

**VERBATIM
TRANSCRIPT
ATTACHED
AFTER
MEETING
MINUTES**

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 1

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Michael Mack, Chairman	- Excused
Robert Bugbee	- Present
Maggie Coleman	- Excused
Robert Guthrie	- Present
Joe Johnston	- Present
Fred Kennedy	- Present
Sherri Tracy	- Present

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Satisfaction of Open Meeting Law and Reading of Standard Conditions:

All Zoning items shall conform to the following general conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations;
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 systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license;
3. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the 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 (Excluding single family development);
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 Design and Development;
8. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

STAFF PRESENT

Harold Foster, Director, Department of Community Planning and Development

Howard Null, Chief, Planning Division

Robert Clemmer, Chief, Zoning Division

Les Comeau, Planning Assistant

Val Steed, Deputy City Attorney

Linda Owens, Deputy City Clerk

MR. FOSTER announced this meeting is in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

MR. FOSTER read the standard conditions that apply to all rezonings, tentative maps, final maps and vacation items.

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 2

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

All Tentative Maps shall conform to the following 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. Street names to be provided in accord with the City's Street Name Policy.
3. Subject to all conditions of City departments and State Subdivision Statutes.

All Final Maps shall conform to the following condition:

1. Conformance with the tentative map.

All Vacations shall conform to the following conditions:

1. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom.
2. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
3. Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met.
4. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or an extension is not granted by the Planning Commission, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes for the September 25, 1984 and October 11, 1984 City Planning Commission meetings.

Bugbee -
APPROVED
Unanimous

AGENDA

November 27, 1984

City of Las Vegas PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 3

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Z-60-84 FEDERAL LAND & DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Request of FEDERAL LAND & DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION for reclassification of property generally located on the east side of Rancho Drive between Alta Drive and Pinto Lane, from R-D and R-1 to P-R.
Proposed Use: Office Complex (Condominiums)

Staff recommends DENIAL. If approved, subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit.
2. No access to Alta Drive.
3. Install half-street improvements on Alta Drive, Rancho Drive and Pinto Lane as required by the Land Development and Flood Control Division of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
4. Dedicate 25' property line radius corners at the intersection of Pinto Lane and Rancho Drive and Alta Drive and Rancho Drive as required by the Department of Design and Development.
5. Right-turn lane from Rancho to Alta shall be approved by the City Council.
6. Standard conditions 1 through 8.

PROTESTS: 0

Bugbee -
APPROVED as submitted.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated this item was held in abeyance from the last meeting due to a 3/3 tie vote. There is P-R zoning to the south. To the west is R-E zoning. To the north is R-1. At the last meeting there was an access to Alta Drive, but the access has been closed making all the access from Rancho Drive and Pinto Lane. There will be a right-turn lane on Rancho Drive so there will be a free right-hand turn onto Alta Drive. There is a Land Use Plan that has been approved by the City for this area east of Rancho and south of Alta which indicates this area should be developed on a low density residential basis. Since this application is contrary to the Land Use Plan, staff would recommend denial. Staff has 23 protests on record.

ATTY. BOB FAIS, 300 South 4th Street, and JAY THOMAS appeared and represented the application. Johnny Ribeiro met with the neighborhood representatives and tried to resolve the differences in the plan. As a result of that meeting, the plan has been modified by eliminating the entrance on Alta Drive. There will be construction of a right turn traffic lane on Alta. The north block wall of the project along Alta has been set back to 45' from the street center line to increase the landscaping area. There will be assurances that Quail Park V will only be single story. They submitted a petition with 22 signatures in favor and 1 letter from Michael Mushkin in favor.

FRANK LONGO, 325 Parkway West, appeared stating he is in favor of this application since the development has been modified.

WALTER ZUCKER, 531 Parkway West, appeared stating he met with a representative from Ribeiro Builders and his wife and he are now in favor of this project.

No one appeared in opposition.

To be heard by the City Council on 12/19/84.

(19:33-19:43)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 4

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

NEW BUSINESS:

1. TENTATIVE MAP - ROSEWOOD CONDOMINIUMS (CONVERSION)

Property generally located on the north side of Bonanza Road, west of Highland Drive, R-3 Zone.

Owner: Argonaut, Inc.

Subdivider: Argonaut, Inc.

No. of Acres: 7.36 No. of Units: 148

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. A direction sign shall be placed at the Bonanza Road entrance to this project depicting the location and address or building number of each structure within the development; and, the unit addresses within each building shall be clearly displayed and visible from adjacent parking areas as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

2. Standard conditions.

Bugbee -
ABEYANCE
Unanimous

MR. NULL stated staff would recommend approval, subject to the conditions.

No one appeared to represent the application.

To be heard again by the City Planning Commission on 12-13-84.

(19:43-19:44)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 5

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

2. TENTATIVE MAP - STONEY BROOK VILLAGE

Property generally located on the west side of Torrey Pines south of Smoke Ranch Road, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-PD14).

Owner: CHA Venture

Subdivider: Dick Crossley

No. of Acres: 10.97 No. of Lots: 76

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the conditions of approval for Plot Plan Review Z-60-80.
2. Conformance to the Flood Hazard Reduction Ordinance.
3. Temporary improved access be provided on Torrey Pines Drive north to Smoke Ranch Road as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
4. If a wall is constructed on an exterior boundary street, the CC&R's 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.
5. Approval of the building elevations as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
6. Payment of all outstanding property taxes.
7. Standard conditions.

Johnston -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. NULL stated staff would recommend approval subject to the conditions.

CHARLEY JOHNSON, 2300 Paseo Del Prado, appeared to represent Dick Crossley. They are in agreement with staff's conditions.

To be heard by the City Council on 12-19-84.

(19:44-19:47)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 6

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

3. FINAL MAP - STONEY BROOK VILLAGE - UNIT 1

Property generally located on the west side of Torrey Pines Drive, south of Smoke Ranch Road, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-PD14).

Owner: CHA Venture

Subdivider: Dick Crossley

No. of Acres: 5.2368 No. of Lots: 18

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Approval of the Tentative Map.
2. Conformance with the Tentative Map.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval for the Tentative Map.
4. The Final Map shall not be submitted to the City Council until all conditions of approval for the Tentative Map have been satisfied.

4. VAC-22-84 - E. R. SPIESS, ET AL

Petition of Vacation submitted by E. R. SPIESS, ET AL, to vacate Government Patent easements, generally located west of Rainbow Boulevard and south of Charleston Boulevard.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to the standard conditions.

Johnston -

APPROVED, subject to staff's condition
Unanimous

MR. NULL stated this Final Map is in substantial conformance with the Tentative Map. Staff would recommend approval subject to the conditions.

CHARLEY JOHNSON, 2300 Paseo Del Prado, appeared to represent the applicant. They are in agreement with staff's conditions.

(19:47-19:48)

Tracy -

APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. NULL stated staff would recommend approval with the standard conditions.

JOHN M. BANGLE, 4458 Annie Oakley, appeared and represented the applicant.

City Council to set date for public hearing on 12-5-84.

(19:48-19:49)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 7

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

5. Z-83-84 - JACOB B. AND BETTY L. COHEN

Request of JACOB B. AND BETTY L. COHEN for reclassification of property generally located on the northwest corner of Sirius Avenue and Valley View Boulevard, from C-1 and M Zones to M Zone.

Proposed Use: Showroom and warehouse

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit.
2. Install street improvements on Sirius Avenue and sidewalk on Valley View Boulevard as required by the Land Development and Flood Control Division of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
3. Standard conditions 1 through 8.

PROTESTS: 0

6. Z-84-84 - AHMANSON FOUNDATION

Request of AHMANSON FOUNDATION for reclassification of property generally located on the southwest corner of Eastern Avenue and 25th Street, from R-4 to C-2 Zone.

Proposed Use: Retail Stores

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit.
2. Approval of the driveway locations by the Traffic Engineer.
3. Standard conditions 1 through 8.

PROTESTS: 0

Bugbee -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated the general pattern in this area is M Zoning. This will be a 73,000 square foot L-shaped building. Staff would recommend approval subject to the conditions. Staff does not have any protests on record.

WILLIAM F. CURAN, 2109 Plaza Del Cerro, appeared and represented the applicants.

No one appeared in opposition.

To be heard by the City Council on 12-5-84.

(19:49-19:51)

Guthrie -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated this is part of a larger parcel. Staff would recommend approval, subject to the conditions.

CLYDE SPITZE, VTN, 2300 Paseo Del Prado, appeared and represented the applicant. They are in agreement with staff's conditions.

No one appeared in opposition.

To be heard by the City Council on 12-19-84.

(19:51-19:53)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 8

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

7. Z-85-84 - HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF THE ESTATE OF ANN GRETA JONES

Request of the HEIRS AND DEVISEES of the ESTATE OF ANN GRETA JONES for reclassification of property generally located between Ann Road and Lone Mountain Road; and Jones Boulevard and Decatur Boulevard; from R-E to R-D, R-CL, R-1, R-PD9 and C-1 Zones.

