

>> REID: CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER.  
>> GOOD MORNING COMMISSIONERS.  
FIRST ITEM IS THE APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA, AFTER CONSIDERING ANY ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS.  
OF ANY ITEMS WE HAVE RECEIVED THE FOLLOWING REQUESTS.  
ITEM 15, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]  
HOLD TO THE 4-22-09 PER STAFF TO RENOTIFY.  
ITEM 16, HOLD TO THE 4-22-09 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO BE HEARD WITH ITEM 15.  
ITEM 17, HOLD TO THE 4-22-09 PER STAFF TO RENOTIFY.  
ITEM 18, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]  
HOLD TO THE 4-22-09 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR STAFF TO RENOTIFY.  
>> ITEM 19, ROLLED TO THE 4-22-09 PER STAFF.  
ITEM 20, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]  
HELD FOR THE SUNRISE MANOR TOWN BOARD DUE TO KNOW APPLICANT.  
ITEM 21, HOLD TO THE 4-22-09 IN THE 506 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS PER THE APPLICANT.  
ITEM 24, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]  
HOLD TO THE 4-22-09 BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS PER STAFF TO RENOTIFY.  
ITEM 25, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]  
WITHDRAWN PER THE APPLICANT.  
THE ABOVE PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS WILL BE OPENED AS A PUBLIC HEARING AND MEET IMMEDIATELY RECESSED UNTIL THE DATES AS PREVIOUSLY STATED WITH THESE DELETIONS IF THERE IS NO OBJECTION THE MORNING AGENDA STANDS READY FOR YOUR APPROVAL.  
>> REID: ANY DISCUSSION ON THE AGENDA FROM THE AUDIENCE?  
COME FORWARD -- NO NOT -- A LITTLE INDECISION IN THE AUDIENCE.  
>> BRAGER: MOTION FOR APPROVAL AS STATED.  
>> COMMISSIONERS IF, I COULD CLARIFY ON ITEM 20, I THINK COMMISSIONER GIUNCHIGLIANI THAT WAS YOUR EXTENSION.  
WE TALKED THAT YOU WANTED TO DENY IT.  
IF YOU WANT TO DO THAT WE WON'T HOLD IT AT THIS POINT IN TIME.  
>> BRAGER: SO MOVED.  
>> REID: CAST YOUR VOTE.  
>> REID: MOTION CARRIES.  
>> NEXT ITEM IS THE APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE 17 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING.  
>> BRAGER: MOTION FOR APPROVAL.  
>> REID: HEARD THE MOTION.  
CAST YOUR VOTE.  
>> REID: MOTION CARRIES.  
>> NEXT IS THE ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS, WHICH CONSISTENT OF ITEMS 3-19, EXCEPT FOR ANY ITEMS WHICH MAY HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY HELD OR DELETED AND ITEM 9, WHICH WILL BE HELD SEPARATELY.  
THESE ITEMS MAY BE CONSIDERED TOGETHER IN ONE MOTION, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED WITH EACH AGENDA ITEM.  
ITEM, 5, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

AND ITEM 6

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

SPRING TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED APPROVAL FOR ONE YEAR, AND THE PROPERTY BE MAINTAINED NEAT IN APPEARANCE AND IN GOOD WORKING ORDER.

ITEM 9, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

STAFF HAS RECEIVED ONE CARD IN PROTEST.

ITEM 10, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

STAFF HAS RECEIVED ONE CARD AND ONE LETTER IN PROTEST.

AND ITEM 11

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

ENTERPRISE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED TWO YEARS TO COMPLETE AND STAFF IS RECOMMENDING ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE.

ANY PERSON WHO DOES AN AGREE WITH THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF, AS LISTED ON THE AGENDA, SHOULD REQUEST THAT ITEM BE REMOVED FROM THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA AND BE HEARD SEPARATELY WHEN THE PUBLIC HEARING HAS BEEN OPENED.

IN ADDITION ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL OR WITH DIFFERENT CONDITIONS OF THE APPROVAL BY THE RESPECTIVE TOWN BOARD ARE NOT AUTOMATICALLY REMOVED FROM THE ACTION AGENDA.

IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK ON ANY ITEM, YOU MUST COME FORWARD AND REQUEST IT BE REMOVED FROM THE ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS AND BE HEARD SEPARATELY.

THESE AMENDMENTS AND NO OBJECTION FROM THE AUDIENCE.

THE ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS OF THE MORNING SESSION STANDS READY FOR APPROVAL.

>> HI, RHONDA ENIS.

585 EDEN.

I AM REQUESTING FIVE AND SIX, IF THEY COULD BE PULLED AND HEARD CONJOINTLY.

ONE IS A ZONING EXTENSION.

AND ANOTHER IS A DESIGN REVIEW EXTENSION OFF OF THE SAME PROPERTY.

>> REID: WE DON'T KNOW WHAT TO DO, WHEN YOU'RE HERE WITHOUT YOUR SISTER.

>> I'M HERE.

>> REID: SORRY.

>> COMMISSIONER READ YOU, KNOW WE ALWAYS COME TOGETHER.

>> REID: FIVE AND SIX WILL BE HEARD SEPARATELY.

>> THANK YOU.

>> MR. CHAIRMAN AND COMMISSIONERS.

GREG BORGER 300 SOUTH FOURTH STREET.

I REPRESENT THE APPLICANT AMERICAN WEST HOMES ON ITEM 11-14.

WHICH ARE BOND EXTENSIONS.

STAFF READ ON ITEM 11 THE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED TWO YEARS.

IN POINT OF FACT THE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED TWO YEARS ON ALL OF THE ITEMS 11, 12, 13, AND 14, THE TOWN BOARD CHAIRMAN IS HERE TO VERIFY, IF YOU WISH.

WE WANT TO UNIFY THE EXPIRATION PERIOD ON ALL OF THESE THERE'S A SCATTERING OF ONE YEAR, TWO YEAR, SECTION MONTHS.

WE WANT TO RATIFY ON TWO YEAR BOND EXTENSION.

HOME DEVELOPMENT IS GOING WATER SLOWLY.

SUB TO YOU WANTING TO VERIFY WITH THE TOWN BOARD CHAIRMAN WOULD ASK YOU TO FOLLOW THE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDATION, WHICH IS TWO YEARS ON ALL FOUR ITEMS.

>> REID: COMMISSIONER SISOLAK, THESE ARE IN YOUR DISTRICT.

VIS THANK YOU MR. CHAIR I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH TWO YEARS ASK PUTTING THEM ALL TOGETHER.

>> REID: ALL RIGHT.

ANYTHING ELSE?

A MISSION ON THE ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS. COMMISSIONER BROWN?

>> REID: ANYONE ELSE.

>> BRAGER: FOR COMMISSIONER BROWN I MAKE A MOTION AS STATED.

>> REID: YOU HEARD THE MOTION.

COMMISSIONER BROWN IS STILL IN HIS PROBATIONARY PERIOD.

>> BRAGER: I THINK YOU HAVE TWO DAYS.

>> REID: NOT ENOUGH, CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> BRAGER: I THINK TODAY IS THE 100TH DAY.

>> REID: MOTION CARRIES.

>> FOR THE AUDIENCES INFORMATION, ANYONE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK ON AN ITEM THIS MORNING SHOULD MOVE TO THE FIRST COUPLE OF ROWS AND BE PREPARE TO SPEAK AS EACH ITEM IS HEARD IF THERE ARE SEVERAL SPEAKERS IT IS SUGGESTED A ITEM REPRESENTATIVE BE APPOINTED TO REPRESENT THE ISSUE.

THE NEXT ITEM IS NUMBER 5.

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

ZONE CHANGE SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE CONVERSION OF A EXISTING. SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE TO AN OFFICE BUILDING IN THE DESERT INN CORE OVER LAY DISTRICT.

ON THE NORTH SIDE OF DESERT INN ROAD.

NORTH OF TOREY PINES DRIVE.

THE BACKGROUND AS DESCRIBED IN THE AGENDA.

THERE HAS BEEN ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE SURROUNDING AREA.

THERE ARE SEVERAL PARCELS THAT HAVE BEEN RECLASSIFIED THEREFORE STAFF CAN SUPPORT THE REQUEST FOR AN ADDITIONAL THREE YEARS.

THEREFORE STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS LISTED IN THE AGENDA.

TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED ONE YEAR FOR IT REVIEW.

THEY HAD A CONDITION FOR PROPERTIES TO BE MAINTAINED NEAT IN APPEARANCE AND GOOD WORKING ORDER.

ITEM 6, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

DESIGN REVIEW FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME TO CONVERT RESIDENTIAL INTO AN OFFICE ZONE IN THE DESERT INN TRANSITION OVER LAY DISTRICT.

LOCATED 290 FEET EAST OF TORREY PINES DRIVE.

THE BACKGROUND AS DESCRIBED IN THE AGENDA THERE.

HAVE NOT BEEN ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGES SINCE ORIGINAL DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL.

ADDITIONALLY SINCE THE PARCELS TRANSITION OVER LAY DISTRICT THERE ARE SEVERAL OFFICE CONVERSIONS THEREFORE, STAFF CAN SUPPORT THE REQUEST FOR AN ADDITIONAL THREE YEARS.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS LISTED IN YOUR AGENDA.

TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED THE SAME CONDITIONS AS IN NUMBER FIVE.

>> GOOD MORNING COMMISSIONERS.

MEGAN WILLIAMS POGUE MIRE DESIGN GROUP.

6960 SMOKE RANCH ROAD.

89128.

I WOULD LIKE THAT WE ASK THAT YOU HOLD IT.

PART OF OUR STAFF IS DELAYED.

I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THAT WE DELAY THIS THERE WAS AN ACCIDENT AT OUR OFFICE, THAT HE HAS SENSE DETOUR.

>> REID: WE WILL TRAIL THESE TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR AND GIVE US A WAIVE WHEN HE ARRIVES.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> THE NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 9, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR THE FOLLOWING.

INCREASE PERIMETER FENCE WALL HEIGHT.

ALLOW A NON-DECORATIVE PERIMETER FENCE WALL AND ALLOW NOT A USE WITHIN THE PERMANENT ENCLOSED BUILDING.

AND THE 8 ACRES IN THE CRT ZONE.

LOCATED IN THE NORTH CAMARO AND EASTERN AVENUE.

WITH THE WAIVERS AND BACKGROUND AS DESCRIBED IN THE AGENDA.

IT DEMONSTRATES COMPLIANCE WITH SEVERAL WINCHESTER TOWN USE PLAN WHEN EASING WITH OFFICE USE IT'S RE-INQUIRIES LANDSCAPE BUFFER IN THE ARCHITECTURAL STYLE IS APPARENT ON ALL FACADES.

IN ADDITION THE LOCATION OF THE OUTDOOR DOOR REHABILITATION AREA ADJACENT TO A SINGLE FAMILY DEVELOPMENT WILL ACT AS A BUFFER BETWEEN THE OFFICE USE AND THE RESIDENCE AS LONG AS REGULATIONS FOR OUTDOOR LIGHTING AND NOISE ARE FOLLOWED.

THEY BELIEVE THE HOURS WILL HELP MITT GATE ANY POTENTIAL NEGATIVE IMPACT TO THE ADJACENT.

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE PARCELS.

THE PROPOSED FENCE ADDITION TO THE PERIMETER WALLS COMPLIES OF POLICY 6.4.

BY USING METAL PANELS TO MATCH THE ACCRUAL MATERIAL OF THE EXISTING BUILDING.

THE PROPOSED INCREASE WILL BE ARCHITECTURALLY ENHANCED STAFF CAN SUPPORT THE INCREASE IN THE HEIGHT OF THE NON-DECORATIVE FENCE.

THE PROJECT WILL PROVIDE ALTERNATIVE TRANSITION OPTIONS FOR THE TRANSIT OPTIONS FOR PATRONS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FACILITY, SINCE THE SUBJECT DEVELOPMENT IS ADJACENT TO A BUS STOP ON EASTERN AVENUE AND BICYCLE WILL BE AVAILABLE ON SITE.

IT COMPLIES WITH THE WINCHESTER LAND USE PLAN.

STAFF CAN SUPPORT THE WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS LISTED IN THE AGENDA.

TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED APPROVAL PER STAFF.

WE RECEIVED ONE CARD IN SUPPORT AND ONE CARD IN PROTEST.

>> REID: GOOD MORNING.

>> GOOD MORNING.

GEMMA NICELY 2911 EDGEWOOD AVENUE.

G.K.3 ARCHITECT UR.

WE HAVE THE OFFICE BUILDING THAT'S BEING CONVERTED TO BE A PHYSICAL THERAPIST ATHLETIC OFFICE.

WHAT WE ARE DOING IS REMOVING AN EXISTING 1300 SQUARE FEET GARAGE THAT, WAS BUILT ORIGINALLY AND CONVERTING THE AREA WHERE THE GARAGE WAS AND A PORTION OF THE PARKING LOT TO BE AN OUTDOOR ATHLETIC AREA.

THE FLOORING OF THE OUTDOOR AREA WILL BE A SYNTHETIC LAWN MATERIAL.

THE DOCTOR WILL UTILIZE THE OUTDOOR SPACE, FOR HIS ATHLETES, WHO HAVE UNDERGONE TRAINING THEY.

WILL NOW BE TESTED TO SEE IF THEY ARE READY TO GO BACK OUT AND PLAY WHATEVER SPORT THAT THEY PLAY.

THEY WILL BE USING THE OUTDOOR AREA FOR ACTIVITIES, SUCH AS RUNNING HOPPING, AND SKIPPING TO TEST THEIR ABILITIES.

WE ARE ASKING FOR A WAIVER FOR THE HEIGHT INCREASE ON TWO OF THE PERIMETER WALLS.

RIGHT NOW THE ADJACENT NEIGHBOR SAY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

THERE IS A LARGE DOG THAT HAS BEEN ABLE TO JUMP THE FENCE AND COME ON TO OUR PROPERTY.

OBVIOUSLY WE CAN'T ALLOW THAT, IF WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A TRAINER AND ATHLETES IN THAT YEAR.

WE'RE ASKING TO INCREASE THE HEIGHT OF THE FENCE TO PREVENT THE DOG FROM COMING OVER AND CREATE MORE PRIVACY FOR THE ATHLETES, DURING TRAINING.

WE ARE INCREASING THE WALL ALONG EASTERN.

WE'VE HAD SOME ISSUES WITH KIDS OR TAG ARTISTS COMING OVER THE WALL.

WE WOULD LIKE TO INCREASE THE WALL ALONG EASTERN AVENUE, TO MORE SECURE THE ATHLETIC TRAINING YARD.

WE HAVE DESIGNED A WALL TOPPER, IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE THE INCREASING THE HEIGHT OF THE WALL AS ATTRACTIVE AS POSSIBLE.

WE HAVE DESIGNED AN IRON FENCE, WITH METAL SIDING THAT MATCHES THE METAL SIDING CURRENTLY ON THE BUILDING IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE THE PROJECT, ADDING ADDITIONAL COURSES OF C.M.U. IS A LITTLE MORE DIFFICULT.

AND MATCHING THE COLOR OF THE C.M.U..

WE THINK THE METAL FENCE IS A GOOD OPTION, CONSTRUCTIBLE AND MATCHES THE CHARACTER AND DESIGN OF THE BUILDING.

THAT'S WHERE WE'RE AT.

I CAN ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

>> REID: THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.

>> YES, MY NAME IS BRUCE HUGE.

I'M TREASURER OF THE WINDMILL PARK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION.

WE'RE THE ABUTTING OWNER.

FOR A QUICK HISTORY.

THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION WAS ORIGINAL LE A PART OF THE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION.

IT WAS DEANNEXED AND TRANSFERRED AND THE BUILDING WE'RE DISCUSSING WAS CONSTRUCTED.

IA NO TIME DID WE WAIVE THE MUTUAL OWNERSHIP OF THE WALL, WHICH THE PRIOR COMMISSION HAS GRANTED MODIFICATION.

WE DON'T THINK THAT COMMISSIONS HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT MODIFICATIONS TO PROPERTY NOT OWNED BY THE APPLICANT.

IT IS A MUTUALLY OWNED WALL.

WE ARE ADAMANT THE WALL BE CONTINUED IN THE SAME BRICK-TYPE THAT IT IS. THERE ARE OTHER SIMILAR WALLS THAT HAVE BEEN CONSTRUCTED IN THAT SAME AREA, WHERE ANOTHER WAS ANNEXED INTO THE ASSOCIATION SO THAT THE ADDITION OF THE HEIGHT OF THE WALL IS FINE.

BUT WE WOULD FOREVER THAT IT BE THE SAME TYPE OF CINDER BLOCK BRICK THAT THE REST OF OUR COMMUNITY SHOWS.

THESE ARE PERIMETER WALLS.

THE OTHER THING THAT WE WERE CONCERNED ABOUT, I THINK WE HAVE HAD SOME CLARIFICATION WAS IN LIGHTING HOURS OF OPERATION AND NOISE ABATEMENT.

THE ONE QUESTION WE DID HAVE WAS -- WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND THE DEFINITION OF USE NOT WITHIN A PERMANENT ENCLOSED BUILDING, WHICH IS BEING DESCRIBED AS WE WILL TEAR DOWN THE GARAGE AND PUT GRASS THERE.

WELL IN 1100, I SUSPECT THAT FROM PURELY A HEALTH POINT OF VIEW, YOU MIGHT WANT SOME FORM OF TEMPORARY COVERAGE.

