- CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Speaking for the Board, I think this Board would like to look at a couple of sign ordinances that have got some teeth in them.
- COMMISSIONER MACK: Well, I think when you say "too late," yah. I think there are certain guys out there that we may not be able to take their signs or boards away, but I think the minute they come in for a building permit and they want to change their board, now they have to follow the new ordinance, or, it may take us fifteen or twenty years to get it looking right.
- AL BELL: It will, unless you want to go in and get tough and that will consume so much time and energy.
- COMMISSIONER MACK: We can't do it here because it's been tried; I mean, they've tried things like that before and because of the multi-jurisdictions that we have, you go from county to city to county to city along a street that sometimes we can't do it, but at least in the city we could start and maybe we could get somewhere with it.
- COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Maybe if you'd restrict them to certain areas and now they're going to start proliferating out Gragson Freeway and the Rainbow thing and if we can keep them from going in there at all, we'll be better off.
- AL BELL: The item in the package that brought this up is an objective under "Community Design." The object of the objective is visually attractive or restrained signs throughout the city, and we say "except for the downtown gaming and tourist area, centers" rather. What we really have in mind there and what would be developing policies and programs to accomplish is a very distinctly different set of standards for the tourist portions of the community as compared to the residential living areas in the city.
- CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: I think along Mr. Mack's lines, we could. In Phase II and Phase III we're talking about almost doubling the land size of the city. I think we could put ordinances -- the things that are existing are granddaddyed until they're gone, but from this point forward we can do something.

HAROLD FOSTER: Ironically, the Sign Association has been in contact with staff the last several months asking our feelings on a proposal on their part to increase the distance between billboards. Right now I think they're 200 feet in essentially all zones. I think they are talking about 400 or 500 feet between signs in an effort to somewhat police and reduce the number of signs that are presently allowed.

COMMISSIONER MACK: How about just have a total number of signs allowed within the city and don't allow any new ones to be built until they tear some of the old ones down?

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Listen, I want to tell you something. Looking at the ownerships of the sign companies, I hope none of you are planning to run for office, you're dead.

CHAIRMAN MACK: That's the nice thing about being on this Board, we don't get paid --

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No, we don't have any obligations to anybody.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Well, I think one of the most delightful things about driving through Canada is the lack of billboards and the desert is beautiful, too.

COMMISSIONER MACK: They give you a sign every few miles that tells you how far from a city, it's not like you don't know where stuff is.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I tell you what really makes me feel good is to go into a newly-developed area where there are no power poles or power lines and it's just the open sky and there's such a peaceful feeling in that residential area. I think a lot of the problems in the urban area with all these wires strung over your heads and everything like that, it's irritating.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I can see us sticking a whole lot of new ordinances in, but being as how the courts are, one of these big sign companies with their powerful staff attorneys will just come up and say "Well, this new ordinance is discriminatory against the old area" and they'll wipe the whole thing out and put their signs up, so all the money that goes in the planning and everything goes down the tube.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I find very interesting the point that you're coming up with ideas on a new approach to making the different areas distinctive. I think that's really great, and I hope we can carry it through.

COMMISSIONER MACK: When do we get to see something concrete?

AL BELL: Well, now I know you were sent more material than that.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Except it wasn't punched.

AL BELL: Hereafter, all pieces of paper will be punched. We just had a meeting with staff this morning to get our next phase of the work program organized. We're going to be working pretty intensively during the next month to get a draft of the package together that identifies the policies and programs and all the supporting background information that'll give you a handle on what the complete plan will be and we have not picked a firm date yet to come back before your Commission, but I would guess it would be somewhere in the next five to six weeks.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Are you finished working with the Citizens' Advisory Committee?

AL BELL: No. We'll continue working with the Citizens' Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee right through to the bitter end, until it gets to the stage where it's ready to go through hearings.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Do you have a good mix on that Land Use Planning Sub-Committee because it looked to me like it was kind of overloaded with developers and engineers and people that have to do with the housing industry?

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: No, there are an awful lot of housewives on there.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: You should go to a meeting and see who's there. You don't see the engineers.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No, they don't come, but they're on there.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: I think they've got a pretty good mix on that, don't you, Harold?

HAROLD FOSTER: It might be a little heavy, but there's still others on there from other interests.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: It's difficult to get a lot of those people there.