Proposed Use: Low to Medium Density Residential and Shopping Centers

PROTESTS: 40 persons in the audience

Tracy -
ABEYANCE
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated this consists of 574 acres which is most of Section 36. The application is for C-1 at the northwest, northeast and southeast corners with R-CL to the southwest. Along Jones Boulevard is R-E and east is R-1 with a row of R-D lots to the south. R-PD9 is proposed on the remainder of the site. The R-PD9 consists of 436 acres for a retirement community. There will be one entrance at Lone Mountain Road. There will be a golf course on the interior. The applicant has proposed 1,700 units in the R-PD9 site. Staff feels they should have an eight-foot block wall along the street that is extended north to Washburn to the R-D lots, and then a six-foot block wall around the remainder of the R-PD9 site as well as a six-foot block wall between the commercial and the residential sites. Because the predominant amount of the parcel will be utilized for a retirement community, there will be less demand for schools and less traffic. There will be two major streets going through this site. The Major Street Plan would have to be amended to include those streets. Also, the Traffic Engineer has requested three accesses to the retirement community. Staff does not have any protests on record.

JERRY HELTON, U.S. Homes, 1515 East Tropicana, appeared and represented the applicant. This is an ideal area for a retirement community. Utilities will be extended to this property if this application is approved.

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 9

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

CONTINUED

7. Z-85-84 - HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF THE ESTATE OF ANN GRETA JONES

MIKE KOIZUMI, VTN Nevada, 2300 Paseo Del Prado, appeared and represented the applicant. Some of the units will be town homes, duplexes and single-family detached homes. They are in agreement with staff's conditions, but would like the Resolution of Intent to have a 24-month time limit.

CHARLEY JOHNSON, 2300 Paseo Del Prado, appeared and represented the applicant. There are very few areas left in Las Vegas where there is a piece of property this size. All of the utilities will have to be brought to this project. This project will take between 4 to 9 years to be completely sold out. The golf course will be public until the project is sold out.

GEORGE BAXTER, President, Sheep Mountain Homeowners Association, 7465 North Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He had a petition with 122 signatures in protest but did not turn it in to the Commission. The homeowners met with the developers but would like to request this item be held in abeyance so they could meet again and resolve some of the issues.

JERRY HELTON appeared in rebuttal stating they have a deadline of January 1, 1985. The court has awarded U.S. Homes control of this property.

To be heard again by the City Planning Commission on 12-13-84.

MR. FOSTER indicated the application would be heard by the City Council on 12-19-84.

(19:53-20:37)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 10

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

8. Z-8-84 - PLOT PLAN REVIEW - PARK W. HAWS, INC.

Request of PARK W. HAWS, INC. for a Plot Plan Review on property generally located on the north side of Vegas Drive, 200' east of Torrey Pines Drive, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-CL Zone).

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan and elevations.
2. Approval of the variance for the recreation sites.
3. Conformance to the remaining original conditions of approval.
4. Dedicate 40' of right-of-way for Vegas Drive as required by the Department of Design and Development.

9. Z-34-81 - REVIEW OF CONDITIONS - G. C. WALLACE, ENGINEER

Request of G. C. WALLACE, ENGINEER, for Review of Condition No. 1 concerning the location of a fence to enclose a proposed reservoir for the Las Vegas Valley Water District at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and El Capitan Way, C-V Zone.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. The landscaping shall be installed when the street improvements on El Capitan Way and Alta Drive are constructed.
2. The chain-link fence be allowed on the property lines until the landscaping and the street improvements are installed on Alta Drive and El Capitan (as required by the City) and at that time, the chain-link fence along Alta and El Capitan shall be replaced with a decorative fence of a type mutually agreed upon by the City and the Las Vegas Valley Water District.

Johnston -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous
(Bugbee excused)

MR. FOSTER stated this Plot Plan originally had looped streets but now the plan shows two cul-de-sacs which reduces the number of lots by four and two of those lots will be used for a common recreation area.

PARK W. HAWS, 3790 Paradise Road, appeared and represented the application. He is in agreement with staff's conditions.

To be heard by the City Council on 12-5-84.

(20:42-20:44)

Johnston -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated they have requested a chain-link fence along the property lines to be replaced with a decorative fence when the streets are installed; also, the landscaping be deferred until the streets are installed. Staff is agreeable to that request and would recommend approval, subject to the conditions.

JACK MITCHELL, G. C. Wallace, Engineers, 1555 Rainbow Boulevard, appeared and represented the application. They are in agreement with staff's conditions.

NOTE: Mr. Bugbee said along Valley View and Charleston, the Las Vegas Valley Water District property should be cleaned up. The property is used for a storage yard. Mr. Foster said he would contact the Water District and report back to the Commission.

This is final action.

(20:44-20:48)

AGENDA

November 27, 1984

City of Las Vegas PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 11

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

10. Z-20-76 - PLOT PLAN REVIEW - GARY GUY
WILSON, ARCHITECT

Request of GARY GUY WILSON, ARCHITECT, for a Plot Plan Review of property generally located on the east side of Lorenzi Boulevard, between Washington Avenue and Silver Stream Avenue, C-1 Zone.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan.

Bugbee -
APPROVED, subject to the
conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated this request is a minor change in the building location for the convenience store. Staff would recommend approval, subject to the condition.

RICHARD HERRMANN, Gary Guy Wilson, Architect, 5355 Spring Mountain Road, appeared and represented their client.

This is final action.

(20:48-20:49)

11. Z-6-66(26) - PLOT PLAN REVIEW - HELP THEM
WALK AGAIN FOUNDATION

Request of HELP THEM WALK AGAIN FOUNDATION for a Plot Plan Review of property generally located at 5300 West Charleston Boulevard, C-1 Zone.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan.
2. Approval of the elevations with aesthetic treatment along the north side as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

Bugbee -
APPROVED, subject to staff's
conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated they will use this building for their therapeutic pool facility. They do not have any building elevations at this time. Staff would recommend approval subject to the conditions.

CHARLES SMITH, Help Them Walk Again Foundation, appeared and represented the application. This is a HUD project and will be subject to bids.

This is final action.

(20:49-20:50)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 12

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

12. Z-98-83 - EXTENSION OF TIME - DIANE HERR

Request of DIANE HERR for an Extension of Time on property located at 1529 W. Bonanza Road, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to C-2).

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. This Resolution of Intent shall expire 12-21-85.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

Johnston -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated this is their first request for an Extension of Time. Staff would recommend approval of a one-year extension.

LLOYD HAMPTON appeared and represented the applicant.

This will be heard by the City Council on 12-19-84.

(20:50-20:52)

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS:

1. NEW ZONING DISTRICT - C-PB, Planned Business Park District.

Bugbee -
ADOPTED, subject to a minimum of five acres.
Unanimous

(20:56-21:03)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 13

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA:

1. Z-61-82 - EXTENSION OF TIME - ROBERT L. CONN, ET AL

Request of ROBERT L. CONN, ET AL, for an Extension of Time on property generally located on the west side of Tonopah Drive, between Washington Avenue and West Bonanza Road, R-1 Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-PD16).

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. This Resolution of Intent shall expire 1-19-86.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

Guthrie -
APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated this is their second request for an Extension of Time. The applicant needs additional time to start construction. Staff would recommend approval, subject to the conditions.

ROBERT L. CONN, Box 4848, appeared and represented the application.

To be heard by the City Council on 12-19-84.

(20:52-20:53)

2. Z-41-83 - REINSTATEMENT AND EXTENSION OF TIME - LEWIS HOMES OF NEVADA

Request of LEWIS HOMES OF NEVADA for a Reinstatement and an Extension of Time on property generally located on the southwest corner of Vegas Drive and Rock Springs Drive, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-CL).

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. This Resolution of Intent shall expire 12-19-84.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

Tracy -
ABEYANCE
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated they are still within the reinstatement period. Staff would recommend approval, subject to the conditions.

No one appeared to represent the application.

To be heard again by the City Planning Commission on 12-13-84.

(20:53-20:54)

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

November 27, 1984

PLANNING COMMISSION

Page 14

COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

PHONE 386-6301

COMMISSION ACTION

ITEM

3. SP-4-84 - SATELLITE PARKING - WEST LAS VEGAS MEMORIAL CHAPEL

Request of WEST LAS VEGAS MEMORIAL CHAPEL for satellite parking on property generally located at 615 West Van Buren Avenue, C-2 Zone.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Pave and landscape the parking lot as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

Bugbee -
APPROVED subject to staff's conditions.
Unanimous

MR. FOSTER stated The New Town Tavern would like to lease the parking area on this site. The parking area would not be utilized by the chapel because the chapel is a daytime operation and The New Town Tavern is primarily a night-time operation. There are 48 parking spaces. The ordinance requires 29 spaces for the chapel, but because they would be used at different times during the day, staff does not see any problem.


