



**togetherforbetter**

## ***Board of County Commissioners***

**Clark County, Nevada**

Tick Segerblom, Chair  
William McCurdy II, Vice Chair  
April Becker  
Jim Gibson  
Justin Jones  
Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick  
Michael Naft

---

The Board of County Commissioners of Clark County, Nevada met in recessed regular session in full conformity with law and bylaws of said Board at the regular place of meeting in Clark County, Nevada, on Wednesday, November 5, 2025:

CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER  
COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
500 S GRAND CENTRAL PKWY  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SEC. 1. OPENING CEREMONIES .....	3
CALL TO ORDER.....	3
SEC. 2. PUBLIC FORUM.....	3
SEC. 3. AGENDA .....	5
SEC. 4. ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS 4 THROUGH 17 .....	7
SEC. 5. NON-ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS 18 THROUGH 45 .....	25
SEC. 6. APPEAL .....	72
SEC. 7. INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES .....	72
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	73

## SEC. 1. OPENING CEREMONIES

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Vice Chair McCurdy II with the following members present:

**Commissioners Present:**

William McCurdy II, Vice Chair  
April Becker  
Jim Gibson  
Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick  
Michael Naft

**Absent:**

Tick Segerblom, Chair  
Justin Jones

**Also Present:**

Robert Warhola, Deputy District Attorney  
Sami Real, Director, Comprehensive Planning  
Antonio Papazian, Manager, Development Review  
JaWaan Dodson, Assistant Manager, Development Review  
Lynn Marie Goya, County Clerk  
Nancy Maldonado, Deputy Clerk  
Emily Casimiro, Deputy Clerk

## SEC. 2. PUBLIC FORUM

### 1. Public Comment

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Good morning, Zoning Commission meeting will come to order. This is the first time set aside for public comment. Is there anyone wishing to come down at this time? I do have a few cards here with me. Please come down, and state your name, and the item that you're speaking on. I have cards here for [Items] 10, 11, and 12, but we'll get to that soon. Ms. Real.

**SAMI REAL**

And then I believe there's also a card for Item 4.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

So, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask, I know that there are some new people in the audience. And so, maybe we could explain to them that there are items after [Item] 17 that will be a public hearing. They can speak then or they can speak now. And then maybe kind of go through it for them, because I don't want them to speak now but then have other questions, and we typically don't let them speak again. So, maybe we could explain that to them and also talk about the holds.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Okay. If you're here on any item on the agenda, Items 18 through 45, you can either speak when we have the public hearing or you can come down now. If you're in here on Items 4 through 17, those are on consent. If you would like to speak on those items now, please come down if you're here for Items 4 through 17. Welcome.

**TOMMY LOPRESTI**

Morning, Commissioners. It's Tommy Lopresti. We were just hoping to pull Items 10, 11, and 12 off the consent agenda to be heard separately if possible.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

I believe Commissioner Jones has asked that those be held, has he not?

**SAMI REAL**

So, we didn't get a hold for Items 10, 11, and 12. Those were on routine. Staff was supporting them. It is up to the Board of County Commissioners if you wish to pull those off of the routine action item portion of the agenda or hear the testimony now.

**TOMMY LOPRESTI**

And to be clear, I'm sorry, we're supporting it. I know normally we come up here with our—

**MICHAEL NAFT**

If that's the case, maybe it'd be appropriate to do that at this time. You can speak during the first public comment on those items.

**TOMMY LOPRESTI**

Okay. It's just for clarification on the application itself. So— Oh, you want me to talk about it now? Okay. So, here's the applicant. Just our concern, again, as neighbors of our Dean Martin RNP (Neighborhood Protection) [Overlay], we're excited to welcome them to the neighborhood. It's a Maverik gas station. They've been phenomenal with working with us. They've went out of their way to have additional neighborhood meetings to talk about it. They have some conditions they were going to read in that were kind of last-minute that we met on last week. So, we just wanted to confirm that those get read in so we can be proactive. And one major issue that I'm not sure who would answer it, but there was a mention, and I think it was just a miscommunication, that Dean Martin Drive in that area is an arterial road. Which as we know would add different plans to off-sites and development for the project. But it's since been down—I'm not sure when.

**PAM KAISER**

Years ago.

**TOMMY LOPRESTI**

Yeah. But years ago, it was downgraded to a collector road. So, we just wanted kind of confirmation and to have it read in that Dean Martin is in fact a collector road, not an arterial, so that we don't have any issues with further projects down the road.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Perhaps it might be best since this is the first time set aside for public comment, at the Chair's discretion, he can maybe continue through public comment and then allow anything specific to this item to continue.