AL BELL: The attendance at the first two meetings, I think, was around forty. The third meeting was the night of the tenth which got a little bit messy, if you may recall, so we were down to about eighteen or twenty that night. I will say this about the Citizens' Advisory Committee, they really have been participating, not all the bodies, but they've had some very heavy discussions and they've really wrestled with some of this stuff and they've given us some very good ideas, so I expect a lot out of them and you don't always get that from that sort of group. The one thing that I'd like to plant the seed for about this General Plan is that more than anything else we would like very much for this Plan in its final adopted form to be useful, to be a workable tool for you, the City Council and staff and others who influence and make

AL BELL: development decisions to use. That's why it's very important for us to hear from you. We've talked to the City Council members and heard what their concerns are. It was very important at this stage in the process to hear from you Commissioners because you're all involved in making development decisions. We want to structure this Plan to put the material in it that is going to help you make those decisions. We do not suggest to you that Las Vegas is going to become a Garden of Eden as a result of this General Plan. You've got too many problems to overcome to get to that point, but you can make a notable improvement. You can go a long ways in the right direction, if you persist. We aspire to producing a General Plan, along with your staff, that helps you do that.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Any comments on our meeting tonight?

AL BELL: Yes, you've given me a lot of useful ideas.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: How about the earlier meeting?

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Well, he doesn't want to say.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: You're not going to hurt our feelings very much.

AL BELL: We spend most of our time -- by the way, I would like to introduce our team members who are here tonight. The principal in charge of this project from The Planning Center--we have five principals and each one is in charge of a project or more than one project. Gary Cinti is the principal in charge of this General Plan effort and next to him is Jay Kneip who is a staff planner and economist. He does a lot of fiscal analysis for us. The three of us are the people from The Planning Center that you will see the most on this project. We work in an environment most often where the time it takes to get development decisions and the conditions imposed upon those approvals are mindboggling.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: You work in Southern California?

AL BELL: Yes. We actually work in all of Western United States, but we have probably more projects going in Southern California than any other place. What has happened there is jurisdictions have gotten so demanding that the time and the cost of achieving development approvals is just off the scale. In Orange County -- what's the average new house price in Orange County now, well over \$200,000? Anyway, we're accustomed to hearings in which the number of items you took care of tonight would take seven or eight hours.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: See, we don't fool around.

AL BELL: I would say it appeared to me you're awful easy on a lot of folks.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Well, we have a lot of faith in our staff.

AL BELL: You disagreed with them a few times.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: We disagree with them.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I was real glad to see that wasn't one of the goals though, to increase the staff in the Planning Department.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: I think Harold would like to know if you could get an ordinance where we had to follow the recommendations..

COMMISSIONER TRACY: Yes, I'm sure that's what he's looking for.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Are we supposed to accept this Update, or what?

COMMISSIONER MACK: Any of you have a business card?

AL BELL: As a matter of fact, it's in the hotel room, but I'll see that you get one.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Any of you have a business card? What is your schedule?

AL BELL: If you have any suggestions on the Goals and Objectives package that you want formally passed on to the City Council, then we would certainly be glad to hear that and you may wish to make a motion in that regard or if you concur on the package and think we ought to proceed along those lines, that would be fine for you to indicate. We're in the process of writing the Plan, preparing the Plan. The time for public hearings and the formal action will be after it's drafted and ready to get out in front of the public and you formally.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Good report.

COMMISSIONER MACK: Let me ask this, how much time do you spend here a week with your staff in Las Vegas?

AL BELL: We're here just about every other week and then a lot of time on the telephone. We have an outrageous telephone bill, don't we?

COMMISSIONER MACK: I'm curious, do you do a lot of work in the office? What percentage is done in the office and what percentage is done in the field?

AL BELL: I'd say probably on this Plan 20 to 25% here and 75 or 80% in the office, overall.

COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Did you take a tour of the city during the water? on the 10th?

AL BELL: Yes. Staff took us on a tour one day, a rather extensive one, and on two occasions since then we've driven around and looked at some areas that we were curious about ourselves. I think we have a pretty good feel for the physical character of the city. We learn more about it every time we're here and I expect to learn more after we're finished.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: Thank you very much.

AL BELL: Thank you very much for your questions and comments. We'll see you soon.

CHAIRMAN BUGBEE: We adjourn.