O. L. JEFFERSON, 804 Sunny Place, appeared and represented the chapel. They are in agreement with staff's conditions.

To be heard by the City Council on 12-5-84.

(20:54-20:56)


ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the City Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:03 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT



HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN
CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE
CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Ann Greta Jones Estates
c/o Jared Shafer
1700 Pinto Lane
Las Vegas, Nv 89106

RE: Z-85-84

Dear Mr. Shafer:


Your request for reclassification of property generally located between Ann Road and Lone Mountain Road; and Jones Boulevard and Decatur Boulevard, from R-E to R-D, R-CL, R-1, R-PD9 and C-1 Zones, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Planning Commission voted to hold this item in ABEYANCE.

This item will be considered by the City Planning Commission on December 13, 1984. The Commission requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm

cc: Jerry Helton, U.S. Homes
Mike Koizumi, VTN Nevada




MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

November 30, 1984

Mr. Dick Crossley
5357 Latigo Street
Las Vegas, Nv 89119

RE: Final Map - Stoney Brook Village

Dear Mr. Crossley:

The Final Map for Stoney Brook Village on property generally located on the west side of Torrey Pines Drive, south of Smoke Ranch Road, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-PD14) was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the Tentative Map.
2. Conformance with the Tentative Map.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval for the Tentative Map.
4. The Final Map shall not be submitted to the City Council until all conditions of approval for the Tentative Map have been satisfied.

This item is being referred to the Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development. Upon completion of their review, this item will be placed before the City Council for action.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT
HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HOWARD A. NULL, CHIEF
PLANNING DIVISION

HAN:1m

cc: CHA Venture




MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Ahmanson Foundation
Ahmanson Trust Co.
3701 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 100
Los Angeles, Ca 90010

RE: Z-84-84

Gentlemen:

Your request for reclassification of property generally located on the southwest corner of Eastern Avenue and 25th Street, from R-4 to C-2 Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve month time limit.
2. Approval of the driveway locations by the Traffic Engineer.
3. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.
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, whichever occurs first.
6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.

- continued -



To: Ahmanson Foundation
Re: Z-84-84


December 4, 1984
Page Two

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 Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
10. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 19, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR


HPF:lm

cc: Clyde Spitze, VTN

MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

November 30, 1984

Mr. Dick Crossley
5357 Latigo Street
Las Vegas, Nv 89119

RE: Stoney Brook Village Tentative Map

Dear Mr. Crossley:

The Tentative Map for Stoney Brook Village on property generally located on the west side of Torrey Pines, south of Smoke Ranch Road, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-PD14), was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Planning Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the conditions of approval for Plot Plan Review Z-60-80.
2. Conformance to the Flood Hazard Reduction Ordinance.
3. Temporary improved access be provided on Torrey Pines Drive north to Smoke Ranch Road as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
4. If a wall is constructed on an exterior boundary street, the CC&Rs 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.
5. Approval of the building elevations as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

- continued -



To: Mr. Dick Crossley
Re: Tentative Map - Stoney Brook Village

November 30, 1984
Page Two

6. Payment of all outstanding property taxes.
7. 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.
8. Street names to be provided in accord with the City's Street Name Policy.
9. Subject to all conditions of City departments and State subdivision statutes.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 19, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT



HP HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm

cc: CHA Venture

MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Jacob and Betty Cohen
2412 Plaza Del Grande
Las Vegas, Nv 89102

RE: Z-83-84

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Cohen:

Your request for reclassification of property generally located on the northwest corner of Sirius Avenue and Valley View Boulevard, from C-1 and M Zone to M Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent shall be restricted to a twelve month time limit.
2. Install street improvements on Sirius Avenue and sidewalk on Valley View Boulevard as required by the Land Development and Flood Control Division of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
3. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.
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, whichever occurs first.

- continued -



To: Jacob and Betty Cohen
Re: Z-83-84


December 4, 1984
Page Two

6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
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 Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
9. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 5, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT



HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR


HPF:lm

MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

E. R. & Margaret Spiess
5416 Mayflower Lane
Las Vegas, Nv 89107

RE: VAC-22-84

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Spiess:

Your petition to vacate Government Patent easements on property generally located west of Rainbow Boulevard and south of Charleston Boulevard, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom.
2. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
3. Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met.
4. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or an extension is not granted by the Planning Commission, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

This item will be scheduled for public hearing on December 19, 1984 in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas. This hearing will be at 2:00 P.M. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this hearing.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT
HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

Howard A. Null, Chief
Planning Division

HPF:HAN:lm




MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

November 30, 1984

Argonaut, Inc.
1720 West Bonanza Road
Las Vegas, Nv 89106

RE: Tentative Map - Rosewood Condominiums (Conversion)

Gentlemen:

The Tentative Map for Rosewood Condominiums on property generally located on the north side of Bonanza Road, west of Highland Drive, R-3 Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Planning Commission unanimously voted to hold this item in ABEYANCE.

This item will be placed on the December 13, 1984 City Planning Commission agenda. This meeting will be held at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Planning Commission requires you or your representative to be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT

HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm




MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

November 30, 1984

Mr. Johnny Ribeiro
Federal Land Corporation
601 Rancho Drive
Las Vegas, Nv 89106

RE: Z-60-84

Dear Mr. Ribeiro:

Your request for reclassification of property generally located on the east side of Rancho Drive between Alta Drive and Pinto Lane, from R-D and R-1 to P-R, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Planning Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent shall be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. No access to Alta Drive.
3. Install half-street improvements on Alta Drive, Rancho Drive and Pinto Lane as required by the Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
4. Dedicate 25' property line radius corners at the intersection of Pinto Lane and Rancho Drive and Alta Drive and Rancho Drive as required by the Department of Design and Development.
5. Right turn lane on Rancho Drive to Alta Drive shall be approved by the City Council.
6. Conformance to the plot plan and elevations.

- continued -



To: Mr. Johnny Ribeiro
Re: Z-60-84


November 30, 1984
Page Two

7. 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.
8. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit, license or prior to occupancy.
9. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
10. Satisfaction of City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
11. Approval of the parking and driveway plans by the Traffic Engineer.
12. Repair any damage to the existing street improvements resulting from this development as required by the Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
13. Provision of fire hydrants and water flow as required by the Department of Fire Services.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 19, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this hearing.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT



HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm

MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

West Las Vegas Memorial Chapel
615 West Van Buren Avenue
Las Vegas, Nv 89106

RE: SP-4-84

Gentlemen:

Your request for satellite parking on property generally located at 615 West Van Buren, C-2 Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.


The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Pave and landscape the parking lot as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 5, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm




MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Lewis Homes
P. O. Box 19297
Las Vegas, Nv 89119

RE: Z-41-83 REINSTATEMENT AND EXTENSION OF TIME

Gentlemen:


Your request for Reinstatement and Extension of Time on property generally located on the southwest corner of Vegas Drive and Rock Springs Drive, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-CL), was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to hold this item in ABEYANCE.

This item will be considered by the City Planning Commission on December 13, 1984 at 7:30 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Commission requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT




HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm



MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN
CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE
CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Mr. Robert L. Conn
Box 4848
Las Vegas, Nv 89106

RE: Z-61-82 EXTENSION OF TIME

Dear Mr. Conn:

Your request for an Extension of Time on property generally located on the west side of Tonopah Drive, between Washington Avenue and West Bonanza Road, R-1 Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-PD16) was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.


The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Resolution of Intent shall expire January 19, 1986.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 19, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm




MAYOR BILL BRIARE

COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN

CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE

CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Ms. Diane Herr
1529 W. Bonanza Road
Las Vegas, Nv 89106

RE: Z-98-83 EXTENSION OF TIME

Dear Ms. Herr:

Your request for an Extension of Time on property located at 1529 W. Bonanza Road, R-E Zone (under Resolution of Intent to C-2) was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Resolution of Intent shall expire on December 21, 1985.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 19, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,


DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:1m



MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN
CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE
CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Ms. Joanne Toadvine
Help Them Walk Again Foundation
5300 W. Charleston Boulevard
Las Vegas, Nv 89102

RE: Z-6-66 (26) PLOT PLAN REVIEW

Dear Ms. Toadvine:

Your request for a Plot Plan Review of property generally located at 5300 West Charleston Boulevard, C-1 Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to APPROVE this item, subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan.
2. Approval of the elevations with aesthetic treatment along the north side as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

The action by the Planning Commission is final.

Sincerely,


DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT

HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm



MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN
CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE
CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Mr. Richard C. Hermann
Gary Guy Wilson Architects
3355 Spring Mountain Road, Suite 60
Las Vegas, Nv. 89102

RE: Z-20-76 PLOT PLAN REVIEW

Dear Mr. Hermann:

Your request for a Plot Plan Review of property generally located on the east side of Lorenzi Boulevard, between Washington Avenue and Silver Stream Avenue, C-1 Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.