MY QUESTION TO STAFF IS, DOES THE USE NOT WITHIN A PERMANENT ENCLOSED BUILDING ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF TEMPORARY TENTS OR OTHER COVERED CONSTRUCTION FOR THIS TO USE THIS AREA.

AND IF SO, OUR CONCERN WOULD BE THAT IT NOT BE VISIBLE ABOVE THE PROPERTY WALL.

I THINK THOSE ARE ALL OF THE POINTS THAT WE IN GENERAL THE ASSOCIATION -- THE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS THE PROJECT, BUT WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT THESE THREE ITEMS.

>> REID: LET ME ASK IF THERE IS ANYONE ELSE TO SPEAK ON THIS APPLICATION? SEEING NO ONE I CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

WE'LL ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO RESPOND.

>> OKAY.

AS FAR AS THE SHADE STRUCTURE, WE DON'T HAVE ANY PLANNED AND ARE NOT PROPOSING ANY SHADE STRUCTURES.

THE HOURS OF OPERATION, LIKELY SET FROM 7:00 A.M.

TO 7:00 P.M.

WE DON'T HAVE ANY BIG OR GIANT LIGHTS DESIGNED OR PLANNING FOR AT ALL IN THE FUTURE.

IT IS NOT.

THE ATHLETES WON'T BE -- IT IS NOT NECESSARY.

THEY WILL NOT BE OUT THERE 8:00 TO 5:00 TRAINING WHEN THEY'RE READY THEY WILL GO OUT TO TEST THEIR ABILITIES IN 15 MINUTES TO AN HOUR-TYPE TIME FRAME.

IT IS NOT FULL TIME, ALL DAY LONG.

I HOPE THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTIONS AS FAR AS THE BLOCK WALL, OUR DRAWINGS AND SURVEY INDICATE IT IS ACTUALLY ON OUR PROPERTY.

IT IS NOT SHEARING THE PROPERTY LINE, IT IS WITHIN OUR PROPERTY LINE.  
>> REID: COMMISSIONER SISOLAK.  
THIS IS YOUR DISTRICT.  
ACCESS THANK YOU.  
I APPRECIATE THE INPUT.  
I DID TALK TO MR. FOSTER FROM THE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION.  
AND TO MR. FISARO WHO OWNS THE PROPERTY.  
HE TOLD ME HE THOUGHT THE WALL WAS ON THE PROPERTY LINE.  
YOU'RE COMING IT IS NOT ON THE PROPERTY LINE, WHICH IS A LOT DIFFERENT  
THAN WHAT HE TOLD ME.  
THE DRAWINGS THAT I HAVE ILLUSTRATE IT IS WITHIN OUR PROPERTY LINE.  
>> WHEN IT IS DEANNEXED WE OWNED THE LOT AND WALL.  
IT IS OUR WALL.  
WE BUILT IT.  
WHEN WE DEANNEXED THE PROPERTY TO THE NEW OWNER.  
WE DID NOT GIVE THEM THE WALL.  
THE BALL BECAME THE NEW PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN THE NEW PROPERTIES.  
IT IS NEW INFORMATION THAT WE'RE BEING TOLD.  
WE IN FACT DON'T HAVE AN EXISTING EXTERIOR WALL FOR OUR ASSOCIATION BASED  
ON WHAT SHE JUST SAID.  
>> I KNOW THE WALL IS EXISTING--  
>> IT IS A COUPLE OF INCHES.  
>> SISOLAK: MR. FISASHO YOU ARE PUSHING THAT WE WANT TO HOLD THIS -- .  
>> SISOLAK: EXCUSE ME COULD I GET LEGAL TO GIVE ME AN INTERPRETATION.  
>> SHE SAYS IT IS ON HER PROPERTY.  
THE LAND OWNER IS TELLING IT IS NOT ON THE PROPERTY, IT IS ON THE PROPERTY  
LINE.  
THESE FOLKS JUST SAYING IT IS PART OF THEM.  
BUT SHE HAS THIS NEW INFORMATION, WHICH WAS NEVER PRESENTED.  
>> WE WOULD HAVE TO DO SOME RESEARCH TO DETERMINE WHERE IN FACT THE BLOCK  
WALL IS INSTRUCTED.  
AND IT MIGHT ALSO -- MAKE SENSE TO REVIEW THE DEANNEXATION THAT'S  
RECORDED.  
WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO ASSIST IN THAT.  
I CAN'T PINE ON IT, WITHOUT HAVING SEEN THE DUMES OR TO KNOW WHERE THE  
BLOCK WALL IS.  
>> SISOLAK: OKAY.  
THAT BEING THE CASE, IF YOU WANT TO GO BACK TO THE PROPERTY OWNER SENSE  
YOU'RE DISPUTING WHERE THE WALL IS, I'LL HOLD IT FOR TWO WEEKS AND WE'LL  
BRING IT BACK.  
>> WE'RE FINE TO ADD THE ADDITIONAL CMU.  
>> THERE COULD BE SOME WRONG INFORMATION IN THE DRAWINGS WE HAVE.  
WE DON'T WANT TO HOLD IT THEY'RE ANXIOUS TO MOVE IN AND START WITH  
BUSINESS.  
IF WE NEED TO MAINTAIN THE BLOCK CHARACTER FOR THAT WALL, THEN WE'LL DO  
THAT ACCESS OKAY.  
NOW, YOU'RE CONFUSING ME A LITTLE BIT.

YOU SAY IT IS ON THE PROPERTY.  
NOW IT IS NOT ON YOUR PROPERTY MANY -- I CAN'T -- ARE YOU GOING TO AGREE  
IT IS NOT ON YOUR PROPERTY IT IS ON THE LOT LINE.  
I WILL AGREE TO THAT.  
WE REALLY DON'T WANT TO HOLD IT, WE WANT TO MOVE FORWARD.  
>> SISOLAK: I DON'T KNOW I DID TALK TO BUILDING.  
I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE FOOTINGS BEING ABLE TO SUPPORT.  
I'M NOT GOING TO GO WITH ROD IRON ON TOP OF THE WALL.  
IT WILL HAVE TO BE BLOCK THAT'S SIMILAR OR AS CLOSE IN COLOR AS EXISTS TO  
WHAT THE HOMEOWNERS HAVE NOW, SO THAT IT MATCHES.  
BECAUSE THEY HAVE A.R.C. RULES AND SO FORTH ON THEIR SIGHT.  
YOU HAVE TO CHECK THE FOOTINGS IF YOU CAN ADD THE TWO FEET WITH BLOCK.  
THAT'S WHAT MY RECOMMENDATION IS GOING TO BE.  
I AM CONCERNED.  
STAFF CAN HELP ME.  
THERE'S A CONCERN THAT THIS USE DOESN'T TRANSFER.  
IF -- THEY USE THE ARGUMENT.  
HYPOTHETICALLY THIS COULD BE MADE INTO A BEER GARDEN OR TAVERN, IF THESE  
FOLKS AREN'T DONE.  
THAT THE OUTDOOR USE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PASS ON TO THE NEXT -- TENANT.  
>> THE WAIVER WILL BE SPECIFICALLY FOR WHAT THEY HAVE REQUESTED.  
LET'S SAY THEY WERE TO MOVE OUT AND ANOTHER HABILITATION CENTER COMES IN.  
AS LONG AS THEIR WITHIN THE TIME FRAME THEY COULD USE IT FOR THE SAME  
PURPOSES.  
IF THEY MOVE OUT AND I BELIEVE THE TIME LIMIT IS SIX MONTHS.  
THEN THEY WILL EXPIRE AND THAT USE WILL NO LONGER BE THERE.  
>> SISOLAK: IT WILL STAY WITH THAT USE.  
>> IT STAYS WITH THE LAND, NOT WITH THE APPLICANT.  
>> THAT'S OUR CONCERN.  
>> SISOLAK: I'M CONFUSED.  
IT STAYS FOR THAT USE.  
>> -- IF THAT REHABILITATE CENTER MOVED OUT AND A YEAR SOMEONE ELSE MOVES  
IN THE USE IS GONE.  
BUT ANOTHER REHABILITATION CENTERS MOVE IN, THEY CAN CONTINUE WITH THE  
USE.  
>> SISOLAK: DO YOU UNDERSTAND?  
IT WOULD HAVE TO BE ANOTHER REHABILITATION CENTER.  
A RESTAURANT COULDN'T MOVE IN AND HAVE THE OUTDOOR USE?  
>> WE'VE HAD SOME EXPERIENCE WITH THE TERM STAYS WITH THE LAND.  
THERE WAS A LAWSUIT THAT HAD CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS TO THE NEW OWNER THAT  
STILL EXISTS, EVEN THOUGH OWNERS HAVE CHANGED.  
I'M CONCERNED WHEN HE SAYS THAT THIS OUTDOOR USE RUNS WITH THE LAND THAT,  
IN FACT WHAT THAT MEANS IT IS PERMANENT WITH THAT PROPERTY AND ANY NEW  
OWNER MIGHT CHOOSE NOT TO USE IT, BUT IT WOULD BE AN OPTION, WHETHER THEY  
WERE A BEER GARDEN OR ANOTHER PHYSICAL THERAPY BUSINESS.  
>> COMMISSIONER, IT IS ZONED CRT.  
YOU'RE TALKING BEER GARDEN OR TAVERN USE.

A BEER GARDEN IS NOT ALLOWED IN THE C.R.T. ZONE.

>> SISOLAK: THAT'S THE EXAMPLE THEY GAVE ME WHEN THE HOMEOWNERS SAY THEY HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THE REHABILITATION FACILITY AND USED OUTDOOR FOR TESTING.

IF IN FACT THIS BUSINESS IS NOT SUCCESSFUL OR DECIDES TO MOVE ON AND SOME OTHER SUITABLE BUSINESS MOVES IN THERE, THEY DON'T WANT TO AGREE TO THIS, WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT THAT USE WOULD BE.

I AGREE WITH THEM.

>> THAT USE THIS WAIVER IS SPECIFIC FOR THAT USE.

THIS OUTSIDE REHABILITATION.

SOMEONE CAN'T COME IN AND START THROWING PARTIES UNDER THIS WAIVER.

>> REID: COMMISSIONER, YOU UNDERSTAND THE COMMISSIONER'S INTENT.

WOULD LEGAL COUNCIL OR STAFF SUGGEST WHAT THE APPROPRIATE MOTION WOULD BE TO PROTECT THAT INTEREST.

>> WE COULD DO A CONDITION THAT WOULD STATE SOMETHING TO THE EFFECT THAT ONCE THIS -- IF THIS PERSON MOVES OUT THAT USE GOES AWAY.

WE -- STICKING WITH THE CODE TIME LIMIT WE COULD PUT THAT AS A TIME LIMIT.

>> SISOLAK: THAT WOULD BE MY MOTION.

IF THE PROPOSED TENANT MOVES OUT THE OUTDOOR USE GOES AWAY FOR ANY SUBSEQUENT TENANT.

WE CAN INCREASE THE WAIVER OF THE WALL HEIGHT.

I THINK IT IS 2 FEET, AM I RIGHT?

>> 2 FEET 8 INCHES -- BUT.

>> SISOLAK: BUT IT HAS TO BE BLOCK WALL CONSISTENT WITH TERMS OF COLOR AND TEXTURE AND MEET THE CODES REGARDING THE FOOTINGS.

AND ALL OTHER STAFF CONDITIONS.

>> CAN I ASK A QUESTION.

AS FAR AS THE WALL ADJOINING EASTERN AVENUE.

DOES IT ALSO NEED TO BE A BLOCK OR JUST THE AREA ABUTTING THE H.O.A..

>> YOU WANT THE ENTIRE WALL.

>> SISOLAK: I WANT IT CONSISTENT ALL THE WAY AROUND SO IT IS NOT BLOCK WALL AND THEN THE IRON.

I WANT THE WHOLE THING BLOCK.

THAT'S MY MOTION MR. CHAIR.

>> REID: ANY QUESTIONS ON THE MOTION?

CAST YOUR VOTE.

MOTION CARRIES.

>> OUR NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 20, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD] HOLDOVER ZONE CHANGE -- .

>> REID: BEFORE WE GO ON FIVE AND SIX ARE READY TO ROLL, LET'S GO BACK TO THOSE.

DID YOU ALREADY READ THEM?

>> YES, I DID.

>> REID: SO THE APPLICANT ON ITEMS FIVE AND SIX.

>> GOOD MORNING.

THANK YOU FOR THE DELAY.

IT IS MY FAULT.

I GOT CAUGHT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF TOWN.

>> REID: WE'RE GLAD YOU'RE HERE SAFELY, DON'T WORRY ABOUT IT.

>> THANK YOU.

SAM DONEAM.

6960 SMOKE RANCH ROAD.

AS YOU KNOW IT IS AN EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ZONE CHANGE AND DESIGN REVIEW.

LIKE THE PREVIOUS APPLICATION IT IS IN THE C.R.T. ZONE.

THIS DISTRICT IS INTENDED TO PRESERVE EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE FOR COMMERCIAL USE.

THAT'S WHAT WE ARE DOING.

WE DID AN ADMINISTRATIVE EXTENSION OF TIME TO BRING THE APPLICATIONS SO THEY HAVE A COMMON DETERMINATION POINT AS FAR AS THE STAFF IS CONCERNED. STAFF IS RECOMMENDING APPROVAL.

THE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED APPROVAL FOR A ONE YEAR REVIEW.

WE WOULD LIKE TO COME BACK TO THE EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THREE YEARS, BECAUSE ONE OF THE APPLICATIONS SPECIFICALLY STATES IT IS THREE YEARS TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION, NOT COMMENCE, WHICH IS NORMALLY WHAT THE COUNTY IMPOSED ON THIS APPLICATION.

I UNDERSTAND ONE OF THE RESIDENTS IN THE AREA AT THE TOWN BOARD MAY WANT TO SPEAK.

I CAN ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS AFTER THAT, IF YOU DON'T MIND.

>> REID: THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.

ANYONE HERE TO SPEAK?

>> HI RHONDA NUNEZ.

5885 WEST END ROAD.

>> SUE NUNEZ WEST DESERT INN ROAD.

>> I WAS AT THE TOWN BOARD.

I PRESENTED PICTURES.

I JUST SPOKE WITH MEGAN, WHO SAID IF I CAN -- I DON'T WANT TO PUT IT OVER HERE.

THESE ARE THE PICTURES THAT HAVE BEEN UP SINCE NOVEMBER.

IT WILL SHOW YOU THE PROPERTY OF WHAT IT HAS LOOKED LIKE SINCE THE INCEPTION OF WHEN THEY FIRST PURCHASED IT.

DID YOU NOT HEAR ME?

SHOULD I REPEAT?

OR YOU GUYS ARE OKAY?

ALL RIGHT.

OKAY, WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS THEY PUT THE PROPERTY UP FOR SALE IN NOVEMBER.

IT SHOWED C 1 ZONING AND ONE ACRE.

TO GIVE YOU A BACKGROUND, SHOW YOU GUYS WILL REMEMBER LILLY TONG THE DESERT INN PLAZA THE ONES WITH US SINCE 2005.

BASICALLY ON 2003, ABOUT THAT TIME THEY RECEIVED THE C.R.T. FOR THE FRONT HOUSE RIGHT HERE.

TAKE AWAY THE WIRE.

AND THEN SO C.R.T. WITH THE HOUSE, AND THAT'S WHAT IT WAS GOING TO BE IN 2003.

THEN THEY CAME IN 2005.

THEY ASKED AT THE BEGINNING FOR 13,000 SQUARE FEET AND 44 PARKING SPACES. THEN THEY WENT DOWN TO 11,000 SQUARE FEET AND 44 PARKING SPACES. AT THAT POINT, IN WHICH THEY WERE DENIED AT THE MEETING IN 2005. IT WAS IN SEPTEMBER OF 2005.

WE HAD MAJOR PROTESTS OF HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF OUR COMMUNITY, WHICH WE ARE VERY TIGHT COMMUNITY DESERT INN ROAD AND OUR EXTENDED COMMUNITY. WE HAVE THE PROTEST AND IT WAS DENIED.

THEN IN 2007, THEY CAME BACK ASKING FOR 11,000 SQUARE FEET OF BUILDING AND THE DEMOLISHING OF THE HOUSE.

NOW, YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT THIS HOUSE WAS BUILT -- IT WAS BUILT LATER THAN IN MY HOUSE, WHICH WAS 1975.

AND THEN LATER OTHER HOUSES THAT ARE AROUND THERE.

IT WAS -- ALL IT IS UP KEEP.

YOU KNOW, YOU COULD MAKE A HOUSE LOOK LIKE WHAT YOU WANTED TO HAVE THE HOUSE LOOK LIKE IF YOU UP KEEP IT.

YOU KEEP IT UP.

THAT HAS NEVER BEEN SOMETHING THAT THEY HAVE EVER TRIED TO DO, AS YOU CAN SEE FROM WHAT I'M SHOWING YOU.

AND THESE WERE TAKEN ON 3-9 -- IN 2009.

SO IN THE AUGUST -- AUGUST 222007 MEETING.

EXCOMMISSIONER MAXFIELD SAID THERE WAS SO MUCH TIME SPENT ON THIS APPLICATION GOING BACK AND FORTH BACK AND FORTH, HE BASICALLY SAID IN THE TRANSCRIPT, ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

LET'S GET WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO WITH THE PROPERTY AND GO WITH IT.

WHAT WAS DECIDED IS THAT THE HOUSE WOULD BE C.R.T. AND THE BACK PORTION, WHICH IS HERE.

IT IS ANOTHER HALF ACRE WOULD BE RESEARCH E.

AND WOULD REMAIN R.E..