**ROBERT WARHOLA**

And then Commissioner Naft, I think just pull this one off routine.

**TONY CELESTE**

Yes, sir.

**ROBERT WARHOLA**

I think that's the best thing to do.

**TONY CELESTE**

That sounds good. Thank you.

**STEVEN CHRISTMAS**

Hi. Good morning. Just wanted to get some clarification on Items 19 through 23. Are those being held until the [November] 19, or will those be heard today?

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Those will be held.

**STEVEN CHRISTMAS**

They will be held until the 19?

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Yes. And please state your name for the record.

**STEVEN CHRISTMAS**

Yeah, my name is Steven Christmas, 7000 Glencoe Harbor Avenue.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**STEVEN CHRISTMAS**

Thank you very much, Commissioner McCurdy II.

**ELIAS GEORGE**

Morning, Vice Chair. Attorney Elias George, 5940 South Rainbow Boulevard, requesting that Item 4 be held for public comment and discussion.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We got it. Anyone else wishing to come forward at this time? We're going to get to that in just a second. All right, seeing no more public comment, we'll turn it over to Ms. Real.

## SEC. 3. AGENDA

2. Approval of the Agenda After Considering Requests to Add, Hold, or Delete Items. (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**SAMI REAL**

The second item is the approval of the agenda after considering any additions or deletions of items. Staff has the following requests:

Hold to the November 19, 2025, Zoning meeting:

- Item 19, PA-25-700036
- Item 20, ZC-25-0571
- Item 21, WS-25-0573
- Item 22, PUD-25-0572
- Item 23, TM-25-500142
- Item 32, PA-25-700038
- Item 33, ZC-25-0590
- Item 34, VS-25-0591
- Item 35, WS-25-0592
- Item 36, TM-25-500150
- Item 42, WS-25-0557

Hold to the December 3, 2025, Zoning meeting:

- Item 37, ZC-25-0661
- Item 38, UC-25-0662

The above public hearing items are going to be open as a public hearing and immediately recessed until the dates as previously stated. With these deletions, which are Items 19 through 23, 32 through 38, and 42, the agenda stands ready for your approval.

### **MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**

(Inaudible)

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We have a motion by Commissioner Naft. Please cast your vote.

### **VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft  
**VOTING NAY:** None  
**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Jim Gibson , Justin Jones  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

### **3. Approval of minutes. (For possible action)**

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**SAMI REAL**

The third item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes. The minutes of the October 8, 2025, Zoning meeting are ready for approval.

## **MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**  
(Inaudible)

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We have a motion by Commissioner Naft. Please cast your vote.

## **VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Jim Gibson , Justin Jones

**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

## **SEC. 4. ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS 4 THROUGH 17**

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

### **SAMI REAL**

Next are the routine action items which consist of Items 4 through 17, except for Items 4, 10, 11, and 12 will be pulled and heard separately. These items may be considered together in one motion and are subject to the conditions listed with each agenda item. In addition, staff has the following requests:

- Item 6, AR-25-400066 (UC-22-0081): Remove the time limit to review.
- Item 14, WS-25-0674: Add conditions to read, waiver of off-sites approved for Leavitt Street and Waite Avenue, NDOT (Nevada Department of Transportation) approval required from Moapa Valley Boulevard, and drainage study with future development.

If there are no objections, the public hearing is now open, and the routine action portion of the agenda stands ready for approval.

## **MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**  
(Inaudible)

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We have a motion by Commissioner Naft. Please cast your vote.

## VOTE

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft  
**VOTING NAY:** None  
**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Jim Gibson, Justin Jones  
**ABSTAIN:** None

### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

#### 4. DR-25-0630-KHW 625, LLC & MARRIOTT CORP LEASE:

HOLDOVER DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed parking garage on 3.83 acres in a PF (Public Facility) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-60 & AE-65) Overlay. Generally located south of Kitty Hawk Way and west of Paradise Road within Paradise. JG/jud/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

#### Comprehensive Planning

- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time and application for review; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

#### Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance.

#### Department of Aviation

- Applicant is required to file a valid FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" with the FAA, in accordance with 14 CFR Part 77 and comply with all requirements of any and all determinations, or submit to the Director of Aviation a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" and request written concurrence from the Department of Aviation (DOA).
- If applicant does not obtain written concurrence to a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement," then applicant must also receive either a Permit from thePage 1 of 23 Director of Aviation or a Variance from the Airport Hazard Areas Board of Adjustment (AHABA) prior to construction as required by Section 30.02.26B of the Clark County Unified Development Code. Applicant is advised that many factors may be considered before the issuance of a permit or variance, including, but not limited to, lighting, glare, graphics, etc;
- No building permits shall be issued until applicant provides evidence that an unexpired "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation" has been issued by the FAA or a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" has been issued by the DOA;