The Planning Commission voted to APPROVE this item, subject to the following condition:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan.

The action by the Planning Commission is final.

Sincerely,


DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm



MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN
CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE
CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

G. C. Wallace, Engineer
1555 S. Rainbow Boulevard
Las Vegas, Nv 89102

RE: Z-34-81 - REVIEW OF CONDITIONS

Gentlemen:

Your request for a Review of Condition No. 1 concerning the location of a fence to enclose a proposed reservoir for the Las Vegas Valley Water District at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and El Capitan Way, C-V Zone, was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Planning Commission voted to APPROVE this request, subject to the following conditions:

1. The landscaping shall be installed when the street improvements on El Capitan Way and Alta Drive are constructed.
2. The chain-link fence be allowed on the property lines until the landscaping and the street improvements are installed on Alta Drive and El Capitan (as required by the City) and at that time, the chain-link fence along Alta and El Capitan shall be replaced with a decorative fence of a type mutually agreed upon by the City and the Las Vegas Valley Water District.

The action by the Planning Commission is final.

Sincerely,


DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm



MAYOR BILL BRIARE
COUNCILMEN
RON LURIE
PAUL J. CHRISTENSEN
AL LEVY
BOB NOLEN
CITY ATTORNEY
GEORGE F. OGILVIE
CITY MANAGER
RUSSELL W. DORN



CITY of LAS VEGAS

December 4, 1984

Mr. Park W. Haws
Newport Center, Suite 299
3790 Paradise Road
Las Vegas, Nv 89109

RE: Z-8-84 PLOT PLAN REVIEW

Dear Mr. Haws:

Your request for a Plot Plan Review of property generally located on the north side of Vegas Drive, 200 feet east of Torrey Pines Drive, N-U Zone (under Resolution of Intent to R-CL) was considered by the City Planning Commission on November 27, 1984.

The Commission voted to refer this item with a recommendation of APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan and elevations.
2. Approval of the variance for the recreation sites.
3. Conformance to the remaining original conditions of approval.
4. Dedicate 40 feet of right-of-way for Vegas Drive as required by the Department of Design and Development.

This item will be considered by the City Council on December 5, 1984 at 2:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The Council requires you or your representative be present at this meeting.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY PLANNING
AND DEVELOPMENT


HAROLD P. FOSTER, DIRECTOR

HPF:lm



INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date

November 27, 1984

TO:

FOSTER

FROM:

CLEMMER

SUBJECT:

AGENDA ITEM CONDITIONS
11/27/84 PC AGENDA
(ZONING BACKUP)

COPIES TO:

~~CITY ATTORNEY~~
~~CITY CLERK~~
MILLS

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Z-60-84

This was held in ABEYANCE due to a tie vote.

ABEYANCE ITEM

There is residential zoning surrounding this property, although to the south is P-R zoning. They are proposing access to Rancho, Alto and Pinto Lane. There will be nine one-story condominium office buildings. Staff recommends DENIAL because it is in conflict with the Special Activity Center Plan. The Plan indicates this property should be developed on a low-density basis.

Staff recommends DENIAL. If approved, subject to:

1. Resolution of Intent with a twelve-month time limit.
2. No access to Alta Drive.
3. Install half-street improvements on Alta Drive, Rancho Drive and Pinto Lane as required by the Land Development and Flood Control Division of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
4. Dedicate 25' property line radius corners at the intersection of Pinto Lane and Rancho Drive and Alta Drive and Rancho Drive as required by the Department of Design and Development.
5. Standard Conditions 1 - 8.
6. Right turn lane from Rancho to Alta shall be approved by the City Council.

PROTESTS:

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

SET FOR CC: 12/19/84

TO: Foster
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84 PC Agenda

November 27, 1984
Page 2

NEW BUSINESS:

5. Z-83-84

JACOB B. & BETTY
L. COHEN

We inherited the C-1 strip in this industrial area from the county and since the county has allowed industrial uses to the west, it is no longer appropriate.

These are 3000 sq. ft. storage units and retail with a total of 73,000 sq. ft. in the building.

68 spaces required - 112 provided. Buildings have commercial storage units appearance. Industrial area.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. ROI with a 12 month time limit.
2. Standard conditions 1 - 8.
3. Install street improvements on Sirius Avenue and sidewalk on Valley View Boulevard as required by the Department of Design and Development.

PROTESTS:
PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

SET FOR CC: 12/5/84

6. Z-84-84

AHMANSON FOUNDATION

This request involves only a small portion of the overall development site on the north end which is not already classified C-2. The project is a unique arrangement of retail and commercial storage.

The development is aesthetically O.K.

Retail area requires 130 spaces and 226 are provided.

Parking available at commercial storage units.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. ROI with a 12-month time limit.

TO: FOSTER
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84 PC Agenda

November 27, 1984
Page 3

Z-84-84 (Continued)

2. Standard conditions 1 - 8.
3. Approval of the driveway locations by the Traffic Engineer.

PROTESTS:
PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

SET FOR CC: 12/19/84

7. Z-85-84

This proposed project is on a parcel containing 574 acres and they are proposing 2134 units total which is 3.7 units per acre overall. They are proposing 100 acres of 8 and 9 units per acre densities which is ok.

They are requesting R-PD9 on the 1700 unit secured areas to allow flexibility which we can control with caps and staff review. The reason is that the 8 and 9 unit/acre sites could require slight shifting in the final designs. The internal streets system to serve the 1700 unit secured area appears workable but the one access point doesn't.

The M.P.S.&H. will have to be amended to eliminate Washburn and Bradley and the Traffic Engineer feels that that will put several thousand TPD over Lone Mountain Road and Ann Road may be okay. In the NW sector, they are buffering the west with R-E lots, the south with R-D lots. In the SW sector they are proposing back-up lots of the R-CL type and density of 6-7 units/acre. Staff would prefer to have specially designed lots with a minimum of 15' setbacks and an 8' high design block wall due to the 3-1 density difference. The 8' wall should continue to the proposed R-D area.

The site on the NW is across from R-E development but is appropriate at the intersection of 2 major primary streets.

There are 46 acres of R-PD9.
57 acres of 8 un/ac zero lot line
12 acres of R-E
3 acres of R-D
35 acres of R-1
65 acres of recreation space
200 acres of R-CL
39 acres of Commercial
117 acres of streets
574 acres

- continued -

TO: FOSTER
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84 PC Agenda

November 27, 1984
Page 4

Z-85-84 (Continued) Staff recommends approval, subject to:

1. ROI with a 12 month time limit.
2. The R-PD9 shall be limited to a maximum of 1700 dwelling units.
3. A maximum of 110 acres in the R-PD9 zone shall be permitted over 7.5 units per acre.
4. Install an 8' block wall along Leon Avenue and extending it along Washburn Avenue to the R-D sites; a 6' block wall shall be installed around the remainder of the R-PD9 area between any commercial and the residential; as well as adjacent to lots backing up to major streets. (All required walls abutting streets shall be decorative.)
5. Install street improvements on Ann Road, Decatur Boulevard, Lone Mountain Road, Leon Avenue, Washburn Road and Jones Boulevard as required by the Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development.
6. Dedicate 50' of right-of-way for Decatur Boulevard and Lone Mountain road; 30' of r/w for Washburn Road and Leon Avenue; 20' of r/w for Jones Boulevard and a 25' property line radius at the intersection of Washburn Road and Jones Boulevard, Jones Boulevard and Ann Road, Ann Road and Decatur Boulevard, Decatur Boulevard and Lone Mountain Road, and Lone Mountain Road and Leon Avenue, as required by the Department of Design and Development.
7. The private access drives and curvilinear streets shall meet the requirements of the Traffic Engineer.
8. Amend the M.P.S. & H. to eliminate Washburn Road and Bradley Road.
9. Install a minimum of 30' wide temporary paved access along Lone Mountain Road to Jones Boulevard; along Ann Road to Jones Boulevard and overlay a minimum width of 30' on Jones Boulevard between Washburn Road and Lone Mountain Road, as deemed necessary by the City as development occurs.
10. The R-E and R-D lots shall be developed concurrently with the R-1 development.
11. The lots in the R-PD9 backing up to Leon Drive shall have a 15' minimum rear yard setback.
12. P.C. approval of the development plans for the commercial sites.
13. Approval of the site plans of all residential development by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

- continued -

TO: FOSTER
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84 PC Agenda

November 27, 1984
Page 5

- ~~14.~~ Provide CC&Rs for the maintenance of the common areas as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
- ~~15.~~ The street layout shall be finalized for the R-1, R-D and R-PD9 through the subdivision process.
- ~~16.~~ The triangular sites for which land use has not been specified shall be used for landscaped open space.
- ~~17.~~ Standard conditions 2-8 shall apply to the C-1 sites.