AND IF THEY DID SELL IT, THEY WOULD TELL ANY NEW PROPERTY OWNERS THAT THE FRONT PORTION IS C.R.T. AND THE BACK PORTION IS R.E..

YOU CAN SEE FROM THE PICTURES THAT I HAVE, THAT WAS PUT ON MARCH 4, 2009. SOME OTHER PICTURES WILL BE SHOWN FROM THE ARCHITECT -- YOU ARE ARCHITECTS, RIGHT?

--

>> SORRY, THE ENGINEERING COMPANY SINCE THINGS HAVE CHANGED A LITTLE BIT. WE JUST SPOKE BEFORE THE MEETING.

I WANT TO GO BACK THAT WE HAVE BEEN THROUGH BASICALLY HELL AND BACK WITH THIS PROPERTY.

WE HAVE HAD TO PROTEST MAJOR IN 2005.

AGAIN IN 2007.

IT'S BEEN NONSTOP.

BASICALLY, WE FEEL THAT THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN ONLY THE ONE YEAR, AS THE SPRING VALLEY TOWN BOARD DID 5-0.

THEY ALSO SAID AT THE MARCH 31 MEETING OF THE SPRING VALLEY TOWN BOARD KEEPING THE PROPERTY IN NEAT APPEARANCE AND GOOD WORKING ORDER.

>> EVEN THOUSAND YOU WILL BE SEEING PICTURES THAT THEY CLEANED UP THE PROPERTY, THIS PAST WEEKEND IT LOOKS LIKE, WE ARE STILL GOING AND ASKING FOR THE ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR IT AND NOT FOR THE THREE YEARS, BECAUSE OF EVERYTHING WE HAVE BEEN THROUGH.

ALSO, WE WANT TO ADD, IF THERE IS GOING TO BE A DESIGN REVIEW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ADD ON THE RECORDS THAT ON-SITE LIGHTING BE MADE PART OF THE DESIGN REVIEW, BECAUSE OF SOME THINGS WE ARE GOING THROUGH AT THIS POINT WAS SOMEONE THAT CAME IN, CHANGED THE PROPERTY.

HAS DONE SOMETHING THAT SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN ALLOWED.

WE WANT TO MAKE THAT PART OF THE RECORD.

IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE?

>> WE THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

FOR SAVING DESERT INN ROAD AND OUR UNITED COMMUNITY.

WE APPRECIATE YOU LISTENING TO US.

>> MY NAME IS RHONDA.

>> THANK YOU.

>> YOU GUYS ARE NEW TO US.

I WANT TO PUT THESE INTO THE RECORD.

>> REID: WE THOUGHT WE WERE HEARING THINGS THAT, WAS HARMONY.

>> I LIKE THAT A LOT.

>> REID: WE WERE JUST COMMENTING ON OUR HARMONY.

[ LAUGHTER ]

>> MOST OF THE ARCHITECTS -- .

>> OH, HARMONY AT THE SAME TIME--

>> MR. NUNEZ IS CORRECT -- .

>> REID: HOLD ON A SECOND.

LET ME ASK IF THERE IS ANYONE ELSE WHO WANTS TO HARMONIZE?

SEEING NO ONE I CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

THIS IS YOUR CHANCE TO RESPOND.

>> MR. NUNEZ IS CORRECT.

THE PROPERTY IS IN DESPAIR, AT HER REQUEST MR. TOM DID GO IN AND REMOVE THE FOR-SALE SIGN, BECAUSE THE OFFER ON THE TABLE FELL AWAY.

SHE IS NOW THE SOLE PROPERTY OWNER.

THE FOR-SALE SIGN THAT WAS ON THE PROPERTY BEFORE, ADVERTISING C-1 ERRONEOUSLY WAS HER BUSINESS PARTNER.

HE'S GONE.

SHE BOUGHT HIM OUT.

THEY CLEANED UP THE PROPERTY.

HERE IS A CURRENT PHOTO OF THE PROPERTY, AS IT IS TODAY.

YOU CAN SEE THE FOR-SALE SIGN IS GONE.

WE WOULD LIKE AN EXTENSION OF TIME.

I THINK ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION IS NOT REASONABLE THESE DAYS.

WE WOULD HAVE TO DO ENGINEERING ARCHITECTURE, BUILDING, PERMITS THE WHOLE BIT AND COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION WITHIN A YEAR.

THAT'S ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE.

AGAIN WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE THREE YEARS TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION, WHICH WAS THE ORIGINAL CONDITION.

I DO NOT REMEMBER EXACTLY IF IT WAS THE DESIGN REVIEW OR THE ZONE CHANGE.

>> REID: COMMISSIONER BROWN.

>> BROWN: THANK YOU MR. CHAIRMAN.

AND THANK YOU MR. DUNHAM.

ON THE ONE YEAR, THE INTENT OF THE ONE YEAR IS MAKE SURE EITHER TO ACCESS RATE IT OR STAFF WILL HAVE A QUICKER TIME FRAME TO REVIEW IF IT IS GOING IN DISREPAIR?

WHAT'S THE JUSTIFICATION OR THE REASONING BEHIND VERSUS THREE YEARS TWO, YEAR, ONE YEAR?

>> THREE YEARS IS OUR STANDARD FOR ZONE CHANGE, WHICH IS TO COMPLETE, AS WAS PREVIOUSLY STATED.

ON THE DESIGN REVIEW IT IS THE ONE YEAR IS FOR THE COMMENCEMENT.

ACTUALLY COMMENCEMENT FOR DESIGN REVIEWS.

WE FELT THAT, WITH THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION THAT THREE YEARS WASN'T OUT OF THE ORDINARY TO REQUEST AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

>> BROWN: I'M GOING TO -- I'M LEARNING EVERY DAY ABOUT THE HISTORY OF THE DESERT INN CORRIDOR.

ALTHOUGH THE HARMONIZING WAS SOMETHING NEW.

IT IS VERY IMPRESSIVE.

I DON'T ANTICIPATE ANYTHING HAPPENING QUICKLY.

I'M GOING TO FOLLOW, SIMPLY BECAUSE I'M NEW TO THIS.

I WILL FOLLOW THE TOWN BOARD'S ONE YEAR.

UNDERSTANDING THAT PROBABLY VERY LITTLE WILL HAPPEN BETWEEN NOW AND THE ONE YEAR WHEN YOU COME BACK.

THEN WE CAN EXTEND IT TO I THINK A MORE STANDARD APPROACH.

MY SENSE IS THERE'S A LITTLE FEAR OF THE UNKNOWN HERE.

THE PROPERTY OWNER OR HER PARTNER WAS RAISING SOME REAL CONCERNS WITH THE INAPPROPRIATE SIGNAGE OR CONSOLIDATING.

YOU GUYS KNOW ALL OF THAT.

WHEN SOMEONE COMES BACK IN THE YEAR, WHAT IS THE COST TO AN APPLICANT TO COME BACK BEFORE THIS BOARD ON A ONE YEAR REVIEW.

IS IT SIGNIFICANT DO THEY PAY FEES?

>> THEY PAY THE EXTENSION OF TIME ON THE ZONE CHANGE AND THE DESIGN REVIEW.

>> BROWN: OFF THE TOP OF YOUR HEAD DO YOU KNOW WHAT IT IS?

>> A COUPLE HUN BUCKS.

>> I'M THINKING IT IS ON THE ORDER OF \$600 BECAUSE IT IS PUBLIC HEARING.

>> WE ARE REQUIRED TO DO PUBLIC HEARING FEES.

IT IS A LITTLE MORE THAN -- IT IS ABOUT \$750 TO APPLY FOR THESE EXTENSION OF TIME.

>> BROWN: PERHAPS THAT WILL BE BORN BY THE OWNER.

I'M GOING TO ON THIS CASE, I WILL FOLLOW THE TOWN BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION.

AND UNDERSTANDING THAT IF NOTHING HAPPENS IN A YEAR WE WILL BE MORE

REASONABLE, ESPECIALLY IF THE PROPERTY IS KEPT UP, AS YOU HAVE INDICATED.

WE'LL BE MORE REASONABLE MOVING BACK TOWARDS OUR STANDARD IN THE NEXT GO AROUND.

>> IS THAT COMPLETION ON BOTH THE DESIGN REVIEW AND ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE?

>> BROWN: IF NOTHING MOVES FORWARD WE WILL NOT SEE A DESIGN REVIEW, WILL WE?

>> WE WILL SEE THE DESIGN REVIEW.

>> BROWN: THEY'RE MOVING FORWARD AND DOING SOMETHING INSIDE THE HOUSE?

>> NOT DOING ANYTHING NOW.

IT IS HARD TO OBTAIN FINANCING WITHOUT -- WITHOUT THE ZONE CHANGE AND THE DESIGN REVIEW BEING CURRENT.

SO -- THEY HAD DIFFERENT EXPIRATION PERIODS.

ONE EXAMPLE COMING UP THIS AUGUST AND THE DESIGN REVIEW I THINK EXPIRED NEXT MONTH.

WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO IS GET THE EXPIRATION DATES THE SAME, SO WE AREN'T COMING IN EVERY SIX MONTHS FOR ZONE CHANGE.

>> BROWN: THEY'RE BOTH THE SAME AS OF TODAY THEY WOULD BE BACK IN A YEAR.

>> BROWN: I SEE THE RATIONAL.

BECAUSE IT IS NEW TO ME.

I WILL ACCEPT THE INSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE.

MY RECOMMENDATION IS THE ONE YEAR REVIEW TO FOLLOW THE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDATION FOR BOTH.

>> REID: YOU HEARD THE MOTION.

ANY COMMENTS?

CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> JUST A CLARIFICATION.

INSTEAD OF ONE YEAR FOR COMPLETION OR ONE YEAR TO COMMENCE?

>> BROWN: YOU CAN'T FORCE THEM TO COMPLETE IN A YEAR.

ISN'T IT COMMENCEMENT?

>> WE CAN MAKE THE MOTION ONE YEAR, IF YOU ASK TO COMPLETE THE ZONE CHANGE AND ONE YEAR FOR COMMENCE THE DESIGN REVIEW.

THE STANDARD FOR THE DESIGN REVIEW IS COMMENCEMENT.

EITHER WAY NOTHING WILL BE DONE.

THEY WILL BE BACK PROBABLY IN A YEAR ANYWAY.

>> THANK YOU COMMISSIONERS.

>> REID: YOU HEARD THE MOTION.

CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> REID: MOTION CARRIES.

>> THANK YOU, HAVE A GOOD MORNING.

>> OUR NEXT ITEM IS -- EXCUSE ME ITEM 20.

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

HOLDOVER ZONE CHANGE FOURTH EXTENSION OF TIME OF 5.4 ACRES FROM R2 TO C.1 FOR A CONVENIENCE STORE AND GASOLINE SERVICE STATION IN THE M.U.D. OVERLAY DISTRICT.

FOR A GASOLINE AND SERVICE STATION ON PALM STREET AND OLIVER STREET.

WITH THE BACKGROUND, AS DESCRIBED IN YOUR AGENDA.

THE ORIGINAL ZONE CHANGE AND USE PERMIT WAS APPROVED OVER NINE YEARS AGO IN WHICH THE PARCELS WERE DESIGNATED -- .

>> REID: ITEM 20 WAS HELD--

>>.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: WE SET IT ASIDE.

THAT WAS A CLARIFICATION OF THE MOTION THAT -- COMMISSIONER G WANTED TO ACT ON IT.

--

>> THE PARCELS ARE DESIGNATED AS RESIDENTIAL.

THE APPLICANT HAS HAD UP TO MEAN YEARS TO COMMENCE AND STAFF INDICATED DURING THE PRIOR EXTENSION OF TIME THIS WOULD BE THE LAST EXTENSION OF TIME STAFF WOULD SUPPORT.

STAFF DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS REQUEST AND RECOMMENDS DENIAL.

IF APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED IN YOUR AGENDA.

TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED A HOLD, BECAUSE THE APPLICANT DID NOT SHOW UP.

WE DID RECEIVE FOUR CARDS IN APPROVAL AND TWO CARDS IN PROTEST.

>> REID: IS THERE ANYONE HERE TO SPEAK ON THIS APPLICATION?

SEEING NO ONE I CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

COMMISSIONER GIUNCHIGLIANI.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: IN LIGHT THAT IT HAS BEEN NINE YEARS.

MY MOTION WOULD BE TO DENY THE EXTENSION.

IF THEY WANT TO DO SOMETHING.

COME BACK AND START OVER.

>> REID: YOU HEARD THE MOTION.

CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> REID: MOTION CARRIES.

>> ITEM 21 WAS HEL.

THE NEXT ITEM IS 22, [READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

HOLDOVER WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR THE FOLLOWING.

ELIMINATE LANDSCAPING REDUCE PARKING REDUCE DRIVE AISLE WIDTH AND ALLOW A NON-DECORATIVE WALL.

WAIVER OF CONDITIONS AND SCREEN ANY ROOF MOUNTED EQUIPMENT.

THE DESIGN REVIEW FOR A CONVERSION OF SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE TO AN OFFICE IN THE C.P. ZONE GENERALLY LOCATED ON EASTERN AVENUE.

80 FEET NORTH OF RAW HYDE STREET.

WITH THE WAIVERS AND BACKGROUND AS DESCRIBED IN YOUR AGENDA.

STAFF FINDS THE SITE AND SOME OF THE REQUESTED WAIVERS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE OTHER CONVERSION ALONG EASTERN AVENUE.

THE REDUCTION OF THE DRIVE AISLE WIDTH AND PARKING THE RESULT OF LIMITED SIZE OF THE LOT.

SAFE STAB CAN ALLOW NON-DECORATIVE WALLS TO REMAIN SINCE DEMOLISHING WOULD BE AN INCONVENIENCE TO THE PROPERTY OWNERS.

REGARDING SIGNAGE AND REDUCED VISIBILITY BY ALLOWING SIGNAGE TO HAVE A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 7 10:FEET AND 70 FEET SQUARE FEET PROVIDED BY CODE.

IT ADVERTISES THE BUSINESS AND MAINTAINING TRAFFIC ABILITY.

STAFF CANNOT SUPPORT LANDSCAPING STRIP ALONG EASTERN AS THERE IS ROOM FOR WIDER LANDSCAPING IF THE SITE WAS REDESIGNED STAFF CANNOT REDUCE THE LANDSCAPE BUFFER.

PLANS INDICATE THERE'S ADEQUATE ROOM TO PLANT REQUIRED TREES.

TREES INSTALLED ALONG THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINES WHERE THE DRIVE AISLE WOULD NOT BE AFFECTED.

STAFF CANNOT SUPPORT THE WAIVE TO THE PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING.

STAFF UNDERSTAND THE SITE IS CONSTRAINED BUT FINDS A PLANNER COULD BE INSTALLED IN FRONT OF THE PARKING AREAS WITHOUT REDUCING THE PARKING. OTHER PROPERTY HAVE UNSCREENED ROOF MOUNTED EQUIPMENT. STAFF CANNOT SUPPORT ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT TO REMAIN UNSCREENED AS SCREENING COULD BE AN EASY FIX.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TWO, THREE, FOUR AND WAIVERS OF CONDITION ONE AND TWO AND DENIAL OF WAIVERS, ONE.

AND WAIVER OF CONDITIONS THREE IN THE DESIGN REVIEW.

IF APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED IN YOUR AGENDA.

ADD THE FOLLOWING DELETE CIVIL ENGINEERING CONDITIONS AND COMPLY WITH PLANS SUBMITTED DATE MARCH 13, 2009.

PROVIDE APPROPRIATE SIGNAGE FOR ENTER ONLY AND EXIT ONLY.

PARADISE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED DENIAL.

WE DID RECEIVE ONE CARD IN APPROVAL AND SIX CARDS IN PROTEST.

>> REID: ALL RIGHT.

WE HAVE BEEN THROUGH THIS A COUPLE OF TIMES.

WHAT'S NEW?

>> I THINK WE HAVE IT SORTED OUT HOPEFULLY.

I MET WITH MEGAN AND DENISE AND I THINK THE FIRST TIME WE HAD THE LANDSCAPING ISSUE.

WE SOLVED THAT OVER HERE.

AND IN THE BACK AS WELL.

THE SECOND TIME WE HAD THE ISSUE WITH THE DRIVEWAYS I WORKED THAT OUT WITH DENISE.

WE HAVE TWO, ONE IN AND OUT.

I THINK THAT'S SETTLED.

SHOULD I DISCUSS THE SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEMS THE STAFF APPROVALS?

>> REID: NO, I THINK WE'VE BEEN THROUGH THAT.

THERE'S A NEIGHBOR THAT WANTS TO SAY SOMETHING.

WHY DON'T WE LET HIM DO THAT.

THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.

>> GOOD MORNING.

>> GOOD MORNING COMMISSIONER READ.

BOB REEVE.

3111 MONT ROSA AVENUE.

LAS VEGAS, I OWN THE PROPERTY ADJACENT TO THE WEST.

I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH HIS PROJECT.

MY ONLY CONCERN IS THE HEIGHT OF THE BLOCK WALL ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF THE PROPERTY.

FROM HIS PARKING LOT THE WALL IS 60 TO 64 INCHES HIGH.

HE HAS AGREED THE DEVELOPER AGREED TO INCREASE THAT TO 6 FEET.

I WANT TO GET IT ON THE RECORD HE AGREED TO DO THAT.

>> REID: ANYONE ELSE HERE TO SPEAK?

SEEING NO ONE I CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

WOULD YOU STATE FOR THE RECORD YOU DON'T OBJECT TO INCREASING THE WALL HEIGHT.

NO, THAT'S FINE.

>> REID: .

>> PERFECTLY FINE.

>> REID: NO, GOOD -- GOOD ANSWER.

MOTION FOR APPROVAL.

STAFF WILL HAVE TO HELP ME OUT.

SHOULD THE MOTION BE AS PER THE PLAN -- I DON'T KNOW IF THIS HAS BEEN SUBMITTED OR NOT?

>> CIVIL DID ADD A CONDITION WHERE IT SAID COMPLY WITH PLANS SUBMITTED MARCH 31, 2009.

IF WE GO WITH THAT CONDITION WE'LL IMPOSE EVERYTHING THAT HE'S SHOWING NOW.

>> REID: AND THAT WOULD BE THE MOTION.

ANY QUESTIONS ON THE MOTION?

CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> COMMISSIONER IS THIS FOR ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS?,.

>> REID: YES, SIR.

>> I HAVE SOME THINGS TO SAY ABOUT SOME OF THEM IF, I COULD.

>> I JUST DISCUSSED THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE WHAT THEY DO AND DON'T RECOMMEND.

SOME MAKE SENSE, SOME DON'T.

ONE IS TO REDUCE THE LANDSCAPE STRIP ALONG EASTERN AVENUE TO HAVE 16 FEET OF LANDSCAPING.

>> REID: NO.

WE'RE -- MY MOTION WOULD APPROVE IT PER THE PLAN YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU. THAT WAS SUBMITTED.

SO YOU'RE -- YOU'RE NOT BEING REQUIRED TO PROVIDE 16 FEET OF LANDSCAPING. YOU'RE BEING REQUIRED TO DO WHAT YOUR PLAN SHOWS.

>> OKAY.

>> REID: YOU WITH ME?

>> AND ROOF -- ROOF BLOCKING THE AIR CONDITIONING?

-- IS THAT PART OF THAT ALSO?

>> STAFF RECOMMENDED THAT THE AIR CONDITIONING BE ENCLOSED WITH SOME KIND OF BLOCKAGE?

>> REID: DO YOU OBJECT TO THAT?

>> YES, I DO.

>> REID: WHY?

>> THERE'S ONLY ONE HOUSE ON THE ENTIRE STREET THAT HAS AN ENCLOSURE. I HAVE A PICTURE OF THAT.

>> I GUESS SINCE I CAN SEE THE AIR CONDITIONER FROM MY PROPERTY.

IT IS NOT A CONCERN, UNLESS HE GETS TO THE POINT WHERE HE NEED 10 FEET OF DUCT WORK THAT DIRECTION AND ANOTHER DIRECTION.

IT IS A RESIDENCE.

IT IS A CONVERTED RESIDENCE WITH A SINGLE MOUNTED UNIT ON THE ROOF NOW.

THE BLOCKING IS NOT A CONCERN, AS LONG AS IT STAYS LIKE IT IS.

>> REID: ALL RIGHT.

>> THIS IS WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE.

THIS IS WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE.  
THE ONLY HOUSE ON THE STREET HAS A PICKETT FENCE.  
IT IS NOT A HUGE OBJECTION.  
I JUST DON'T THINK IT MAKES SENSE.  
I THINK IT IS LESS APPEALING.  
>> REID: TO BE CLEAR THEN STAFF, THE MOTION WOULD GRANT THE WAIVERS  
RELATED TO LANDSCAPING, SO LONG AS THEY COMPLY WITH HIS PLAN, CORRECT?  
>> THAT'S CORRECT.  
>> REID: TO PARKING SO LONG AS HE COMPLIES WITH THE CIVIL ENGINEERING  
CONDITION.  
RIGHT?  
>> THAT'S CORRECT.  
>> REID: I DON'T SEE A WAIVER BEING ASKED FOR THE AIR CONDITIONING ON THE  
ROOF, WHERE IS THAT?  
>> IT'S NUMBER 3 UNDER WAIVER OF CONDITIONS.  
THE ZONE CHANGE REQUIRING TO SCREEN IT.  
>> REID: MY MOTION WOULD REFLECT THAT WAIVER.  
IS THERE ANYTHING I MISSED THEN, SIR?  
I'M ASKING YOU?  
>> ALSO IT SAYS TREES COULD BE INSTALLED ALONG THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINE.  
>> REID: THE LANDSCAPING WILL BE PER YOUR PLAN?  
>> THAT'S FINE.  
EVERYTHING IS GREAT THEN.  
>> REID: THAT COVERS IT?  
>> I BELIEVE SO--  
>> YES, I BELIEVE IT DOES.  
>> COMMISSIONER, DOES HE WANT TO ADD IN THE DISCUSSION ABOUT RAISING THE  
WALL TO 6 FEET HIGH?  
>> REID: YES, THAT WOULD BE MY MOTION.  
I'M NOT GOING TO REPEAT THE MOTION.  
EVERYONE KNOWS WHAT IT IS.  
CAST YOUR VOTE.  
MOTION CARRIES.  
>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
>> THE NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 23  
[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]  
HOLDOVER ZONE CHANGE RECLASSIFY 1.9 ACRES FROM R-E ZONE TO C 2 ZONE FOR  
BAN QUESTION THE FACILITY.  
ON PROPERTY LESS THAN 2 ACRES IN THE BAN QUESTION THE FACILITY WITH  
OUTSIDE USES WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TO REDUCE THROAT DEPTH.  
ALLOW COMMERCIAL ACCESS AND REDUCE DRIVEWAY WIDTH IN THE DESIGN REVIEW FOR  
BAN QUESTION THE FACILITY ONLY BUFFALO DRIVE.  
WAS USE PERMITS WAIVERS AND BACKGROUNDS DESCRIBED IN THE AGENDA.  
STAFF CAN SUPPORT THE USE AS BAN QUESTION THE FACILITY AND FINDS AT THIS  
TIME WILL PROVIDE A BUFFER FROM THE R.M.P. TO THE NORTH AND MORE INTENSE  
COMMERCIAL USES TO THE SOUTH.

THE OUTDOOR USES REQUESTED ARE ON LOCATED ON THE SOUTH END AND BUFFERED FROM THE SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND TO THE NORTH BY THE BUILDING ITSELF IT.

HAS EXISTING MATURE LANDSCAPING.

IN ADDITION THE HEIGHT, SCALE ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE EXISTING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND CAN ALLOW ON LESS THAN 2 ACRES BECAUSE PROPER BUFFERING IS PROVIDED STAFF APPRECIATE THE APPLICANT DESIRE TO MAINTAIN EXISTING FENCES AND GATES, MANY OF THE REQUESTS FOR WAIVERS WOULD BE UNNECESSARY.

SITE IS LARGE ENOUGH TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY SETBACK ON SITE.

AS WELL AS TURN AROUND, WHICH WOULD MAKE ACCESS ON TO IT UNNECESSARY.

THE ONLY WAIVER SUBPOENA OF CAN SUPPORT IS SIX ALLOWING ACCESS FOR THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY AND THE GARAGE WITH THE LIMITATION IT BE USED SOLELY FOR THE MANAGER.

SLIDING GATES NEED TO BE SETBACK PER CODE, DUE TO THE PROXIMITY ADJACENT TO MAJOR ARTERIAL.

THEREFORE STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE ZONE CHANGE.

USE PERMITS OF STANDARDS 6, AND DESIGN OF STANDARDS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, AND 7.

IF APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE AGENDA.

ENTERPRISE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF THE ZONE CHANGE.

AND USE PERMITS OF OPERATION BETWEEN 6:00 AND 10:00.

WITH WAIVER OF WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND DENY OF 6, 4, 7.

>> DICK BONAR, LAS VEGAS, HERE TO REPRESENT THE APPLICANT.

THE THREE ACTIONS THAT ARE ASKED THE ZONING IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE ADOPTED PLAN.

THE USE PERMITS WHICH EVERYONE SEEMS TO AGREE ARE ACCEPTABLE THE TOWN BOARD AND ALL.

AND THE ITEM WHICH IS THE CONTROVERSIAL ONE THE SIRE TO KEEP THE STREETScape ALONG BUFFALO.

THE SIX ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL ARE ALL BASED ON THAT FENCE AND GATE WANTING TO STAY THERE.

WE HAVE SUBMITTED A TRAFFIC STUDY PER THE REQUEST OF THE BOARD, SINCE OUR LAST TIME BEFORE YOU.

THERE DOESN'T SEEM TO BE A QUEUING PROBLEM.

THE PARKING THAT HAS BEEN PROVIDED MEETS 100% OF CODE.

THERE'S SOME SPECIAL ISSUES ABOUT THE BUILDING THAT SAY THE OCCUPANCY OF THE BUILDING WILL NOT BE TO THE EXTENT THAT THE SQUARE FOOTAGE WOULD APPEAR.

THAT IS THAT ONE ENTIRE WING OF THIS BUILDING IS AN INDOOR SWIMMING POOL OF APPLICANT SIZE.

ANOTHER WING HAS BEEN RESERVED FOR A LARGE COMMERCIAL KITCHEN, WHICH IS NOT GOING INTO USE AT THIS TIME, BUT PARKING REQUIRED ON GROSS SQUARE FOOTAGE AND THE GROSS FAIR FOOTAGE EVEN TAKING THOSE USES INTO ACCOUNT, HAVE BEEN MEETING THE CODE.

WE ARE NOT ASKING ANY REDUCTION FROM THE STANDARD PARKING REQUIRED.

AS FOR THE -- IF THERE IS ANYTHING ABOUT THE QUEUING OR ON-SITE CIRCULATION OR TIMES OF RUSH HOUR TO ENTER ALL OF THESE FOLKS AT ONE TIME. THAT REPORT HAS ADDRESSED THOSE.

UNLESS YOUR STAFF HAS SEEN ANYTHING WRONG WITH THE TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS AND IN AND OUT.

HERE IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

>> SUSAN IVY 8420 SOUTH SIMILARON ROAD, REPRESENTING SOUTHWEST ACTION NETWORK AND THE NEIGHBORS.

I'M SORRY MY VOICE IS SO BAD, I HAD LARYNGITIS.

WE HAD A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING.

13 OF THE NEIGHBORS APPEARED.

AND THE REMAINING NEIGHBORS WHO WERE ADJACENT, WHO WERE NOT THERE GAVE US THEIR INPUT PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

I THINK WE HAD CONSENSUS FROM EVERYONE WHO LIVES RIGHT AROUND THAT AREA.

I WOULD JUST LIKE TO READ THE CONDITIONS THAT WERE AGREED INTO THE RECORD IF, THAT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.

NO COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC ON AGATE.

ALL COMMERCIAL ACCESS TO BE FROM BUFFALO.

AGATE TO REMAIN A RURAL STANDARD ROAD.

BUT A DELINEATION ON BUFFALO TO ALLOW SAFE TURNS INTO THE PROPERTY.

ALL PARKING TO BE WITHIN THE FENCED COMPOUND.

WE WOULD SUPPORT ALLOWING WAIVERS, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 AND 7.

EVERYONE LIKES THE EXISTING ROD IRON FENCE AND MATURE LANDSCAPING.

IT MAKES IT LOOK MORE HOMEY, MORE HOUSE--LIKE THAN WOULD BE THE CASE, WHERE THE FENCE MOVED AND THE LANDSCAPING TORN OUT AND REPLACED.

NO LESS.

CATERERS WOULD BRING ANY -- NO LIQUOR LICENSE AND CATERERS WILL BRING AS IT IS SCHEDULED NO OUTSIDE AMPLIFIED ENTERTAINMENT WILL BE ALLOWED.

ALL OUTSIDE EVENTS TO BE ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE PROPERTY, AWAY FROM ANY RESIDENTIAL USES AND WILL END AT 10:00 P.M.

THE TOWER TO REMAIN LOCKED DURING ALL EVENTS.

LIGHTS AND SIGNAGE SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC REVIEW.

USE PERMITS SUBJECT TO REVIEW THREE YEARS AFTER ISSUANCE ANY CHANGE IN USE WOULD REQUIRE A AMENDED PERMIT.

WITH THOSE CONDITIONS SWAN AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THIS PROJECT.

>> BRAGER: IS THERE ANYONE ELSE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK ON ITEM 23.

SIR IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RESPOND THEN I WILL GO TO COMMISSIONER SISOLAK?

>> I WE HAD A CONSTRUCTIVE MEETING SOME UNDERSTANDING AND MISS

UNDERSTANDING CLEARED AWAY BY THE APPLICANT TO THE NEIGHBORS.

SOME WAS RELATED TO THE USE OF LIQUOR AND SO FORTH.

THE TIME OF OPERATION WAS ALL GREED UPON.

THE ONLY THING I THINK IN CONTENTION IS WHETHER THE FENCE AND GATES CAN STAY WHERE THEY ARE.

ALL OF THE WAIVERS THAT HAVE BEEN REQUESTED COME BACK TO THAT ISSUE OF WILL THE GATES BE OPEN FULL TIME?

THE ANSWER IS YES.

THERE'S NO IMPROPER QUEUING OR PULLING IN AND HAVING TO BACK OUT ON BUFFALO, BECAUSE THE GATES WILL BE COMPLETELY OPEN.

>> BRAGER: THANK YOU, COMMISSIONER SISOLAK.

>> SISOLAK: THANK YOU MADAME CHAIR.  
IF YOU CAN HELP ME AGAIN WITH THIS SHANE.  
STAFF IS RECOMMENDING WHICH ONES?  
-- WAIVERS?  
>> WE ARE RECOMMENDING APPROVAL ON ONLY ONE WAIVER NUMBER 6.  
>> SISOLAK: WHICH IS THE ONLY ONE SWAN IS OBJECTING TO.  
GREAT.  
THIS IS GOOD.  
OKAY.  
WELL I'VE GOT -- I HAVE A THOUSAND PAGES OF NOTES ON THIS ITEM.  
YOU WILL HAVE TO BEAR WITH ME A LITTLE BIT.  
HOURS OF OPERATION AGREED TO ARE WHAT?  
>> 6:00 TO 10:00?  
8:00 TO 10:00?  
>> THEY AGREED TO COMMISSIONER?  
>> IN HERE, I THINK THEY HAD I THINK I READ IT FROM 6:00 TO 10:00.  
>> SISOLAK: I'M FINE WITH THE HOURS OF OPERATION.  
I WANT NO COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC ON AGATE.  
KEEP THE COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC OFF OF AGATE.  
THE DECELERATION LANE ON BUFFALO.  
THE PARKING IS AN ENORMOUS ISSUE TO ME.  
THE CAPACITY OF THIS FROM WHAT I'M BEING TOLD BY STAFF IS 900 PEOPLE AND  
YOU HAVE 90 CARS.  
I KNOW YOU WILL NOT HAVE 10 PEOPLE IN THE CAR IF YOU GET UP TO THE  
CAPACITY OF POTENTIALLY 900 PEOPLE.  
THERE WILL BE NO EXTENSION OR PARKING OUTSIDE OF THE PERIMETER OF THE  
WALL.  
THE NEIGHBORS SOME IN SWAN, SOME NOT IN SWAN HAVE CONTACTED ME THEY'RE  
VERY CONCERNED THIS BECOME BIGGER THAN IT STARTS AT AND THE RESIDENTIAL  
STREETS -- THEY'LL USE IT FOR EVENTS AND FUND-RAISERS AND PEOPLE WILL BE  
UP AND DOWN ALL OF THE NEIGHBORING STREETS FOR THIS EVENT.  
DO WE SET A CAPACITY FOR THE BUILDING?  
OR HOW DOES IT WORK?  
>> YOU CAN SET A CAPACITY WITH THE LAND USE APPLICATION.  
I BELIEVE WHEN WE WERE BRIEFING YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT DOING TWO PEOPLE  
PER A VEHICLE.  
I THINK THEY'RE PROVIDING 82 STALLS IF YOU TAKE THAT ROUTE.  
THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT HAD A MUCH LARGER NUMBER.  
>> SISOLAK: DICK HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE CAPACITY OF 170 PEOPLE.  
>> I'VE NEVER CONSIDERED THE ISSUE.  
THE WAY WE BACKED INTO IT WHEN AN EVENT PLANNER, SAY A WEDDING RECEPTION  
SEES THAT WE CAN HANDLE X NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES AND X NUMBER OF PEOPLE  
INSIDE.  
IF WE CAN'T MEET THAT, THEY WILL GO SOMEWHERE ELSE.  
>> SISOLAK: I DON'T WANT TO RELY ON JUST THAT.  
STAFF IS TELLING ME POTENTIALLY YOU COULD PUT 800 PEOPLE.  
THEN YOU NEED 400 PARKING SPACES.

>> IF YOU'LL PUT WHATEVER NUMBER YOU'RE GOING TO COME UP WITH, AND IT CAN BE AMENDABLE OVER A CERTAIN TIME -- AT THE TIME.

>> SISOLAK: AT THE TIME OF THE ONE-YEAR RENEWAL.

>> WE WON'T EVEN BE DONE WITH CONSTRUCTION WITHIN ONE YEAR.

>> SISOLAK: I KNOW.

IF I CAN FINISH.

I WILL RECOMMEND A ONE YEAR REVIEW AFTER COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.

>> ONE YEAR AFTER V.F.O..

>> SISOLAK: THEN YOU CAN COME BACK.

RIGHT NOW WE WILL MAKE THE CAPACITY 180 PEOPLE.

I CAN'T STRESS STRONGLY ENOUGH THAT I WANT NO CARS PARKED OUTSIDE.

IF HE CAN BUY ADJACENT LAND AND BUILD A PARKING LOT, THAT'S FINE, BUT I DON'T WANT THEM UP AND DOWN ON RESIDENTIAL STREET.