PROTESTS: 0
THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING

cc action: 12/19/84

8. Z-8-84

This proposal is to amend following a zero lot line detached plan where a setback detached was originally approved, 2 cul-de-sacs from Vegas Drive rather than the loop street originally proposed, and this is a net reduction of 5 lots, i.e., from 49 to 44 with 2 lots for recreation in addition. The same number of units will border the north line which was a point of contention.

We cannot approve recreation area but a Variance has been filed. Elevations look okay.

Staff recommends approval, subject to:

- 1. Conformance to the revised plot plan and elevations.
- 2. Approval of the Variance for the Recreation sites.
- 3. Conformance to the remaining original conditions of approval.
- 4. Dedicate 40' of r/w for Vegas Drive.

PROTESTS: N/A
THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

CC ACTION: 12/5/84

TO: Foster
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84 PC Agenda

November 27, 1984
Page 6

9. Z-34-81

G.C. WALLACE, ENGR.

—REVIEW OF CONDITION

If the chain link fence is placed at the circumferential access drive, all of the pumps, etc., will be inside the fence and protected.

The landscaping should be allowed delay until the street is installed.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. The landscaping shall be installed when the street improvements on El Capitan Way and Alta Drive are constructed.
2. The chain link fence be allowed on the property lines until the landscaping and the street improvements are installed on Alta Drive and El Capitan (as required by the City) and at that time, the chain link fence along Alta and El Capitan shall be replaced with a decorative fence of a type mutually agreed upon by the City and the Las Vegas Valley Water District.

PROTESTS: N/A
NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

PC FINAL ACTION

10. Z-20-76

GARY GUY WILSON
ARCHITECT

PLOT PLAN REVIEW

This is a positive change from the original approval. Shifts the building south of Washington Avenue.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan.

PROTESTS: N/A
THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

PC FINAL ACTION

TO: FOSTER
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84

November 27, 1984
Page 7

11. Z-6-66(26)

HELP THEM WALK
AGAIN FOUNDATION
PLOT PLAN REVIEW

This is a proposed 30 x 60 pool therapy building which will employ a metal building system

The aesthetics from the R-1 to the north should be considered.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. Conformance to the revised plot plan.

2. Approval of the elevation with aesthetic treatment along the north side as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

PROTESTS: N/A
NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

PC FINAL ACTION

12. Z-98-83

DIANE HERR
EXTENSION OF TIME

This is the first request for an Extension of Time.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. This R01 shall expire 12/21/85.

2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

PROTESTS: N/A
THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

SET FOR CC: 12/19/84

TO: Foster
RE: Agenda Item Conditions
11/27/84

November 27, 1984
Page 8

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA:

1. Z-61-82

ROBERT L. CONN
ET AL

EXTENSION OF TIME

This is the second request for an Extension of Time.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. This ROI shall expire 1/19/86.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

PROTESTS: N/A

THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

SET FOR CC: 12/19/84

2. Z-41-83

LEWIS HOMES OF NV

REINSTATEMENT AND
EXTENSION OF TIME

This expired 6/1/84 and is within the 6-month reinstatement period.

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to:

1. This ROI shall expire 12/19/85.
2. Conformance to all ordinance amendments enacted subsequent to the original approval.

PROTESTS: N/A

THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

SET FOR CC: 12/19/84

3. SP-4-84

This satellite parking proposal is to add parking to an existing tavern and is not required parking at this time. The parking lot is for a mortuary chapel which specifies hours of operation from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and the tavern hours are primarily from 8:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. They are required 29 spaces and 48 are available so before they could lease over 19 this approval is necessary. This would be appropriate.

Staff recommends approval, subject to:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Pave and landscape the parking lot as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.

PROTESTS: N/A

THIS IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING

CC ACTION: 12/5/84

NAME

ADDRESS

Walter C. Zucker

531 Parkway West

J. M. Bay

4458 ANNIE OAK,

Ron MENDICINO

300 S 4^E #805.

Jerry Helton - US Home

1515 E. Tropicana #600

George Baylee

7465 N. TORREY PINES

R. C. HERZMANN

5355 SP. MT. Arenal,

Charles J. Smith

BOX 4848 LV, NV 89108

Robert L. Co

804 Spring Pl LV 89106

D. L. Jeffers

NAME

ADDRESS

Larry Thomas
Judy E. Longo
Jack H. Mitchell

601 Ranchito L.V.
325 Parkway West
1555 RAINBOW BLVD.

NAME

ROBERT FAISS

Charley Johnson

W F Quinn

Clyde Spitzer

MIKE KOZUMI

ADDRESS

#1700 300 So. 4th LV

2300 Paseo del Prado A-100

2109 Plaza del Cerro

VTW 2300 Paseo del Prado A-100

VTN 2300 PASEO DEL PRADO

**(2) VERBATIM
TRANSCRIPTS
ATTACHED**

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Item No. 7, Z-85-84. Request of Heirs and Devisees of the Estate of Ann Greta Jones for reclassification of property generally located between Ann Road and Lone Mountain Road and Jones Boulevard and Decatur Boulevard from R-E to R-D, R-CL, R-1, R-PD9 and C-1 zones. Proposed Use: Low to medium density residential and shopping centers.

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

This involves a relatively large parcel of land consisting of 574 acres. You can see it on the screen to your right. It's most of Section 36. Where the 36 is that's the center of that particular section. It includes everything except the westerly 80 acres which is partially developed on an R-E basis and zoned R-E. The green shading on the map indicates R-E around the site. The portions that are white and there is no color on them reflect the areas in the county. The application is for essentially what's shown on the screen. There is C-1 requested at the northwest corner, the northeast corner and the southeast corner. Around the C-1 on the southeast corner you can see the R-CL, which is around the C-1 site. To the northwest, south of the C-1 there is a strip of R-E to remain, which is the present zoning, so it will act as a buffer from the R-E across the street. There are some homes essentially about the southwest corner of that R-E site, where he's pointing to right now, fronting on Jones Boulevard, and to the south, east of Jones, there are some homes in there that are proposing R-D size lots which are quarter acre in size to act as a buffer. Then north of that we have an R-1 parcel and then to the east of that is R-PD9 on the remainder of this site. The R-PD9 consists of about 436 acres. This is a project that is proposed to be utilized by senior citizens. It's a security development that will have a wall all the way around it. One entrance they are proposing along the south side on Lone Mountain Road. There will be private drives on the interior and there will also be a golf course on the interior and you can probably better see that by the map in front of you. The golf course is the area shown in green on this large parcel. They are proposing several sites where the density is around 8 to 9 units per acre. On some of the other parcels it's more around 5 to 6. Overall on the entire site that is being utilized for residential purposes there is a density of around 3.7 units per acre. Now that's a density that's something less than an R-1 subdivision. In an R-1 you get about 4 to 5 units per acre. The applicant applied for the R-PD9 over the entire site because they

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

wanted to have some flexibility on these various sites that were at around 8 to 9 units per acre. The density in the R-PD9 will be substantially lower than the 9 that is being requested, but it's only to give them some flexibility in design of the size or slightly changing the shape of them from what is shown on the plot plan. These sites are essentially along the south portion. Lone Mountain Road is one going north of that. There is another one along the east on Decatur. There is one about in the northeast portion of the development. Also, one at the very northeast part right adjacent to the C-1; there's actually two sites there. There is one to the west adjacent to the R-1, as well as one on this southwesterly part. Because of the R-E development in this southwest portion where Rosada, LaMadre and Verde Streets are located, they are proposing to back up these single family lots on the private drive with the cul-de-sacs that will have relatively wide rear property lines and it will minimize the number of homes that are adjacent to the westerly boundary. Staff feels to provide an adequate buffer and protection along that that they should have an 8 foot block wall along their westerly property line on Leon Drive and then extend it north to Washburn and then along the north side of Washburn to the R-D lots and then a 6 foot block wall around the remainder of the R-PD9 site, as well as their being a 6 foot block walls between the commercial sites and the residential that provide adequate protection between those two uses. The applicant has proposed a maximum of 1700 units in the R-PD9 site, which will guarantee that there will be a certain density, even though they are asking for a zoning classification, R-PD9, that would allow a much higher number of units. We also would like to condition the fact in the R-PD9 that there only be 110 acres that could be utilized for densities around 7.5 acre -- units per acre, or higher, which would actually be between 7.5 and 9, so again, it would minimize the -- or maximize the amount of area that they could utilize for the R-PD9 zoning that's being requested. Staff, in evaluating the request, we feel that it is a logical plan on this larger parcel of property to be developed on that basis. We think because the predominant amount of the parcel that is to be utilized for a senior citizens project will be compatible in the respect that it will generate less traffic than a normal single family development, if it was to be developed on an R-1 basis. There would be less demand for schools, obviously, because you are not going to have any children in the 1700 units in the R-PD9.