WHAT ARE YOU RECOMMENDING WE DO WITH THE GATE.

IT HAS GONE BACK AND FORTH.

>> ACCORDING TO THE TRAFFIC STUDY, THE EXISTING GATES -- .

>> SISOLAK: WHICH I JUST GOT THIS MORNING.

>> THE EXISTING GATES SHALL BE ADEQUATE IF GATES ARE LEFT OPEN DURING EVENTS.

THE MANAGEMENT OF THE FACILITY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO INSURE STAFF IS AVAILABLE TO DIRECT PARKING.

THE QUESTION, I THINK WAS ON THE LARGER OF THE TWO DRIVEWAYS ON AGATE.

THE PLAN SHOWS IT WAS FOR DELIVERY OR EVEN A CARETAKER.

BUT THERE IS POTENTIALLY ENOUGH ROOM THERE FOR PARKING.

THAT WAS A QUESTION.

I WAS WANTING TO VERIFY, WHEN YOU SAID NO COMMERCIAL ACCESS, DOES IT INCLUDE DELIVERIES?

BECAUSE THEIR PLAN SHOWS, THEY DO HAVE DELIVERIES IN THE GATE VIS.

>> SISOLAK: I THOUGHT THE ONLY PEOPLE WILL USE IS THE LANDLORD.

>> THAT'S WHAT WE INTEND YES.

>> SISOLAK: THERE WILL BE NO COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC ON AGATE, INCLUDING DELIVERY TRUCKS.

>> THAT IS WHERE THE TRASH CONTAINER IS AND WHERE IT IS NOW.

TRASH TRUCKS DO COME IN OFF OF AGATE TO PICK UP TRASH.

>> SISOLAK: TRASH IS -- AN EXCEPTION.

>> YOU CAN APPLY A CONDITION FOR THE GATE, THE TRAFFIC STUDY SAID THEY SHALL REMAIN OPEN DURING EVENTS.

THAT LEAVES THE POTENTIAL FOR SOMEONE PARKING ON THAT LARGER SPOT.

DO YOU WANT THEM CLOSED AT CERTAIN POINTS OF TIME.

>> THERE'S NO GATE AT THE CARETAKERS GARAGE.

THERE WAS A GATE LISTED ON THE MOST WESTERLY DRIVE.

>> THERE'S A GATE ON AGATE AT THE FOR THE PARKING LOT FOR THE USE, BUT THE OPENING FOR THE GARAGE IS STRICTLY FOR THE CARETAKERS USE.

>> IT STILES USE THE POTENTIAL USED FOR COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC.

>> WITH NOT BEING GATED IT LEAVES THE POTENTIAL FOR PEOPLE PARKING DURING EVENTS AND USING IT.

>> I GUESS THE BEST WE CAN DO IS SIGN IT.

I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO CONSTRUCT A WHOLE OTHER GATE.  
BUT WE CAN -- .

>> SISOLAK: WHAT IS STAFF RECOMMENDING I DO WITH THIS?  
>> IF IT IS JUST FOR THE CARETAKER YEAH YOU CAN SIGN IT.  
>> SISOLAK: THAT'S GOING IN AND OUT.  
JUST SIGN IT.

I DON'T WANT TO MAKE ANOTHER EXPENSE IS.  
>> WOULD YOU LIKE THE APPLICANT TO SIGN THE STREET FOR NO PARKING.  
>> SISOLAK: THAT'S FINE.

SUSAN HOW IS IT GOING TO BE?

-- I DON'T WANT TO CAUSE A PROBLEM FOR THE NEIGHBORING RESIDENTS, IF  
THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE A HOLIDAY PARTY AND I SIGN THE STREETS NO PARKING  
MR. BORGEL I KNOW HE HAD A CLIENT.

>> SISOLAK: THE PROPERTY FOR THE NEIGHBORS, IF THEY HAVE A PARTY.  
>> IT IS THEY OWN WALKER FURNITURE.  
I'M BLANKING ON THE NAME NOW.

-- THEY TYPICALLY DON'T HAVE A LOT OF PARTIES.  
THEY HAVE HOST EVENTS, BECAUSE IT IS AN EQUESTRIAN ESTABLISHMENT.  
THEY PARK OFF OF THE ROAD BEHIND THEIR BARN AND HOUSE THEN THEY PARK IN  
FRONT.

MOSTLY I HAVEN'T SEEN MANY CARS IN FRONT.  
MOSTLY IT IS BEHIND.

>> GREG BORGEL HERE FOR LARRY ALTERWITS.  
HIS ONLY TWO CONCERNS IS THE ONE YEAR TIME FOR REVIEW AND CLEAR ON THE  
RECORD, ALTHOUGH SWAN HAS STATED NO AMPLIFIED OUTDOOR ENTERTAINMENT IT IS  
OUR BELIEF, AFTER DISCUSSION WITH STAFF, THEY CAN'T HAVE OUTDOOR  
ENTERTAINMENT AMPLIFIED OR NOT, BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T APPLIED FOR IT.  
THOSE ARE OUR TWO CONCERNS.

ON THE NARROW QUESTION OF PUTTING NO PARKING ON THE STREET.

I THINK THAT'S ADEQUATELY COVERED BY THE ONE YEAR REVIEW, IF THERE SHOULD  
BE A PROBLEM, YOU HAVE ALREADY REQUIRED THEM TO PARK ON THEIR SITE I DON'T  
KNOW IF HE IS PLANNING TO HAVE A LOT OF PARTIES, BUT I DON'T KNOW WHY  
THERE SHOULD HAVE TO BE NO PARKING SIGNS ON THE STREET, WITH THE ONE YEAR  
REVIEW THESE PEOPLE ARE ASKING.

>> SISOLAK: I WOULD AGREE.

LET'S LOOK AT THAT AFTER THE ONE YEAR AND SEE IF IT IS A PROBLEM FOR THE  
NO PARK.

YOU DO UNDERSTAND THERE'S NO OUTDOOR ENTERTAINMENT AT ALL.

>> THERE'S AN AREA FOR OUT DOOR USE BUT NOT ENTERTAINMENT.

>> CORRECT LIKE A WEDDING.

>> SISOLAK: IF YOU COULD ADVISE, AS A CONDITION TO KEEP THE PATRONS AND  
THE PARTIES AWAY FROM MR. ALDER WOODS HORSES.

THEY GO OVER TO VISIT THE HORSES.

I DON'T WANT THEM VISITING THE HORSES.

IT IS AN ISSUE.

IS MY MOTION UNDERSTOOD?

I CAN'T REPEAT MINE EITHER.

>> CAN I HAVE ONE POINT OF CLARIFICATION.  
I KNOW WE HAVEN'T ASKED FOR RURAL STANDARDS ON AGATE.  
I'M NOT SURE WHAT THE POSITION IS OF SWAN, BUT I KNOW THIS IS A WONDERFUL  
TRANSITION OPPORTUNITY, IF THE RURAL STANDARDS ARE ADOPTED FOR AGATE IN  
THIS LOCATION.  
I JUST WANTED TO EXPLORE THAT.  
>> SWAN WOULD ALSO SUPPORT THAT.  
WE WOULD REQUEST RURAL STANDARDS ON BOTH SIDES OF AGATE AT THAT POINT.  
>> COMMISSIONER CAN I CLARIFY ONE FACT ON THE TRAFFIC STUDY.  
>> SISOLAK: THE VALET PARKING.  
THEY WILL USE IT STRICTLY FOR DROP-OFF OF TAXIES AND LIMOUSINE, IS THAT  
CORRECT?  
>> CORRECT.  
>> COMMISSIONER ON THE ONE MOTION YOU MENTIONED BY THE ONE YEAR REVIEW  
AFTER THE C.F.O..  
IT WOULD BE EASIER TO SAY ONE OR TWO YEARS FOR REVIEW.  
>> SISOLAK: WE CAN'T SAY ONE YEAR.  
REALISTICALLY THERE'S SOME IMPROVEMENTS HE HAS TO PUT IN GOING DOWN TO  
BLUE DIAMOND FOR SEWER OR WHAT NOT.  
ONE YEAR IS NOT REASONABLE.  
>> HOW ABOUT 18 MONTHS THEN?  
-- .  
>> SISOLAK: REALISTICALLY HOW LONG IS CONSTRUCTION GOING TO TAKE?  
>> OVER A YEAR.  
>> PERHAPS TWO YEARS TO REVIEW THEN?  
>> SISOLAK: MR. BORGEL WOULD YOU CLIENT OBJECT TO MAKING IT FROM TWO YEARS  
FROM NOW.  
IF STAFF CAN'T TRACK IT AS IT RELATES TO THE C OF O.  
I UNDERSTAND THE LOGISTIC.  
IT WOULD BE A YEAR FOR CONSTRUCTION AND THEN -- A YEAR OF THE FACILITY  
BEING USED AS THE BAN QUESTION THE FACILITY.  
>> I GUESS WE WANT TO HEAR CLEARLY FROM MR. BONAR THAT THE FACILITY WON'T  
OPEN FOR A YEAR, IS THAT CORRECT?  
>> I GUESS WE WILL MAKE THE COMMITMENT.  
>> THEN TWO YEARS IS FINE.  
>> SISOLAK: MAKE IT TWO YEARS.  
>> JUST TO CLARIFY THE MOTION IS PER STAFF.  
YOU ARE TALKING NO COMMERCIAL TRAFFIC ON AGATE THE DECELERATION ON BUFFALO  
AND PARKING WITHIN THE FENCE COMPOUND 180 PEOPLE PER EVENT.  
SOUNDS LIKE YOU SUPPORT THE WAIVER FOR THE FENCING TO REMAIN.  
AND THERE IS NO OUTSIDE ENTERTAINMENT AT ALL TO BE ALLOWED OUTSIDE AND THE  
HOURS FROM 6:00 TO 10:00 AND AN BAN QUESTION THE USES SHOULD CEASE AT  
10:00 P.M.  
AND THEN WE HAD THE TWO-YEAR REVIEW.  
>> SISOLAK: CORRECT.  
>> DO YOU WANT TO INCLUDE THE REMAINDER OF SWAN ABOUT THE TOWER SHALL  
REMAIN LOCKED AND ADDRESSING LIGHTS AND SIGNAGE?

>> SISOLAK: THAT'S FINE.  
>> WE'LL INCLUDE ALL OF THE SWAN.  
ACCESS THAT'S FINE.  
I HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THAT.  
>> REID: QUESTIONS ON THE MOTION.  
ACCESS I CAN'T REPEAT THE MOTION.  
>> REID: QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?  
CAST YOUR VOTE PLEASE.  
MOTION CARRIES.  
>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
>> REID: WE HAVE A SPECIAL MEETING SET FOR 10:00 A.M.  
AND IT IS PAST THAT TIME, SO WHY DON'T WE SWITCH TO STAFF AND WE'LL HEAR  
ITEM 26 IN A MOM.  
-- IN A MOMENT.  
>> REID: I'LL CALL TO ORDER THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CLARK COUNTY BOARDS  
OF COMMISSIONERS.  
>> GOOD MORNING.  
THE FIRST ITEM ON YOUR SPECIAL AGENDA IS ITEM 1 TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.  
>> REID: LET'S TAKE THE VOICE VOTE.  
ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.  
ANYONE OPPOSED MOTION CARRIES.  
>> ITEM 2 TO CONDUCT THE CONSIDER THE FISCAL BE EFFECT OF THE LAS VEGAS  
TOURISM IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT UNDER CHAPTER 275 OF THE NEVADA REVISED  
STATUTE AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO SUBMIT TO THE LAS VEGAS CITY COUNCIL.  
MR. CHAIRMAN THE COMPTROLLER IS HERE TO OFFER COMMENTS.  
>> GOOD MORNING, ED FINGER COMPTROLLER.  
THE ITEM IS A PUBLIC HEARING THERE.  
IS NO ACTION TO BE TAKEN AT THE PUBLIC HEARING, OTHER THAN TO RECEIVE  
COMMENT FOR SUBMISSION TO THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
STATUTE THAT IS THE LIMIT TO THE COUNTY'S PARTICIPATION AND THE CREATION  
OF SUCH A DISTRICT.  
STAFF HAS PREPARED A DEVELOPMENT AGENDA REPORT PRESENTED WITH THE AGENDA  
ITEM.  
COUNTY STAFF IS AVAILABLE, I'M AVAILABLE.  
THERE ARE ALSO REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS HERE, SHOULD YOU  
HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.  
>> REID: THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.  
ANYONE HERE WISHING TO SPEAK?  
AGAIN THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING ANY COMMENT FROM THE BOARD?  
COMMISSIONER GENERAL PATRIAS.  
>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: THANK YOU.  
>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: THIS IS FOR ESTABLISHING AN TOURISM IMPROVEMENT  
DISTRICT.  
I BELIEVE BY LAW IT EXPIRES IN SEPTEMBER IS THAT CORRECT?  
>> THE CURRENT STATUTE.  
UNLESS IT WERE TO BE AMENDED WOULD PROHIBIT AFTER OCTOBER 1, 2009 THE  
CREATION OF SUCH A DISTRICT, BECAUSE OF THE REASON THAT, AFTER SUCH DATE

THE TOURISM IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT MAY NOT BE CREATED INCLUDING PROPERTIES ALSO WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: IT IS SOMETHING AS OF OCTOBER 1 WOULD GO AWAY.

>> THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: THE PROPOSED PROJECT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE LADY LUCK, BUT IT IS ACROSS THE STREET.

IT IS THE OLD MUSEUM -- OR POST OFFICE THAT'S PREPARED.

AND -- BUT THE ANALYSIS THAT'S BEEN DONE ANTICIPATES A HOTEL AND A CASINO.

>> IT DOES ANTICIPATE THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH.

THERE ARE FOLKS HERE THAT COULD ANSWER MORE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: IT SAYS THE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE TOURISM DISTRICT IS MULTIPLE STORY PUBLIC PLAZA AND OTHER SUPPORTING IMPROVEMENTS IN THE AREA, YET IF, I READ THROUGH THE ANALYSIS THAT WAS DONE, IT'S ALL TIED TO HOTEL ROOMS TAXPAYERS THAT COULD BE GENERATED FROM THAT, EVEN THOUGH IT IS NOT PART OF THE PROJECT.

COULD YOU EXPLAIN THAT TO ME.

>> SURE, SCOTT ADAMS OF DIRECTOR OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND THE CITY OPERATION OFFICER OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY.

THIS DEVELOPMENT -- THEY'RE -- IN OUR AGREEMENT WITH THE C.I.M.

GROUP, WE REALLY LOOK AT THE EXISTING COMPONENTS.

ONCE THEY HAVE COMPLETED THE RENOVATION OF LADY LUCK.

THEY HAVE UN OUR DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT THE RIGHT TO ACCESS THE POST OFFICE SITE FOR DEVELOPMENT.

THAT SITE WE BELIEVE HAS THE ABILITY TO BE IN TITLE FOR GAMING.

SO, IN THEIR MASTER PLAN -- IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT THIS IS THE OLD POST OFFICE RIGHT HERE.

SURROUNDING THAT POST OFFICE ON THE TOTAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE BLOCK THERE, IS PROPOSED A GAMING HOTEL.

AND THAT WOULD BE PART OF A PHASED IN DEVELOPMENT AS PART OF THEIR MASTER PLAN.

SO WE DID LOOK AT, WHEN WE DID THE PREPONDERANCE TEST.

THE POTENTIAL OF GAMING DEVELOPMENTS ON THAT SIDE.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: DOES IT ANTICIPATE GIVING AWAY PUBLIC PROPERTY TO THE PRIVATE GROUP?

>> WE OWN THAT SITE, THE CITY OWNS THAT LAND.

WE OWN THE LAND SUBJECT TO SMALL SLIVER ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OWNED BY NDOT.

AND THEN THE POST OFFICE ITSELF WE OWN, BUT IT IS SUBJECT TO DEEP COVENANTS IMPOSED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR.

WE KNOW THE C.M. GROUP DOES PROVIDE SELLING THAT PROPERTY TO THEM.

WE DID STRUCTURE A SALE AT THAT TIME BASED ON THEN APPRAISED VALUE.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: I DIDN'T SEE ANY REFERENCE TO SALES COST.

IS THE PARK STILL GOING IT TO BE THERE?

>> IN THE CENTER OF DEVELOPMENT, THE CORNER OF SITE, WE HAVE CLOSED WHAT WAS FRANK WRIGHT PLAZA FOR USE AS A CONSTRUCTION STAGING AREA FOR SOME IMPROVEMENTS.

THE PLAN IS TO MOVE THE OPEN SPACE FROM THE CORNER INTO THE CENTER OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

YOU SEE IN THE CENTER OF THE MASTER PLAN THERE'S A LARGE COMPLIMENT OF OPEN SPACE, WHICH IS THE PLAZA THAT WE WOULD BE USING TOURISM IMPROVEMENT FUNDING TO DEVELOP AS PART OF THE OVERALL MASTER PLAN DEVELOPMENT.

I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT NONE OF THE TOURISM IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT FUNDING WOULD BE REBATED BACK TO THE DEVELOPER AS HAS BEEN THE CASE WITH OTHER T.I.D.S IN THE STATE OF NEVADA.

WE WOULD CAPTURE THE T.I.D. FUNDING AS A CITY AND USE IT TO MAKE THE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATES WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BUILD OUT OF THAT BLOCK.

>> WOULD THE PARKING GARAGE BE PART OF IT?

>> WE DON'T HAVE THE DETAILS WORKED OUT BECAUSE THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT STIPULATES WE ARE NOT FULLY COMMITTED EVEN HAVING TO BUILD THAT.

THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT STIPULATE THAT WE DO A MULTIPLE BLOCK RADIUS OF THE SITE OF THE EXISTENCE AND THE DEMAND FOR PARKING TO SIZE THE GARAGE. WE DID NOT COMMIT TO A SPECIFIC LODGE.

I DON'T BELIEVE THERE WAS -- I DON'T BELIEVE THERE'S A NEED.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: THERE MAY NOT BE A NEED.

>> RIGHT SO THAT WILL BE A DEMAND-INDUCED AND SIZE PARKING GARAGE AT THAT TIME.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: I GUESS MAYBE THAT'S MY CONCERN BESIDES THE POTENTIAL DETRIMENTAL EFFECT OF SCHOOLS AND THE LOSS OF REVENUE THAT COMES INTO PLAY, WHAT EXACTLY IS THE PROJECT?

>> THE PRIVATE COMPONENT OF THE PROJECT IS THEIR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, WHICH CONSISTS OF RETAIL, OFFICE, HOTEL, GAMING MIXED USE.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: EVEN THOUGH IT IS NOT IN THE IT.

I.D.

IT IS THE -- .

>> IT IS.

LET ME CLARIFY AGAIN.

WHAT YOU SEE ON THE OVERHEAD IS THE POST OFFICE BLOCK.

IT IS A LITTLE SKEWED.

IT IS A LITTLE LONG GATED.

THE EXISTING LADY LUCK IS OFF OF THIS MASTER PLAN.

LADY LUCK IS IMMEDIATELY SOUTH OF THAT.

THIS MASTER PLAN IS ONLY FOUR THE POST OFFICE BLOCK ITSELF.

AND AS I SAID AT THE OUTSET, THE LADY LUCK ITSELF IS NOT PART OF ANY PART OF THE MASTER PLAN.

IT IS SIMPLY A THRESHOLD.

THEY HAVE TO PERFORM IN THE RENOVATION OF THE LADY LUCK, BEFORE THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO ACCESS AND BE SOLD THE PROPERTY ON THE POST OFFICE BLOCK.

>> REID: WE'RE SUPPOSED TO MAKE THE FINDING OF.

IT WOULD HAVE A POSITIVE FISCAL EFFECT ON THE PROVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES.

IF I GO INTO THE ANALYSIS THERE WILL BE AN INCOME LOSS OR TAX LOSS FOR BOTH THE COUNTY, METRO, SCHOOL DISTRICT, STATE OF NEVADA.

READ COMMISSIONER GIUNCHIGLIANI.

I DON'T THINK WE'RE REQUIRED TO MAKE ANY FINDINGS.

--

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: I'M JUST READING WHAT IS IN THE APPLIED ANALYSIS.

>> REID: CAN I ASK THAT QUESTION.

I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE WHAT IS OUR ROLE?

>> JUST TO ACCEPT COMMENTS AND MOVE THEM ON, IF DEEM APPROPRIATE TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

IT IS THE CITY COUNCIL THAT WILL MAKE THE FINDINGS.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: MY COMMENTS ARE, I STILL DON'T KNOW -- I THINK IT COULD BE DETRIMENTAL EVEN TO THE THIS ECONOMIC TIME FOR THE SCHOOL DISTRICT, I THINK THE PROJECT -- I PERSONALLY LIKE THE IDEAS OF THE MUSEUM AND SO FORTH.

I THINK THE NEXUS OF THE MIXED USE IS GENERATING THE ISSUE FOR WANTING A IT.

I.D..

>> LET ME CORRECT FOR THE RECORD THOUGH -- THAT RIGHT NOW THE SITE IS TAX-EXEMPT.

THE CITY OWNS IT.

OTHER THAN THERE WAS A COUPLE OF VENDING MACHINES IN THE OLD BUS TERMINAL, THERE WAS NO TAX GENERATION ON THE SITE WHATSOEVER.

WITH THE NEW DEVELOPMENT THERE WILL BE NEW TAXES GENERATED.

THAT TAX BASE, THAT NEW GENERATED TAX BASE WILL BE SPLIT BOTH THE PROPERTY TAXES AND THE SALES TAXES.

THE PROPERTY TAXES WE HAVE NOT NEGOTIATED, NOR IS THERE ANY CONTEMPLATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT.

ANY REBATE BACK TO THE DEVELOPER OF ANY OF THE REAL ESTATE PROPERTY TAXES. THEY WILL BE DISTRIBUTED THE WAY THEY ARE NORMALLY DISTRIBUTED WITHIN A REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

AND THEN THE TOURISM IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT -- WE'VE LAID OUT IN THE INFORMATION A PORTION OF THOSE TAXES ARE PROTECTED BY STATUTE WILL GO BECOME TO THE STATE AND BE DISTRIBUTED THEIR NORMAL WAY THROUGH C TAX. THE PORTION THAT'S CAPTURED BY THIS TOURISM IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT.

75% OF THAT BALANCE WE KEEP TO GO IN THE DISTRICT.

THE OTHER 25% GOES BACK AND IS DISTRIBUTED BACK TO THEIR NORMAL PASSING JURISDICTIONS THROUGH C TAX.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: YOU CAN USE THE REDEVELOPMENT MONEY TO BUILD THE QUOTE UNQUOTE MUSEUM AND PARK.

YOU DON'T NEED A T.I.D..

IT ALLOWS YOU TO COMPLIMENT YOUR DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT YOU ARE NEGOTIATING WITH THE PARTNER ACROSS THE STREET.

THAT'S WHAT I.

>> YES, BUT I THINK IT IS REVENUE NEUTRAL.

>> GIUNCHIGLIANI: I DON'T BELIEVE IT IS.

BUT THAT'S MY COMMENT WILL GO AND THAT'S THE WAY IT GOES.

THANK YOU.

>> REID: ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

COMMISSIONER SISOLAK.

>> SISOLAK: I'VE JUST GOT ONE.

I GUESS IT IS MORE OF A QUESTION.

OUR ROLE IS ALSO TO ASK QUESTIONS THAT WILL BE FORWARDED, BUT I'LL ASK IT ANYWAY.

I APPRECIATE IT.

I GOT A GREAT BRIEFING FROM TERRY AND THE CITY.

WHAT I'M NOT UNDERSTANDING AS EXPLAINED THE TOURISM IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT HAS TO HAVE 50% MINIMUM OF THE SALES FROM TOURISTS CORRECT?

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

>> SISOLAK: GO AHEAD.

>> THE STATUTE REQUIRES THAT A FINDING BE MADE THROUGH AN INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS, WHICH WE'VE DONE THROUGH APPLIED ANALYSIS THAT -- THAT THE TAXES BEING GENERATED BY THE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT, THAT BEING THE SALE TAXES PREPONDERANCE OF THOSE TAXES ARE BEING GENERATED BY TOURISTS OR PERSONS FROM OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA.

>> SISOLAK: HOW IS THAT ESTIMATED AND HOW IS IT QUANTIFIED AFTER THE FACT OR IS IT QUANTIFIED?

SO IT IS NOT JUST PEOPLE GOING TO IT EAT LUNCH THERE, AS OPPOSED TO GOING AND EAT LUNCH AT THE MALL ACROSS THE STREET?

HOW DO YOU -- EVENTUALLY QUANTIFY THAT?

>> I'LL ASK BRIAN GORDON OF APPLIED ANALYSIS TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION THERE.

THE FIRM THAT WE HIRED TO DO THAT PREPONDERANCE TEST AND I DEFER TO BRIAN.

>> SURE.

WHAT WE DID IS PART OF THE ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE THE PREPONDERANCE BETWEEN VISITORS AND RESIDENCE.

WE PURELY TOOK A LOOK AT THE THROUGH THE MIX OF THE POPULATION IN THAT AREA.

OBVIOUSLY IT IS DOMINATED BY HOTEL ROOMS. WE LOOKED AT THE HOTEL ROOM INVENTORY AND THE EQUIVALENT ON SITE DOWN IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.

AND THEN, ALSO LOOKED AREA THEIR CONSUMER SPENDING.

COMPARED THAT TO THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTS LIKELY IN THE AREA.

BALANCED THE TWO AND THE RATIOS COME OUT 79% OF THE SPENDING ON SITE WOULD COME FROM NON-NEVADA TOURISTS AND THE BALANCE BEING FROM RESIDENCE.

>> SISOLAK: IS THAT VERIFIED AFTER THE FACT?

WHAT IF AFTER THE FACT WE FIND OUT IT IS NOT WORKING THAT WAY, WHAT HAPPENS?

>> TO BE QUITE HONEST I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S A METHOD TO MEASURE THAT AFTER THE FACT.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE PROCEDURE WOULD BE IN THAT INSTANCE.

>> SISOLAK: SO ALL YOU BASICALLY HAVE TO DO IS GET A STUDY THAT VERIFIES THE ASUNCION.

THAT MAKES IT A T.I.D.

KIND OF?

IT IS ONE OF THE TESTS--

>> IT IS ONE OF THE TESTS AND OBVIOUSLY WE OUTLINE THE STEPS WE TOOK TO PRODUCE THE RESULT AND THE FINDINGS WE CAME TO.

>> SISOLAK: THANK YOU.

>> REID: COMMISSIONER WEEKLY.

>> WEEKLY: JUST BRIEFLY.

MR. ADAMS AS WE LOOK AT THIS PROPOSED PUBLIC PLAZA HERE CAN YOU PUT ON THE RECORD JUST FOR OUR CLARK COUNTY RESIDENTS NOT UP TO DATE AS TO WHAT THE PROJECT IS ALL ABOUT.

WHAT IS THE UP WITH THE BUS TERMINAL THERE?

>> THE EXISTING SITE HAS THE EXISTING REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION BUS TERMINAL ON SITE.

THE PLAN IS TO RELOCATE THAT BUS TERMINAL TO A BLOCK WITHIN BONVILLE CASINO CENTER, FIRST AND GAS.

THAT ENTIRE BLOCK, WHICH IS PART OF THE WOODWARD LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE DEVELOPED AS AN INTERMODAL BUS TERMINAL.

THE BLOCK HAS BEEN CLEARED.

THE BUS TERMINAL AND THE DESIGN IS COMPLETE.

THEY'RE IN THE PERMITTING PROCESS AND THE PLAN IS TO MOVE FORWARD.

IT WILL ALLOW THE INTEGRATION OF THAT TERMINAL WITH THE NEW A SYSTEM, THE BUS RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM THE CASINO CENTER THAT WILL PROVIDE ENHANCE TRANSIT SERVICES.

>> WEEKLY: THAT IS CITY-OWNED LAND?

>> IN THE WOODWARD LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT?

>> YES.

>> WEEKLY: YES?

>> NO, IT IS OWNED BY THE PROPERTY OWNERS AND THERE'S A LONG-TERM LEASE ESTABLISHED BY THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND THE OWNERS OF THE PROPERTY.

>> WEEKLY: THANK YOU MR. CHAIR.

>> REID: OTHER COMMENTS?

WE NEED A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO SUBMIT THESE COMMENTS TO THE CITY.

YOU'VE HEARD THAT MOTION.

ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AY, .

>> AYE.

>> REID: ANYONE OPPOSED?

HEARING NON.

THIS IS TIME SET ASIDE FOR COMMENT BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

IS THERE ANYONE HERE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON THIS MATTER?

COME FORWARD, STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS, PLEASE.

>> GOOD MORNING, DICK GUIR 8260 HILTON HEAD COURT.

I'M ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DOWNTOWN ALLIANCE, WHICH IS BASICALLY IN THE LAST YEAR AND A HALF OR SO TAKEN UPON ITSELF TO GET INFORMED AND WORK FOR ALL ASPECTS OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTION OF THE DOWNTOWN AREA AND IN PARTICULAR, THE R.D.A..

I'M ALSO THE PRESIDENT OF THE 18 B ARTS DISTRICT NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION.

IT IS FROM THAT STANDPOINT I GUESS I SHOULD SPEAK.

WE OF COURSE ARE HAVING AND HAVE HAD OVER THE YEARS A DIFFICULT TIME DEVELOPING THAT PART OF TOWN.

IT IS FROM THE ARTS FACTORY AND WHERE YOU CAN GET THE FINEST PRINTS IN THE WORLD AND OTHER DEVELOPMENTS, PLANNED OF COURSE NOT OF INTEREST TO YOU, SENSE YOU HAVE SO MANY OTHER PROJECTS TO TALK ABOUT HAVING THAT BUS STOP HERE IS VERY, VERY GOOD FOR US.

HAVING THIS DEVELOPMENT DOWNTOWN AND THIS MUSEUM, WE WOULD EXPECT A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE.

AND EXPECTED TO COME UP FROM THE STRIP TO SEE THIS MUSEUM.

WE WOULD THINK THEY ARE PEOPLE NOT GOING UP TO GO GAMING.

THEY'RE GOING TO SEE OTHER ASPECTS OF LAS VEGAS.

THEREFORE, THEY WOULD BE MORE LIKELY TO GET OFF AT OUR BUS STOP AND EXPLORE THE ARTS DISTRICT ON THEIR WAY UP TO SEE THE MUSEUM OR BACK TO THE HOTELS ON THE SOUTH END OF THE STRIP.

WE ARE VERY EXCITED ABOUT THIS HAPPENING.

BOTH THE MUSEUM AND IS THE BUS.

WHATEVER HELP IT TAKES TO MAKE SURE IT HAPPENS, WE HOPE THAT YOU WILL AGREE TO FORWARD A POSITIVE COMMENT ON IT, THANK YOU.

>> REID: ANYONE ELSE?

>> THIS MEETING ADJOURNED.

>> ITEM 24 WAS HELD.

ITEM 25 WAS WITHDRAWN.

THAT BRINGS US TO ITEM 26.

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

USE PERMITS FOR INCREASE DENSITY REDUCE THE SETBACK FROM A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND A DESIGN REVIEW FOR A MIXED USE IN 5.2 ACRES IN THE M.U.D. AND DESIGN OVERRULED ON THE EAST SIDE OF TORREY PINES DRIVE AND CAP VELA AVENUE.

WITH THE USE PERMITS AND BACKGROUND AS DESCRIBED IN THE AGENDA.

THE SITE AND BUILDING DESIGN EFFICIENTLY DISTRIBUTES THE PROJECT COMPONENTS WITHIN ONE BUILDING AND THE ENTIRE FIVE ACRES.

STAFF FINDS THE DENSITY ARE APPROPRIATE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.

IT IS CONSISTENT WITH OTHER MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT LOCATED WITHIN THE M.U.D.

AND C.M.A. OVERLAY DISTRICT.

THE DENSITY IS CONSISTENT WITH THE UPPER DENSITY AS A ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR THE C 3 AREA.

AND THE PEDESTRIAN REALM 8,000 SQUARE FEET GROCERY STORE.

OPEN SPACE WITH AMENITY AND PEDESTRIAN CORRIDORS PROVIDES FOR A SAFE, CONVENIENT AND UNIQUE ALTERNATIVE TO TRADITIONAL SUBURBAN DESIGN.

THE PROPOSED DENSITY IS NOT ANTICIPATED TO EFFECT THE AREA.

IT IS NONRESIDENTIAL WITH SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF APPROVED USES STAFF FINDS THE STANDARD WILL NOT ADVERSELY EFFECT THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE USE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.

THE PORTION THAT INTRUDES INTO THE SETBACK IS ONLY A PORTION OF THE NON-LIVABLE CORNER IT IS REDUCED TO 64 FEET FROM THE PREVIOUS 70 FEET AND THE

SETBACK REDUCTION FROM THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE IS TAKEN FROM AN OPEN SPACE COMMON LOT.

BASED ON THE INFORMATION CONTAINED WITHIN THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES ALL EXISTING SCHOOLS LOCATED WITHIN THE CORRESPONDING SCHOOLS ARE OVER OR NEAR CAPACITY.

STAFF IS CONCERNED WITH THE ACCUMULATIVE IMPACTS WITH THE STUDENT YIELD OF THIS PROJECT AND FUTURE PROJECTS.

THE APPLICANT INITIATED A DIALOGUE AND WILL ADDRESS ANY ISSUES AND CONCERNS WITH THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT.

THEREFORE, STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS LISTED IN YOUR AGENDA.

THE ENTERPRISE TOWN BOARD RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF USE PERMIT 2, AND DENY OF USE PERMIT 1.

ONE RECEIVED ONE CARD IN APPROVAL.

AND ONE SPEAKER IN APPROVAL AND RECEIVED NINE CARDS IN PROTEST.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED IT AT THE MARCH 3 MEETING SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AS LISTED IN YOUR AGENDA.

>> REID: GOOD MORNING.

>> GOOD MORNING COMMISSIONERS.

>> SCOTT RUDY 10649 HERE ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT.

WE'RE HERE IN AGREEMENT.

AND ALSO THE PLANNING COMMISSIONS RECOMMENDATION APPROVAL.

AND WE'RE HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

THANK YOU.

>> REID: THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.

>> GOOD MORNING.

CAREY NEWTON 8320 WEST FORD AVENUE.

HERE ON BEHALF OF THE SOUTHWEST ACTION NETWORK.

AS YOU SEE FROM THE HAND OUT PASSED OUT.

WE HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THIS KIND OF A PROJECT IN THIS AREA.

AND SPECIFICALLY UPPING THE NUMBER OF UNITS, WHEN WE FEEL LIKE EVEN 188 WAS TOO MANY FOR RESIDENTS IN THE AREA, WHEN IT SHOULD BE A COMMERCIAL PROJECT.

OR SOMETHING ELSE BESIDES HAVING RESIDENTS ALL IN THAT AREA.