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

Obviously, you will have them in the R-CL, the R-1, R-D and R-E. There are also two major streets that go, or proposed, to go through this particular site, Bradley and Washburn. You can see those, as indicated by the lines through the site. The Major Street Plan would have to be amended to exclude those. We feel that with this type of design that -- and the projected traffic to the north and in an east/west direction in that that these streets could be deleted without it affecting traffic flow in the area. I've got quite a number of conditions that somewhat embrace just about -- or many of the things that I've mentioned in my presentation, but I'll go through and read those to you. Staff feels the zoning application is acceptable, compatible, in this area. We would recommend approval, subject to these conditions. No. 1, that it be by Resolution of Intent with a twelve month time limit. The R-PD9 be limited to a maximum of 1700 dwelling units. Three, the maximum of 110 acres in the R-PD9 shall be permitted over 7.5 units per acre. Four, install an 8 foot block wall along Leon and extending it along Washburn Avenue to the R-D sites. Also a 6 foot block wall shall be then installed around the remainder of the R-PD9 area between any commercial and residential, as well as adjacent to the lots backing up to major streets. All the required walls abutting the streets shall be of a decorative type. Five, install street improvements on Ann Road, Decatur Boulevard, Lone Mountain Road, Leon Avenue, Washburn Road, and Jones Boulevard as required by the Division of Land Development and Flood Control of the Department of Community Planning and Development. Six, dedicate 50 feet of right-of-way for Decatur Boulevard and Lone Mountain Road, 30 feet of right-of-way for Washburn Road and Leon Avenue, 20 feet of right-of-way for Jones Boulevard and 25 foot property line radius at the intersection of Washburn Road and Jones Boulevard, Jones Boulevard and Ann Road, Ann Road and Decatur Boulevard, Decatur Blvd. and Lone Mountain Rd. and Lone Mountain Rd. and Leon Ave., as required by the Department of Design and Development. Seven, the private access drives and curvilinear streets shall meet the requirements of the Traffic Engineer in terms of the curvature and what type of speed they would generate to make sure that they are an acceptable curve. No. 9, install a minimum of a 30 foot wide temporary paved access along Lone Mountain Road to Jones Boulevard, also along Ann Road to Jones Boulevard, and overlay a minimum of 30 foot width on Jones Boulevard between

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

Washburn Road and Lone Mountain Road as deemed necessary by the City as development occurs. What we're saying here is the primary access will be to Jones Boulevard. Their main entrance will be from Lone Mountain to the south. There are some necessary connections between this project and Jones Boulevard, as well as on Jones from the development to the north, extending down to Lone Mountain Road. We think that those -- also there is connections neither across the C-1 to the north that as development takes place and these are needed, that these temporary improvements be installed to handle the traffic on these streets and provide the continuous suitable paved access to the existing paving on Jones Boulevard. I believe also the developers are proposing some additional paving further south on Jones Boulevard from Lone Mountain Road to provide better access to the site.

LADY IN AUDIENCE:

I'm sorry, I missed that part about the paved road to Rancho off of Jones.

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

I indicated that the developer is proposing some improvements on Jones Boulevard south of Lone Mountain Road to provide better access to this site. It will just be in various portions and they will probably elaborate on that. No. 10, the R-D and R-E lots shall be developed concurrently with the R-1. No. 11, the lots in the R-PD9 backing up to Leon Drive shall have a minimum rear setback of 15 feet. That would be these on this portion. That would be backing up to the 8 foot wall. No. 12, Planning Commission approval of the development plans for the commercial sites. No. 13, approval of the site plans of all residential development by the Department of Community Planning and Development. Fourteen, provide the Conditions, Covenants, and Restrictions for the maintenance of the common areas as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development. No. 15, the street layout shall be finalized for the R-1, R-D and R-PD9 through the subdivision process. No. 16, the triangular sites for which land use has not be specified shall be used for landscaped open space and that's essentially the R-PD9 and there's various miscellaneous splinter parcels around. We feel that those should just be landscaped. Seventeen, standard conditions 2 through 8 shall apply to the C-1 sites. I've just been told I missed No. 8 which is, amend the Master Plan of Streets and Highways to eliminate Washburn Road and Bradley Road. From this advertised public hearing we have no protests on record.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Is that all the conditions? Let me hear from the applicant now, if we would, at this time.

JERRY HELTON; U. S. Home:

Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Jerry Helton with U. S. Home Corporation, 1515 East Tropicana, Suite 600. U. S. Home has been building residential conventional housing in Las Vegas, Clark County and Henderson since 1977. We haven't been in front of this Planning Commission for a couple of years, since we finished our last project in Las Vegas in 1982. We are here tonight to present the Master Plan on this 574 acres, 436 of which will be a retirement community, with an 18 hole golf course, a 15,000 square foot clubhouse, a recreation center, swimming pool and tennis courts. It's about retirement and U. S. Home that I would like to talk briefly before turning the main part of the presentation over to representatives from VTN Engineering. U. S. Home has been building retirement for ten years. The company currently has nine active retirement communities located in Florida, New Jersey, Maryland, Texas and we hope soon, a tenth in Las Vegas. The demographics of Las Vegas make it an ideal area for retirement communities such as we have designed. Phoenix and Riverside both have successful retirement communities and we believe that the amenities offered by Las Vegas and the Las Vegas valley have more to offer the retired individual than either of those two cities. We've designed this Master Plan incorporating our knowledge of the needs of the retired individual, along with our knowledge of the needs of the citizen of the city of Las Vegas based on our experience and our reputation in both of these areas. At this time I'll turn the rest of the presentation over to representatives from VTN.

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

Mr. Chairman, let me comment on one thing before the applicant proceeds. I neglected to mention one other thing. Our Traffic Engineer feels that there should be more than one access to the R-PD9 development on Lone Mountain Road. They recommend a minimum of three, that there be the one on Lone Mountain, one on Decatur and also one on Ann Road. Due to the type of development, being a retirement community, the applicant indicated that they wanted to just have the one. They also indicated they were going to present some data to us that would reflect that there is a lower trip generation than a normal single family development and then you can judge, based on that, if you feel that the one or more accesses should be provided.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE:

Did you indicate, Mr. Foster, that he was planning security on that development?

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

That's correct.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE:

It makes it a difficult job. The more gates you open up the more difficult security becomes. Couldn't we be satisfied with some high crash gates, or something?

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

Well, no. He's saying that there should be more than one, let's say, guard gate where you have continuous free flow of access. Generally in single family developments it generates around ten trips per day per unit. I think their statistics are substantially lower and they'll be presenting that to you.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Applicant have anything further?

MIKE KOIZUMI, VTN Nevada:

Oh, yes. My name is Mike Koizumi with VTN Nevada. I'd like to elaborate on some of Mr. Foster's remarks. First I would like to thank the Planning staff for their time and efforts in helping us put together the Master Zoning Plan. I would also like to thank the homeowners in the area who took their time to meet with U. S. Home and VTN in two meetings prior to this meeting. I know we don't agree on all the issues, but we appreciate their time also. I'm sure they're going to have a few things to say. As Mr. Foster mentioned, the basis of the site is a Master Planned Retirement Community. There will be approximately 436 acres in this development and the zoning asked for is R-PD9. If you took that 9 units per acre over the 436 acres, obviously, you'd come up with something like 3900 units. We're asking for a maximum cap on that of 1700 units. The units will be in three product styles. One would be a townhome, one would be a duplex and the remainder would be single family detached. They will all be single story units. The anchoring is obviously the golf course and the planned construction would be the golf course and the clubhouse will be built first because you cannot promise amenities without actually having them. Again, there are out parcels involved here; this area being R-CL, which would allow small lots, but we have asked, excuse me, that these lots be a minimum size of 55 feet by 100. On this particular out parcel we have an R-E, an R-D strip, with an interior R-1. The corner parcels in the proposed General Plan for the City are indicated to be commercial, which we have done. There is a great deal of concern about this commercial piece in the northwest corner as there are existing R-E homes across Ann Road.