THE SCHOOLS ARE OVER CROWDED ALREADY.

AND THE VERY LEAST WE WOULD LIKE THE NUMBER HELD TO THE 188 THANK YOU.

>> REID: ANYONE ELSE?

>> GOOD MORNING COMMISSIONERS.

DAVID CHESTNUT HERE REPRESENTING ENTERPRISE TOWN BOARD.

OUR INITIAL PART OF OUR RECOMMENDATION FOR THIS PROJECT WAS TO HOLD IT TO ITS ORIGINAL APPROVAL OF 188 UNITS.

WHAT THAT IS BASED SPONSORSHIP LOOKING AT THE AREA.

THERE HAVE BEEN FIVE APPROVALS AND THE STAFF WAS USING A THREE QUARTER MILE RADIUS TO POINT OUT THE AURORA.

WE LOOKED AT THE SAME .75 RADIUS.

THERE ARE FIVE M.U.D.

THAT TAKE 3500 ACRES AND PLACE 100 RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON IT, WHILE RESERVING LESS THAN ONE ACRE FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES.

WE HAVE ESSENTIALLY TAKEN 34 ACRES OF COMMERCIAL LAND OUT OF USE, WHERE WE COULD CREATE JOBS AND ENHANCE THE ECONOMIC BENEFIT AND ESSENTIALLY MADE IT R 4 LAND.

THIS IS WHERE WE HAVE A SERIOUS DISAGREEMENT WITH THE STAFF'S ANALYSIS AND THE TENT OF THE C.M.A. IS TO PREVENT AIRCRAFT OVER LAY FLIGHT NOISE AND CRASH HAZARD.

THE INCIDENT IN LAGUARDIA.

IF THE RIVER WAS NOT THERE, WHERE WOULD CAPTAIN SULLY BUT HIS AIRPLANE? IN LAS VEGAS IT IS A DIFFICULT DECISION.

THE C.M.A. WAS DESIGNED TO HELP PREVENT THAT.

THE SCHOOL BOARD IS PROHIBITED FROM BUILDING SCHOOLS IN THE C.M.A., SO IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO HELP RESOLVE THE ADDITIONAL PROBLEM OF STUDENTS OCCURRING FROM THIS.

THE OTHER THING THAT WE LOOKED AT IS THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN TO THE R.T.C C. THERE ARE NO TRANSPORTATION NODES WITHIN THAT AREA PLANNED FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.

OUR CONSIDERATION IS THAT GIVEN THE OVER ALL AREA, WE ARE ACTUALLY CREATING MORE HIGH-DENSITY HOUSING, WHICH WILL CREATE MORE VEHICLE TRAFFIC, BECAUSE WE ARE TAKING UP LAND WHERE THESE FOLKS ARE REALLY GOING TO NEED TO GO TO WORK AT IN THE FUTURE MANY THANK YOU.

>> REID: ANYONE ELSE?

WOULD YOU LIKE TO RESPOND TO THAT?

>> COMMISSIONERS, THIS PROJECT IS WITHIN THE MIXED USE OVERLAY DISTRICT THAT WAS ADOPTED BY THE COUNTY.

I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE'S SEVERAL OVERLAY DISTRICTS IN THE AREA AND THE IMPACT FROM THE INCREASE OF THE UNITS IS ACCORDING TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS IS 11 UNITS.

WE ADJUSTED THE UNITS FROM MAINLY TWO BEDROOM UNITS TO ONE BEDROOM UNITS. AGAIN, WE HAVE INCREASED THE DENSITY BY 44 UNITS AND INCREASED OVER ALL THE STUDENT COUNT BY 11.

ALSO WITHIN OUR DEVELOPMENT WE HAVE INCREASED -- WE HAVE A COFFEE SHOP IN THERE.

WE HAVE INCREASED FROM 1,000 TO 1500 SQUARE FEET.

THE GROCERY STORE FROM 8,000, TO 10500 SQUARE FEET.

AND THE CLUBHOUSE FOR THE RESIDENCE FROM 4,000 TO 6500.

THIS PROJECT IS DESIGNED FOR PEOPLE TO ACTUALLY LIVE THERE AND THEN ALSO BE ABLE TO USE THE AMENITIES ON SIGHT SO THEY DON'T HAVE TO DRIVE ACROSS TOWN TO GO TO THE GROCERY STORE.

WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE CONCERNS, BUT IN THE C.M.A.

THERE'S A LOT OF MIXED USE AND DEED-RESTRICTIVE PROPERTIES.

BEHIND US AN OFFICE WAREHOUSE WAS APPROVED.

TO THE SOUTH OF US, WHERE WE'RE ASKING FOR THE RESIDENTIAL PROXIMITY THERE'S A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION, SO IT IS COLLECTIVE IN THE AREA THE TYPES OF USES, HOWEVER, WE ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE

STANDARDS SET BY THE OVER LAY DISTRICT AND -- WE WOULD REQUEST YOUR APPROVAL.

>> REID: YOU KNOW VERY WELL WE DON'T GET IN A DEBATE HERE.

>> YOU KNOW I WOULD LIKE TO ADD TWO COMMENTS.

OUR CONCERN IS COMMUNAL IMPACT ON THE AREA OF PROJECTS AND ONE I DID NOT MENTION IS EXAMINING THE GROCERY STORE DENSITY IS AN UNENFORCEABLE STANDARD.

THANK YOU.

>> REID: THIS IS IN MY DISTRICT.

THIS IS JUST A POLICY DIFFERENCE, FRANKLY BETWEEN WHAT OUR CODE ALLOWS AND WHAT THE TOWN BOARD BELIEVES SHOULD OCCUR.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF MY COLLEAGUES THESE MIXED USE PROJECTS WERE THE RESULT OF OUR TASK FORCE WORK.

WE ADOPTED A MIXED OVERLAY DISTRICT, WHERE WE SCRUTINIZED THE VALLEY AND DETERMINE AREAS, WHERE WE BELIEVED HIGHER DENSITY SHOULD OCCUR, SO PEOPLE COULD LIVE, WORK, AND PLAY IN THE SAME AREA, TO HUSBANDRY RESOURCES, IMPROVE THE ENVIRONMENT.

I BELIEVE IN THAT POLICY.

I THINK WE NEED TO DO MORE OF THIS, NOT LESS.

AND IF OUR POLICY IS WRONG, WE COULD ADJUST IT AND SHOULD NOT PENALIZE FOR FOLLOWING IT.

AND WE GIVE DENSITY BONUSES TO FOLKS THAT DO CERTAIN THINGS, TO ENCOURAGE THEM TO PROVIDE AMENITIES WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT THAT SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE REASONS THAT I DESCRIBED, AS THE STAFF POINTS OUT WITH THE POLICY THAT WE'VE ADOPTED.

THEREFORE, I'M GOING TO SUPPORT THE APPLICATION.

MY MOTION WILL BE FOR APPROVAL PER THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

>> BRAGER: WHAT IS THE SIZE OF THOSE?

DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU'RE PLANNING AS FAR AS OCCUPANCY?

>> THEY'RE STILL WORKING AT THE FINAL.

VERY A ONE BEDROOM, TWO BEDROOM, THREE BEDROOM THEY WILL BE 700 THE TOP RANGE WOULD BE 1400 TO 1500 SQUARE FEET.

>> BRAGER: DUE TO THE BUS NOT BEING HERE AT THIS POINT IN TIME AND THE TYPE OF UNITS YOU'RE DOING, ESPECIALLY WITH THE 700, IS THERE ANY KIND OF BUS, THIS COMPLEX COULD HAVE ON ITS OWN TO GET PEOPLE WHERE THEY NEED TO GO?

JUST OUT OF CURIOSITY?

>> IT WAS NOT DESIGNED LIKE THAT.

AGAIN WE DID HAVE ON THE ORIGINAL 188 AS A CONDOMINIUM COMPLEX.

IT WAS FOR INDIVIDUAL OWNERS, SO WE DIDN'T HAVE THAT PARTICULAR AMENITY OUTLINED.

BRINGING THANK YOU.

MR. CHAIR.

>> REID: COMMISSIONER WEEKLY.

>> WEEKLY: I WANT TO ASK A QUESTION ABOUT THE GROCERY STORE.

DO WE KNOW THE CHAIN WE'RE LOOKING AT?

>> WELL, AT THE TIME THIS PROJECT ACTUALLY WAS ABOUT TO RECEIVE ITS BUILDING PERMITS, JUST BEFORE THEY PAID THEIR FEES, THE WATER FEES, AND THE BUILDING PERMITS FEES THE BANK PULLED THE MONEY. SO THE DEVELOPER ASKED US TO COME BACK AND LOOK AT WHAT COULD MAKE IT WORK.

IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY WERE SPEAKING WITH FRESH AND EASY AND ANOTHER SMALL BODEGA MARKET.

IT WILL BE A SMALLER SPECIALIZED MARKET FOR THOSE FOR THIS UNIT.

>> WEEKLY: I GUESS MY REASON FOR ASKING, IS BECAUSE I DO UNDERSTAND SOME OF THE CONCERNS BROUGHT FORTH BY SWAN.

BUT I ALSO WANT TO ASK, IN TERMS OF IS THERE ANOTHER GROCERY STORE WITHIN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THIS PROPOSED SITE?

>> NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF.

>> WEEKLY: HAVING GONE THROUGH THAT KNOWING THERE'S AN EMPTY VOID.

PEOPLE DO RESPECT AND APPRECIATE HAVING THAT OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE THAT CONVENIENCE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD LIKE THAT.

HAVING A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE AREA WHERE THE NEIGHBORHOOD HAD GONE SEVERAL AREAS WITHOUT A GROCERY STORE, HOW IMPORTANT THAT CAN BE FOR THE RESIDENCE.

I JUST WANT TO KNOW THAT AND PUT IT ON THE RECORD.

I APPRECIATE THAT, THANK YOU.

>> REID: MY MOTION IS ON THE FLOOR.

OTHER COMMENTS?

CAST YOUR VOTE ON THE MOTION.

>> REID: MOTION CARRIES.

>> THAT WILL CONCLUDE THE MORNING AGENDA.

>> REID: THIS MEETING IS IN RECESS UNTIL 1:00 PM FOR AFTERNOON AGENDA.

>> BRAGER: WE WILL GO AHEAD AND START THE AFTERNOON SESSION.

>> GOOD AFTERNOON COMMISSIONERS.

THE FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS IS APPROVAL OF THE AFTERNOON AGENDA.

WE HAVE RECEIVED NO REQUESTS AT THIS TIME.

IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION FROM THE AUDIENCE THE AFTERNOON AGENDA IS READY FOR YOUR APPROVAL.

>> BRAGER: OKAY.

CAST YOUR VOTE FOR THE AFTERNOON AGENDA.

WE HAD A MOTION FOR APPROVAL.

MOTION PASSES.

>> FIRST ITEM IS ITEM 28,

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

HOLDOVER APPEAL WAIVER OF CONDITIONS REQUIRING THE COVENANT AGREEMENT WITH REMODEL AND ADDITIONS TO THE EXISTING POWER GENERATING PLANT ON THE PORTION 106 IN THE M.D.

AND MUD AND M1 ONE ON THE WEST SIDE OF STEFANIE STREET AND 700 FEET OF RUSSELL ROAD.

I BELIEVE CIVIL ENGINEERING AND THE APPLICANT HAVE COME TOGETHER ON THIS.

I THINK WE WILL BE DONE WITH THAT INTRODUCTION.

WE CAN TAKE IT FROM THIS.

>> BRAGER: THAT WOULD BE GREAT.  
>> TOM DONEBROWSKI 6226 WEST SAHARA.  
WE WOULD LIKE TO WITHDRAW THE ITEM WITHOUT PREJUDICE.  
>> BRAGER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR STATEMENTS?  
OKAY, WE HAVE A MOTION FOR APPROVAL NO CONVERSATION.  
WE CAN CAST YOUR VOTE.  
FOR APPROVAL OF WALL WITHOUT PREJUDICE.  
OKAY.  
WE CAN CAST YOUR VOTE.  
MOTION PASSES.  
THANK YOU.  
SORRY YOU HAD TO DRIVE DOWN.  
>> THE NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 29, HOLDOVER APPEAL WAIVER FOR FULL OFF SITE  
IMPROVEMENTS AND WAIVER OF CONDITIONS, AS LISTED IN YOUR AGENDA, AND  
DESIGN REVIEW FOR A NEW PLACE OF WORSHIP IN 20NY2 ACRES IN THE DESERT INN  
CORRIDOR OVER LAY.  
500 FEET WEST OF TORY PINES.  
ALTHOUGH THE APPLICANT HAS DEMONSTRATED COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 30 STANDARDS  
FOR THE PROPOSED PLACE OF WORSHIP.  
STAFF IS CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROPOSED DESIGN AND THE PROXIMITY TO DESERT  
INN IN THE ADJACENT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES.  
STAFF'S UNDERSTANDING THAT THE PROTESTERS AND APPLICANT HAVE COME TOGETHER  
ON CONDITIONS.  
THEREFORE, STAFF CAN SUPPORT THE CONDITIONS THEY'VE AGREED UPON.  
SPRING VALLEY TOWN BOARD DID RECOMMEND DENIAL.  
WE RECEIVED ONE CARD IN APPROVAL.  
ONE SPEAKER IN THE TOWN BOARD WAS IN APPROVAL AND DID RECEIVE ONE CARD AND  
FOUR IN PROTEST.  
IT WAS APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE AGENDA IT.  
HAS BEEN APPEALED BY NEIGHBORS REQUIRING IT REQUIRE WITH THE ORIGINAL  
CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL OF THE WORSHIP AND COMPLY WITH THE DESERT INN OVER  
LAY DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS.  
>> BRAGER: THANK YOU.  
IF YOU WANT TO MAKE A COMMENT YOU MAY.  
>> LUCAS TUCKER 300 SOUTH FOURTH STREET.  
I'M HERE ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT IT.  
WAS APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION IN DECEMBER.  
THEN THERE WAS THE APPEAL FILED.  
BOTH ME, MY CLIENTS AND THE APPELLANTS, WE HAD A MEETING TOGETHER, WHERE  
WE ALL DISCUSSED THEIR CONCERNS.  
EACH OF US MET SEPARATELY WITH THE COMMISSIONER.  
THESE ARE THE CONDITIONS WE AGREED UPON AND WE ARE AGREEABLE TO THE  
CONDITIONS NEGOTIATED.  
>> BRAGER: THANK YOU.  
IS THERE ANYONE ELSE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK ON ITEM 29?  
PLEASE COME FORWARD AND STATE YOUR NAMES.

>> HI.

IT IS RHONDA DINS.

5885 WEST DESERT INN ROAD.

>> SOVIET UNION NUNEZ.

>> WE HAVE NEVER BEEN AGAINST THE KOREAN AMERICAN CALGARY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH FROM BUILDING A NEW CHURCH BUILDING.

NEITHER HAS ANYONE IN OUR COMMUNITY.

WE BELIEVE IT IS MORE THAN EVER, THAT THE SPIRITUALITY IS VERY IMPORTANT IN ONES LIVES.

WE ARE LIVING IN HARD TIMES RIGHT NOW.

AND WELCOME THE CHURCH TO HAVE A NEW BUILDING.

AND HOPE THAT THEY WILL BE A GOOD NEIGHBOR TO OUR COMMUNITY.

WE WORK VERY HARD IN OUR AREA AND ARE VERY PROTECTIVE, BECAUSE WE CARE VERY DEEPLY ABOUT OUR UNITED COMMUNITY.

>> WE UNDERSTAND WHY IT IS BEING GRANTED WAIVER FOR SOME CONDITIONS AND CHURCHES ARE ALLOWED TO BE BUILT WITHIN COMMUNITIES.

THE CHURCH IS BEING ALLOWED TO DEVELOP NEW BUILDINGS THAT, ARE LARGER THAN HOMES IN THE AREA, BECAUSE THEY ARE A CHURCH.

WE WANT TO INSURE THAT ANY DEVELOPER THAT MAY WATCH THIS AND THINK THEY WILL BE ABLE TO DO THE SAME SHOULD UNDERSTAND THAT OUR COMMUNITY WILL STAND UP IN PROTEST AND MAKE OUR VOICES HEARD, AS WE HAVE DONE IN THE PAST.

THE DESERT INN ORDINANCE AND THE INTENT MUST BE FOLLOWED SO OUR AREA REMAINS RURAL AND NO DEVELOPER SHOULD BE ABLE TO ALTER OUR WAY OF LIFE AND THE CHURCH AGAIN IS AN EXCEPTION.

>> I HAVE IS SOME TO THOSE THAT I WILL JUST BRIEFLY GO OVER.

>> THESE ARE THE TO THOSE OF THE SURROUNDING CHURCH, WHICH HAS 10 ACRES OF VACANT LAND.

THERE IS FIVE ACRES OF B.L.M. LAND ON DARBY AND SOREL, WHICH YOU CAN SEE HERE.

THERE IS THE OTHER FIVE ACRES THAT IS OFF ON DID.

AND DARBY, WHICH IS RIGHT NEXT TO THE CHURCH, WHICH IS HERE.

AND THIS, AS YOU CAN SEE, THERE IS NO LIGHTING IN THE AREA SURROUNDING THE HOMES ALONG DARBY AND SURROLE TOWARDS THE BACK PORTION OF THE CHURCH, WHICH IS RIGHT HERE.

IT WAS REALLY INTERESTING, WHILE WE WERE TAKING THESE TO THEOS THERE WERE TWO PEOPLE RIDING ON HORSES, WHICH WE HAVE NEVER SEEN IN ALL OF THE YEARS GOING ON DARBY.

AND GOING TO SOREL ON TO THE B.L.M. LAND.

I WOULD LIKE TO HAND IT IN SO, YOU CAN UNDERSTAND THE RURALNESS OF OUR AREA.

>> BRAGER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH COMMISSIONER BROWN.

-- .

>> OH, I HAVE A COUPLE MORE THINGS AND THEN WE'RE DONE.

WE WANT TO PUT ON THE RECORD.

ONE OF OUR OTHER CONCERNS IF, THIS PROPERTY SHOULD CHANGE HANDS, BEFORE ANY DEVELOPMENT SHOULD COMMENCE THAT IT SHOULD BE REFERRED BACK TO THE R.E.

STATUS AND THE APPLICATION PROCESS SHOULD START ALL OVER AGAIN. WE WANT TO THANK COMMISSIONER BROWN VERY MUCH AND HIS LIAISON KIM BUSH FOR THEIR PATIENCE AND PROFESSIONALISM, WITH WORKING WITH US ON THIS APPLICATION.

OUR COMMUNITY APPRECIATES THE TIME AND EFFORTS YOU HAVE GIVEN US, COMMISSIONER BROWN.

AND THE STAFF AND ESPECIALLY TO KIM BUSH TOO.

ON BEHALF OF OUR COMMUNITY WE WANT TO THANK YOU FOR SAVING DESERT INN ROAD AND OUR COMMUNITY.

THANK YOU AGAIN SO MUCH.

>>.

>> BRAGER: THANK YOU, WERE YOU GOING TO SPEAK? AND THEN COMMISSIONER BROWN.

>> GOOD MORNING MY NAME IS MIKE MISONNY FROM THE ASIAN GROUP. I WORKED ON THIS PROJECT WITH COMMISSIONER BROWN AND A FEW OTHER PEOPLE. I REALLY RECOMMEND THIS SHOULD BE PASSED. IT IS GOOD FOR THE COMMUNITY FOR THE KOREAN ASIAN COMMUNITY. THANK YOU.

>> BRAGER: COMMISSIONER BROWN.

>> BROWN: THANK YOU MADAME CHAIR. CERTAINLY IT IS RECIPROCAL.

THANK YOU FOR THE SUPPORT FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

MR. TUCKER THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENCE.

AND CERTAINLY THANK THE CHURCH FOR THE PATIENCE.

I THINK WE WILL HAVE A WONDERFUL PROJECT HERE.

MY UNDERSTANDING IS STAFF HAS RECEIVED THE CONSOLIDATED CONDITIONS.

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

I WAS GOING TO, JUST GIVE A QUICK SUMMARY OF ALL OF THEM SO EVERYONE KNOWS WHAT WE HAVE.

>> BROWN: PLEASE DO.

>> BASICALLY WE'VE GOT 20 CONDITIONS AGREED UPON.

I WILL TOUCH ON THEM BRIEFLY.

THE FIRST IS HAVING AN EXPIRATION OF FEBRUARY 172010.

THERE WILL BE NO ACCESS ON DARBY.

EXECUTE RESTRICTIVE COVENANT AGREEMENT.

DRIVING LOCATION SHOULD BE APPROVED BY CIVIL ENGINEERING.

RECONSTRUCT ANY UNUSED DRIVEWAYS.

DRAINAGE STUDY AND COMPLIANCE.

LIMITED TO THE CHURCH BUILDING ONLY.

PROPERTY IS NOT TO BE CONVERTED FOR PROFESSIONAL AND COMMERCIAL USES.

SETBACKS FROM THE PROPERTY LINES WILL BE PER THE CURRENT CODE.

THERE'S EXISTING BLOCK WALL ON THE EXISTING PROPERTY LINE.

THERE'S ALSO LANDSCAPING IN THE 6 FOOT DEBTIVE WALL WITH SOME LANDSCAPING.

AND LANDSCAPE MATERIALS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLARK COUNTY.

THE 8 FOOT DECORATIVE STUCCO WALL ALONG DARBY CHURCH BUILDINGS TO BE SINGLE STORY WITH THE LOST HEIGHT OF 29 FEET.

THE CHURCH BUILDING WILL BE ATTENDED PER BUILDING CODE.

NO TENTS ON THE PROPERTY OR RENTING OF THE COMMUNITY.

WE ALSO HAVE, ONLY MONUMENT SIGNAGE WILL BE PERMITTED AND APPROVAL OF THE USE PERMIT AND NOT THE DESIGN REVIEW THAT WILL COME BACK TO THE BOARD TO ADDRESS ISSUES SUCH AS LIGHTING AND ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS, AS WELL AS THE LAYOUT OF THE SITE.

ALSO HAVE A FIRE EMERGENCY ACCESS PLAN FOR MINIMUM TURNING RADIUS OF 28 FEET.

WE ALSO HAVE A CONDITION FROM THE SOUTHERN NEVADA HEALTH DISTRICT OF PROPERTY OWNER MUST ABANDON THE EXISTING SEPTIC TANK, ONCE THE CHURCH IS COMPLETED AND READY TO TAKE OCCUPANCY.

>> .

>> BROWN: MR. TUCKER?

>> YES THOSE CONDITIONS ARE THE ONES WE AGREED TO.

>> WE WILL BRING IT BACK FOR THE DESIGN REVIEW.

>> REVEREND JOE IS WORKING ON THE NEW DESIGN AS WE SPEAK.

>> BROWN: IN LIGHT OF THE 11-YEAR HISTORY WHAT WOULD STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION BE?

>> GO AHEAD AND APPROVE THE WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT.

THE WAIVER OF CONDITIONS AND DENY THE DESIGN REVIEW, BECAUSE WE WILL HAVE A NEW ONE COMING BACK.

IT WILL BE PER THE CONDITIONS, OBVIOUSLY MORE DETAILED, BUT THAT WERE JUST SUMMARIZED.

>> BROWN: MADAME CHAIR THAT WOULD BE MY MOTION.

>> BRAGER: SOMEWHERE SISOLAK?

>> SISOLAK: WAS ONE OF THE CONDITIONS NO TENTS?

>> YEAH ONE OF THE CONDITIONS WAS TO NO TENTS TO BE LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY FOR MEETING AND USE AND NO RENTING OF THE CHURCH BUILDING, ONLY FOR CHURCH USE.

>> SISOLAK: WHAT IF FOR EXAMPLE, I DON'T WANT TO CAUSE A PROBLEM.

WHAT IF THEY HAVE A CHURCH FAIR OR CARNIVAL, COULD THEY HAVE NOT HAVE A TENT?

>> I BELIEVE IT SAYS ONLY FOR CHURCH USE, WHICH INDICATES WE COULD HAVE ONE FOR CHURCH-RELATED.

>> SISOLAK: I WANTED TO MAKE SURE MOST CHURCHES MIGHT HAVE A FESTIVAL OR FAIR OR CARNIVAL FOR THE KIDS, THEY CAN DO THAT.

>> BRAGER: WE HAVE A MOTION.

CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> BRAGER: THE MOTION PASSES.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

ENJOY.

>> THANK YOU COMMISSIONERS.

>> ITEM 30

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS INITIATE THE ADOPTION PROCESS FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT MAP OF GOODSPRINGS TO REMOVE FAIL, AND GENE STREET WITH THE 100 FOOT PLANNED RIGHT OF AWAY.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES THE RIGHT FOR FAIL OR GENE STREET COULD BE REDUCED TO 60 FEET BASED ON THE RURAL NATURE OF THE AREA.

AND REMOVE FAIL STREET AS AN ARTERIAL WITH THE 100 RIGHT OF WAY BECOMING A RIGHT OF WAY LOCAL STREET.

IT IS A DIRECTIVE TO INITIATE.

>> BRAGER: OKAY SO, BE DIRECTED.

>>.

>> ITEM 31

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE TO INCREASE FEES RELATED TO SUBDIVISION MAPPING. STAFF ANALYZE THE COUNTY FEES CHARGED FOR MAPPING PROJECTS AND COMPARE TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS CLARK COUNTY FEES WERE DETERMINED TO BE LOWER AND REQUESTING THAT YOU DIRECT US TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE.

>> BRAGER: DOES ANYONE HAVE ANYTHING, ICE WE CAN DIRECT STAFF.

>> SISOLAK: WHY IN THE PARCEL MAP ARE WE REMOVING THE \$2?

IN THE SUBDIVISION WE'RE ADDING \$2?

IT IS JUST A SHORT.

I DON'T WANT A LONG.

>> ROBERT THOMPSON FROM DIRECTED CIVIL DIVISION.

>> THE \$2 MADE A DIFFERENCE OF \$8 ON THE FEE.

WHERE THE SUBDIVISION CAN RUN UP TO 100 TO 200 LOTS.

I THINK IT MATCHED WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND NORTH LAS VEGAS.

>> SISOLAK: MY CONCERN IS THAT FOR THE WORK THAT YOU PUT INTO IT, IF IT IS ONLY TWO OR FOUR LOTS AND COSTS THEM \$600 AND THE OTHER IS HUNDREDS OF LOTS COSTING \$200 IS IT TAKING CARE OF THE LABOR FOR THE MANPOWER?

>> WE THINK IT DOES.

WHEN WE PROPOSED THE CHANGES IT WORKED OUT AS FAR AS TIMING SPENT.

>> SISOLAK: OKAY.

>> BRAGER: IF THERE'S NO OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS, WE DIRECT STAFF TO MOVE FORWARD.

>> ITEM 32

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE AN ORDINANCE TO INCREASE FEES RELATED TO CIVIL ENGINEERING STAFF ANALYZE THE CHARGE FOR CIVIL PROJECTS AND COMPARE THAT TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS AND OUR FEES WERE DETERMINED TO BE LOWER.

>> BRAGER: ANYONE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS?

WE DIRECT STAFF TO DO WHAT YOU'RE DOING ACCORDINGLY.

>> THANK YOU, ITEM 33

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

REQUEST THAT THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS INTRODUCE AN ORDINANCE TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF THE STANDARD DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH MICHAEL CUSSIC JUNIOR AND HEATHER CUSSIC AND DOUGLAS JAMES FOR A DAYCARE CENTER.

>> BRAGER: INTRODUCE THE ORDINANCE TO BE HEARD -- APRIL 22ND.

>> AT 1:00 PM.

ITEM 34 IS A REQUEST THAT THE BCC INTRODUCES AN ORDINANCE TO BE ON THE 22ND AT 1:00.

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

THAT THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS INTRODUCE AN ORDINANCE TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF THE STANDARD DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH NEVADA STATE BANK FOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT DURANGO AND AIRBY A COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION.

>> BRAGER: INTRODUCE THE ORDINANCE TO BE HEARD APRIL 22 AT 1:00.

>>.

>> ITEM 25, ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE MAP RECLASSIFYING PROPERTIES THROUGH VARIOUS ZONE CHANGE APPLICATIONS ON MARCH 4, 2004 TO BE HEARD ON THE 22ND AT 1:00.

>> BRAGER: I INTRODUCE THE ORDINANCE TO BE HEARD AT APRIL 22.

>> NEXT THREE ITEMS ARE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.

>> ITEM 36 IS TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP RECLASSIFYING PROPERTIES THROUGH VARIOUS ZONE CHANGE APPLICATIONS AND ACCESSORS BOOK 140, 161, 163, 177, AND 2 2.

>> BRAGER: IS THERE ANYONE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK ON ITEM 36 OR BE HEARD? HEARING NO ONE.

WE WILL -- 36--

>> 37 HAS SOME CHANGES.

>> BRAGER: ITEM 36 WE WILL INTRODUCE THE ORDINANCE.

>> THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING.

>> BRAGER: NO ONE IS HERE TO HEAR.

WE ALREADY DID THAT PART.

DON'T TRY TO CONFUSE ME.

O WITH YOU -- WE NEED A MOTION TO ACCEPT IT.

WE HAVE A MOTION ON ITEM 36, CAST YOUR VOTE.

THE MOTION PASSES.

>> ITEM 37 ORDINANCE 205-09 AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP RECLASSIFYING PROPERTIES APPROVED THROUGH THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ON ZONE CHANGE APPLICATIONS FEBRUARY 4, 2009.

WE HAVE SOME READ INTO THE RECORD.

>> UNDER ZC111-08 ON THE THIRD PARAGRAPH REPLACE LOTS ONE THROUGH FOUR. PARCEL MAP 34, WITH LOTS 104 FILE 37 PAGE 89 IN THE SIR PARAGRAPHS REPLACE LOTS ONE THROUGH FOUR.

PARCEL MAP FILE 67 PAGE 82.

WITH LOTS 2-4 A PARCEL MAP FILE 67, PAGE 82.

AND THE ASSESSORS PARCEL REPLACE 163-36-701-08-THROUGH 11 8.

>> WITH 3-701 THROUGH 025 THROUGH 028.

>> BRAGER: THAT WAS VERY GOOD.

A PUBLIC HEARING.

IS THERE ANYONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ON ITEM 37?

>> BRAGER: WE NEED A MOTION OR ANY QUESTIONS.  
THERE'S A MOTION FOR ACCEPTANCE.  
CAST YOUR VOTE.  
MOTION PASSES.

>> ITEM 38 ORDINANCE

[READING ORDINANCE NUMBERS INTO THE RECORD]

TO RECLASSIFY PROPERTIES APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
THROUGH ZONE CHANGE APPLICATION ON FEB 8, 2009.

>> BRAGER: ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC.

THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING THAT WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ON ITEM 38.

SEEING NONE ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

APPROVAL ON 38.

CAST YOUR VOTE.

>> BRAGER: MOTION PASSES.

THANK YOU SO MUCH.

THIS IS THE TIME FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK.

IF YOU WOULD STATE YOUR NAME.

YOU WILL HAVE THREE MINUTES.

>> AS YOU KNOW MY NAME IS MARGARET COLEMAN.

I AM 57 YEARS OLD.

I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THAT OUT LOUD.

I HAVE BEEN HERE NUMBERS OF TIMES.

I'M STILL A HOMELESS VICTIM DUE TO THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD MEMBERS.

I HAVE STRESSED THAT I'M NEEDING REIMBURSEMENTS CONTINUOUSLY FROM LANES  
AND FROM -- FROM LIENS AND COURT ORDERS.

I HAVE ISSUED IT.

I WANT TO SPEAK ON THE ITEMS 83, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL AUTHORITY  
AUTHORIZE DETERMINE TO SIGN AND CORRECT -- TO SIGN THE CORRECTION OF THE  
2005-2006 THROUGH 2008-2009 SECURE AND THE 2007, 2008, AND 2008-2009  
UNSECURED WHAT IS THIS -- ASSESSMENT ROLL.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT IS AR 0407-09-7 AND ORDER THE CONTRADICTION TO BE  
MADE.

NOW I'M MAKING THAT POINT, BECAUSE I WOULD LIKE MY ORDER TO BE HONORED AND  
CORRECTION TO BE MADE.

I KNOW I'M NOT SPEAKING DIRECTLY TO YOU.

I'M TIRED OF WALKING.

I WOULD LIKE TO STRESS THAT POINT.

I'M A HOMELESS VICTIM.

I HAVE EARNED MY RIGHTS TO RECEIVE.

AND I THINK THAT YOU ARE ALL VERY UNFAIR.

I'VE BEEN RIPPED OFF WEEKLY \$2.1 BILLION HIM AND JOE NEAL, I WOULD LIKE TO  
POINT THAT OUT.

WELL YOU SPOKE WITH JOHN RALSTON ON TV.

I DID HEAR THAT INFORMATION.

THAT WAS CONTINUOUSLY FUNDING.

I FEEL AS THOUGH THAT IS MY MONEY.

I WANT TO THE ASSESSORS OFFICE.  
I HAVE GIVEN THE BOARD, YOU ALL INFORMATION TO RESEARCH, DO STUDIES.  
MONEY WAS COLLECTED, 400,000.  
I DID STRESS THAT.  
I LEFT A LETTER IN THE OFFICE.  
SOMETIME JUST BEFORE YOU CAME BACK FOR THIS MEETING YESTERDAY.  
APRIL 7, AND HOPEFULLY YOU LOOK AT AND VIEW IT AND UNDERSTAND THE SERIOUS  
MATTER OF MY STANDARD OF LIVING.  
I HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES.  
I HAVE CHILDREN.  
I HAVE IS A GRANDSON THAT'S RUNNING WILD.  
IF YOU ARE ALL COLLECTING WHAT I AM SAYING, MONEY WAS CLIPPED FROM ME.  
LOANS FROM BROKERS, AGENCIES -- FROM REAL ESTATE PROPERTIES.  
PEOPLE THAT'S PUTTING IN DEEDS OF TRUST.  
THEY'RE RIPPING ME OFF OF MY TRUST FUND OF \$250,000 THAT WAS PLACED THEN.  
AT THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS--  
>> I'M JUST STRESSED OUT.  
I NEED THE MONEY.  
>> BRAGER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS TODAY.  
>> I ASK YOU ALL TO CORRECT THE DECISIONS AND MAKE SOME ARRANGEMENTS FOR  
ME TO HAVE MONEY, BECAUSE SOCIAL SECURITY IS NOT FLYING ME ENOUGH.  
>> BRAGER: WE APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENTS BUT THE TIME HAS BEEN A LOT THE.  
>> IT IS REALLY A STATEMENT OF FACT.  
>> BRAGER: IS THERE ANYONE ELSE THAT WISHES TO SPEAK THIS AFTERNOON?  
SEEING NONE.  
STAFF THIS MEETING ADJOURNED.