MIKE KOIZUMI, VTN Nevada:

What the developer is willing to commit on that is one of the conditions being architectural supervision. The developer also wishes to state that he would not have any objections to a 20 foot landscaped strip on Ann Road and Jones Boulevard, subject to the approval of the Planning Department. We had discussed with some homeowners who were in this immediate area that that was one of their major concerns. They did not want to be facing the parking lot. Some of the other concerns that the homeowners in the area had were: No. 1, what was going to be the impact on the water. The water is being extended from Jones Boulevard and Rancho at U. S. Home expense to this site. It will be Las Vegas Valley Water District water, which will also include the irrigation of the golf course. The sewer -- there is a major sewer line proposed to be extended roughly to Bradley Street and Lone Mountain here, which we will utilize. In terms of flood control, I think some people had the misconception that we were going to wall this community in and not have any provision for a large ravine which exists right here. Our preliminary flood study indicates there is about a thousand CSF coming through there and there will be either a box structure of some sort or a system of storm drain pipes, but we're well aware of that. The wall itself is not going to impede any kind of water coming through the development. The major portion of that water then travels through the golf course and the golf course is used as a detention area and eventually ends up in a large detention area here. Based on our preliminary studies, the on-site water generated here is going to be less in a developed state than it will be in the undeveloped state because of our routing and the use of the golf course. That, I think, covers some of the major concerns that we had discussed with the homeowners. With regard to the access, U. S. Home has developed 9 of these retirement communities in the United States. They are all basically approximately 1700 units, which is the maximum that an 18-hole golf course can support. All of these have a single access and there is a guard gate with security. We intend to provide emergency access in addition to the main access, but we've also found that the security and one entry and exit is a major selling point with retired people. That is what they want and that is what is provided. Secondly, national traffic studies have shown that typically in residential areas you are generating ten trips per dwelling per day. We have information, and I can leave this letter with Mr. Foster, which was also sent to Mr. Bossi of the Traffic Department that retirement communities generate an

MIKE KOIZUMI, VTN Nevada:

average of 3 to 3.3 trips per day. In addition, the homeowners will provide a shuttle service for groups of people who wish to travel to town or whatever various purposes. It's our feeling that based on the 9 developments that U. S. Home has already completed and the national statistics bear out the fact that the one main entry will suffice for the subdivision. With regard to the conditions that staff has asked for, we're in agreement with all conditions. However, we would like the Resolution of Intent to have a 24 month time period due to size of the project. Once again, the first phases of construction will be the golf course, which will start early next year, the golf course and the model complex. Those will be the first items of construction. At this point I'd like to ask if the Commission has any questions.

COMMISSIONER GUTHRIE:

I have a question. The R-PD9 portion, will that be a condominium type of development or will you maintain ownership and rent? How will that work?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

It's a for-sale, fee simple ownership. There will be a homeowners association that controls the golf course and the green space. Therefore, by the Nevada statutes if legal title is a project in condominium, but it's homeowner, it's individual home ownership. It is not a for-rental project, it's a for-sale project.

COMMISSIONER GUTHRIE:

How can you guarantee that only senior citizens will live there?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

Within the CC&R's, the Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions. We have done this within the other communities and have learned the right way and the wrong way to do it, but we can restrict, create age restrictions in the CC&R's that are upheld by the courts.

COMMISSIONER GUTHRIE:

Will U. S. Homes supervise this project through its bail out?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

Through its completion? U. S. Home will supervise through the completion, supervise the management of the, well, all of the construction, the management of the golf course and the facilities up to the point where the homeowners association is large enough and experienced enough to take over the control themselves.

CHARLEY JOHNSON, VTN Nevada:

My name is Charley Johnson and I'd just like to summarize what Mike said that whenever you do a project like this in the community that's going to have affect on the people that live in the community, you approach it with a lot of

CHARLEY JOHNSON:

apprehension, but in laying this out there's a few things you have to take into consideration. One is there's very few areas left in Las Vegas where you can get a piece of property this size and then when you, like I say, you have to do it and you have to bring all the utilities to it so it's a great amount of expense. One of the other things that the people should realize, they probably do, but a project like this will take between four and nine years to sell out or build and sell out the retirement community. It won't be an overnight impact on them, other than the fact that they will have a golf course in the area, which, for a while, will be public, used by everybody until it comes to the point where the project is sold out enough where the homes, the people that live in the project need to control the tee times, then the public use of it will probably be phased out. You are going to be faced with the -- there's going to be a lot of people that come up to speak in opposition to this project. They're going to have legitimate concerns like traffic and flood control and things like that. There will always be flood control problems in this valley. This project won't either stop flooding nor will it add to flooding during rainy times. We'll have to make provisions to control the flood waters and release them in a controlled way so that it will not adversely affect the people to the east any more than they would be affected from the situation as it is now. We realize that Craig Road floods out every time it rains and we have no control over that and this project will not affect that one way or the other. There was going to be a lot of questions asked about the traffic impact on the project and that's true if this was built overnight like that. There would be a tremendous impact on it from the traffic standpoint but in building this out over the years like this, from four to nine years, hopefully by then some of the regional streets and major roads such as Craig Road, Jones and Lone Mountain between the Salt Lake Highway or the freeway I-15 and the Oran Gragson Freeway and the Tonopah Highway. Some of them roads will be built, hopefully, by then. It is going to have an impact on the people in the neighborhood out there. It sets on kind of a bluff where it's now open and it's a place to ride your horses, it's a place to go view the whole city and things like that. That's one of the reasons why all the units in this retirement community will be one-story units. There will be a block wall around it which some people offensive, block walls, but that's

CHARLEY JOHNSON:

one of the selling points of a retirement community is having the security. Taking all these things into account, we think that U. S. Homes has done a great deal of time and study in preparing this plan for your consideration and we'd ask your approval of it.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Is there anybody else that would like to speak for the applicant. Could I get a show of hands of those who are opposed, against this project? Now if possible we would like to not hear from all of you. As you come forth, would you sign in and as the next one is ready to speak would you come forth. I'd like to commend all of you for allowing the applicant to state his case without heckling him and he'll give you the same consideration. If you don't have anything new to add than the four or five people in front here, why please don't burden us with it.

GEORGE BAXTER:

My name is George Baxter. I'm President-Elect of the Sheep Mountain Homeowners Association which is located in that area. We would like to thank U. S. Homes for taking the time and the effort to present to the homeowners in that area what their plans are in developing this area. Although as they've stated themselves, there's quite a bit of opposition to it. The homeowners that live in that area, we met last Sunday night at Los Rancheros and we have petitions here requesting that the Commission does not change the zoning. There are 122 signatures on these petitions. However, we would like for the Commission at this time to just delay for a period of ninety days making any decision on this so that we could have a committee to meet with U. S. Homes and the developers in this area, to iron out any problems that we may have, any apprehensions that we may have such as flooding, flood control, traffic, some of the commercial zoning and things like that. As Commissioner Tracy stated, it was nice that the last developer was able to work with the homeowners in the area and come up with a plan that was suitable to all.

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

Are the developers in agreement with that? Do you have the time?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

We have a time limit.

GEORGE BAXTER:

They have had, excuse me. I'm sure that the developers have not, in two weeks, studied this plan and designed it themselves. They've

GEORGE BAXTER:

taken a couple of years, I'm sure, to do this. We have only had a couple of weeks in order to look at it ourselves. I'm sure -- we're not opposed to the plan. The homeowners in this area--we live out there in that area because we like the rural atmosphere, but we're not naive enough to realize that, you know, development is going to go on.

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

Mr. Baxter, would you be content with thirty days?

GEORGE BAXTER:

The timing right now is Christmas. Thirty days would be fine with us. I doubt very much if we can get much done. We would be satisfied with any delay so that we could meet with them. We'll be happy to work with them. We're not opposed to any of this, but --

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

How about the first meeting in January?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

We have a purchase time limit of the first of January. At the Planning Commission and City Council meetings we need to be through them before that time. I'm sure you know the schedules and calendars based on that.

VICKY STARR:

Delay the purchase.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

A delay of purchase?

GEORGE BAXTER:

I don't know what Vicky Starr is saying. I'll let her bring it up.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE:

They're asking to see if you could modify the escrow. His escrow says he has to close on -- some time in January, I assume. Is that right? Those are the conditions he's agreed to and I don't think he's in a position tonight to say "yay" or "nay" on that, I mean, that's strictly the option of the seller or the estate of Ann Greta Jones. That property has been there for a long time.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Could I ask one question now on this estate? Does this go through the courts? Does a judge make a decision on who buys it, who has the best offer?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

The decision has already been made. The court has awarded U. S. Home the right to buy the property under the estate sale constraints. In essence, the property is put for sale. U. S. Home approached the estate to buy it, the executors of the estate. The courts reviewed the documents, held in what is the equivalent of an open bid for anybody else who wanted to make

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: a proposal for the property. At the end of that the courts made the decision to enter into a binding contract with U. S. Home to sell the property to U. S. Home.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: Our next Planning --

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY: Is this Judge Mendoza? Go ahead, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: I was going to say our next Planning Commission meeting is December the 13th. The City Commission is December the 19th. Can it go on their agenda right after ours, Harold?

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That will give you two weeks to work with the people.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: It gives a couple of weeks.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: The timing works. I'm not certain of what alterations can be made. We need a 1700 unit retirement community. We need certain things about the units.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: Well, my suggestion is, and it's only my suggestion because I don't know what the rest of the Commissioners think, but my suggestion would be that since the representative of the homeowners would like to have a chance to sit down and talk. If you can't come to an agreement in two weeks and you still want to present the same thing, that's fine, but at least that would give you an opportunity and maybe there are some slight modifications, or something. You could always come back with the same thing if you can't agree with them, but that would be really great if you could have that time.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: We had a meeting on Monday, December the 19th, and we had a meeting last night. We hand delivered notices, reserved a room at the Ermaine Tobler School and then we also mailed out through the Tax Assessor's property owner listing notices to residences within half a mile radius of the property, not 300 feet, or 350 as its required by Ordinance, but within a half mile radius, and discussed the items presented, the information about the project. We have the considerations that we -- or the complaints that we heard have resulted in some of our considerations for architectural control on the commercial properties and the landscaped buffering to mitigate as much of the commercial

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: impact as possible.

COMMISSIONER TRACY: Did you present everything to them that you all presented tonight to us?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: Yes, exactly the same plan, the same information.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE: I'd like to go along with Mrs. Tracy. This is my business. I'm a developer, as you know, and I've Master Planned two or three large parcels of ground, one a little bigger, a thousand acres, and a couple about the same size, one a little smaller, but it was -- it's a tough fight; I'm aware of it, but a lot of the fight was getting across to the people in the area just exactly what you are doing. I think that's what he's asking for is a little explanation of how it's planned. When you turn around and say, R-PD9, I don't want the 1700 and I'm going to do this over here, well, that's great for you and I. I know just exactly what you're talking about, but for the layman it becomes very difficult language and I would like to see, if nothing else, at least two weeks to talk and if it takes more, then go back and talk to your escrow people because it's a big project. I personally like the project. I think there's a need for something like this in the valley, but at the same token I think these people should be well informed as to exactly what you're doing.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY: Most projects the opposition -- (applause) -- if you've been to many of these meetings, most projects the opposition isn't even agreeable to sit down and talk with the client and I think these people that are asking -- let's sit down for a couple of weeks or whatever it takes and see if we can't get some of these things ironed out.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: I can't tell you any different. It certainly sounds alright to me. All I can tell you is that they're saying nothing any different from what they said ten days ago, so I'm not certain that two weeks is going to make any difference. We'll be more than happy to meet with them.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE: Were all these folks there at the last meeting?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: A lot of people were.

GEORGE BAXTER: Commissioners, the one question that everybody asked is that if they have committed themselves in January to buy this property, then they must have been pretty certain that this was going to change

GEORGE BAXTER: the zoning. We're only asking you that we would like to sit down with you. The City said they needed to do some work on Jones Boulevard for people to get in and out. We would like to know when the City is going to do that and the developers are going to do it. We want to get some of this stuff ironed out because we live there now and drive Jones.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: I understand.

GEORGE BAXTER: And some of these other streets. These are things we would like to work out. We are not opposed to your -- I'd love to have a golf course out there. It looks nice. It's going to increase the value of my property out there.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Mr. Baxter, his escrow probably is contingent upon him getting the zoning, not that he knows the zoning is going to go. It's a contingency of closing, I'm sure.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: It's not contingent upon zoning.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's not contingent. Then you have to close one way or the other.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: We understand it's a big project. There is more information. Maybe the people like the concept, but need more information about the improvements, the type of improvements. Again, the product -- we'll present it once a day if that's what need be to get the point across, to provide the information. That's all we can provide is the information.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE: I don't think there's any problem of knowing what your ability is as developers and builders, but I think we do have a problem getting the whole picture across to these people and if the Chair is ready for it, I'LL MAKE A MOTION WE HOLD THIS IN ABEYANCE UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: What I was trying to get to is we would agree to postponement that you are proposing.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Do you have pictures of the completed project?

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME: In the other communities? Yes. We showed those.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You showed them to the people?

GEORGE BAXTER:

Could I make one more statement, please? The homeowners association, instead of trying to meet with all of the homeowners in that area, we have people who have volunteered to be on a committee that would meet with U. S. Home and work with them in our opposition to the project and, also, we've got to give and take, I'm sure, all of us know that, and we'd be happy to do that rather than them trying to sell the whole project to all the homeowners out there, that five or six of us will meet with you.

JERRY HELTON, U. S. HOME:

We'd be more than happy to do that.

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

Mr. Baxter, I think that's a good idea if you can get your committee together.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON:

Give him the names of the people and he can contact you.

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

And I think that if there's anybody in the audience that wants to be on that committee, they ought to let Mr. Baxter know that after the meeting so that in that way it will be much easier for the developer to meet with a smaller group of people that can maybe take the information back. I'm going to outdo Mr. Bugbee, since it was my idea, Mr. Bugbee, I want to make the motion, to HOLD THIS IN ABEYANCE UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING WHICH IS DECEMBER THE 13TH.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE:

Wait until he closes the public hearing.

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

I'm sorry. Poor Mr. Kennedy.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Go ahead, I'll close the hearing.

COMMISSIONER TRACY:

I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION FOR ABEYANCE UNTIL THE DECEMBER 13TH MEETING TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPER AND THE COMMITTEE OF HOMEOWNERS TO MEET AND IF YOU COULD SEE THAT GETS ON THE COUNCIL THE 19TH, THE CITY COUNCIL.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Cast your votes, please. That has been delayed. It will be heard on the next meeting.

HAROLD FOSTER, CLV:

Yes. That will come up on December 13th, 7:30 P.M. in this Commission Chambers.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

We thank all of you for coming down.

(Motion for ABEYANCE carried unanimously.)

END OF DISCUSSION

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Item No. 9, Z-34-81, Review of Conditions. Request of G. C. Wallace, Engineer, for a Review of Condition No. 1 concerning the location of a fence to enclose a proposed reservoir for the Las Vegas Valley Water District at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and El Capitan Way, C-V Zone.

HAROLD FOSTER:

You remember you had this recently before you. There was a condition imposed that the fence, the chain-link fence, that they were proposing around the entire boundary be relocated along the street sides back behind these private drives, or this roadway in here, or along at least the north side of the roadway and along the east side of it so that it would be more aesthetically pleasing with the landscaping on the outer boundary there along the street sides. The applicant indicated there are some problems with that. They do need the fence on the property lines essentially for security purposes. They feel that they would be amenable to having the chain-link fence replaced with a decorative-type fence in the future when the street improvements go in on Alta Drive. Because it's somewhat removed from any development at this time, there was a condition saying that the street improvements not be required until there is sufficient development in the area to justify them. They are also asking that the landscaping be deferred until such time as the street improvements go in. We don't see any particular problem with that. I think because of the security situation, it does make sense to allow the chain-link fence on the property lines now and then in the future we'll work out the type of decorative fence that should be along these two street sides with the Water District and then we'll replace it with that type at the future date when the streets go in. So based on that, staff would recommend approval of the change of the condition so that, No. 1: The landscaping be installed when the street improvements on El Capitan Way and Alta Drive are constructed, and No. 2; The chain-link fence be allowed on the property lines until the landscaping and the street improvements are installed on Alta and El Capitan as required by the City, and at that time the chain-link fence along Alta and El Capitan shall be replaced with a decorative fence of a type mutually agreed upon by the City and the Las Vegas Valley Water District.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Are you the applicant?

JACK MITCHELL:

Yes. I'm Jack Mitchell with G. C. Wallace Engineers. I'm here to answer any questions you may have about these conditions.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY: You agree with staff on their recommendations?

JACK MITCHELL: Yes. I would like to assure myself that that's the extent of the conditions that are placed here; that's what we're agreeing on.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE: Well, Mr. Mitchell, unfortunately, you're not the person I want to talk to, but when we bring up the Las Vegas Valley Water District, I happen to drive by Charleston and Valley View daily and that's the biggest mess I've ever seen. There's no apparent -- clean it up. I'm not addressing my remarks to you. I'm addressing them to the minutes to go on record -- and I think I'm echoing Maggi and several of the Commissioners saying that I would like to see them, before we give them any more concessions, do a little bit to clean up their area in the center of town.

HAROLD FOSTER: What part are you speaking of, along Charleston Boulevard or Valley View, or both?

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE: Along Charleston Boulevard or back along Valley View; I mean, either one, or down Alta, you know, you name it. You've driven out there. It's a mess! There's old pumps. There's cars. There's trucks. There's a little bit of everything parked in there. It's a storage yard and I don't think that was the intent of the zoning there.

HAROLD FOSTER: Let me make contact with the Water District to see what their plans are for approving the appearance, cleaning up some of that stored material, and so forth, and I can give you a report on that.

COMMISSIONER BUGBEE: I'd appreciate it. I just wanted to get it in the minutes, that's all.

COMMISSIONER GUTHRIE: With all the water they've got, you'd think they could have a few pounds and recirculate it.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'll make a motion for APPROVAL on this item, subject to the conditions.

VICE: (Voting)

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY: That has been approved and that's final action.

HAROLD FOSTER: That's with conditions.

VICE CHAIRMAN KENNEDY: With the conditions of staff, right.

(Motion carried unanimously with Chairman Mack and Commissioner Coleman excused.)