- Applicant is advised that the FAA's determination is advisory in nature and does not guarantee that a Director's Permit or an AHABA Variance will be approved; that FAA's airspace determinations (the outcome of filing the FAA Form 7460-1) are dependent on petitions by any interested party and the height that will not present a hazard as determined by the FAA may change based on these comments; and that the FAA's airspace determinations include expiration dates.
- All cranes and temporary equipment will require separate FAA airspace determinations that provide "Determinations of No Hazard to Air Navigation" and a finding of no significant impact on aircraft activity at Harry Reid International Airport (Airport). A Crane/Temporary Equipment plan that includes the separate FAA airspace determinations must be submitted and approved by the DOA (airspace@lasairport.com) prior to the issuance of building permits.
- Incorporate exterior to interior noise level reduction into the building construction as required by Code for use.
- Applicant is advised that the Federal Aviation Administration will no longer approve remedial noise mitigation measures for incompatible development impacted by aircraft operations, which was constructed after October 1, 1998, and funds will not be available in the future should the owners wish to have their buildings purchased or soundproofed.
- Applicant must submit a plan to the DOA (airspace@lasairport.com) for review and approval addressing lighting, solar panels, illuminated signage, and reflective surfaces with potential to impact aviation safety. The plan must include a reflectivity (glare) analysis demonstrating that no significant impact on aircraft activity will occur at Airport. All exterior lighting must be dimmable or otherwise adjustable, with the capability to implement modifications if requested by the DOA or the airlines. Building permits shall not be issued until the DOA Airspace Manager has approved the plan, which may include additional conditions necessary to mitigate glare or reflection hazards to aviation.
- Applicant must prepare a proposed Wayfinding / Signage plan for the DOA's review and approval (landuse@lasairport.com), before building permits can be issued. Applicant must coordinate with and comply with all requirements of Public Works regarding proposed signage within public rights-of-way. The Wayfinding / Signage plan shall show the location of all proposed signage located on public and private Airport roads, sign sizes, sign panels, structures, and denote any power requirements for illumination. The purpose of the plan is to ensure that signage facilitates safe and efficient traffic circulation, prevents driver confusion, and maintains clear routing for emergency responders accessing Airport facilities, including the east side fuel farm.
- Applicant must provide a traffic study (including, but not limited to, Traffic Demand Estimates, Queuing Analysis, 3-Point Turn evaluation, Traffic Mitigation measures, and Traffic Impact Analysis) prepared by a Nevada Registered Engineer with appropriate experience in traffic engineering for the DOA's review and approval, prior to the issuance of building permits (landuse@lasairport.com). Applicant must comply with the recommendations of the traffic study and with any additional requirements imposed by the DOA to mitigate project-generated impacts. Based on the traffic study, the DOA may require Applicant to enter into a cost sharing agreement for the maintenance of private Airport roadways to account for added traffic generated by the project.
- Prior to the issuance of building permits, applicant must demonstrate that emergency response times to the east side Airport fuel farm Fire Department Connections (FDC) are not degraded by project-generated traffic.
- Drainage study and compliance. Submit for DOA review (landuse@lasairport.com) and approval, prior to the issuance of building permits.

- Applicant must establish its own independent connections to public utilities necessary for the project at its sole cost. This includes metered connections to public water and sewer. Any utility alignment(s) across Airport property must be submitted to and approved in writing by DOA (landuse@lasairport.com). At DOA's discretion, the necessary easement(s) may be granted, which shall not be unreasonably withheld.
- Applicant must prepare and submit for DOA (landuse@lasairport.com) review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits, a barrier plan for the western perimeter of APN 162-27-301-009. Applicant must construct the approved barrier (e.g., wall, boulders, bollards) which must include a vehicle crash mitigation rail designed to withstand a Department of Defense K-rating of K12 (15,000-pound vehicle at 50 miles per hour). This requirement is necessary to provide crash protection for the adjacent Airport fuel farm and to mitigate risks to critical aviation infrastructure due to increased traffic generated by the project.
- Applicant must erect 6 foot high decorative fencing around the remainder of the parcel, excluding the above-mentioned barrier and ingress/egress points, to prevent free access of those on foot onto Airport roadways and walking paths and maintain secure boundaries adjacent to fuel farm and Airport operational areas.
- Applicant must revise the building plan to enclose the northern section of the garage to match the western portion of the garage to prevent line of sight to the airfield.
- Applicant must construct solid wall(s) along the western and northern perimeters of the parking garage roof level to eliminate any physical view of the existing aviation fuel tanks and the airfield, subject to FAA airspace determinations that provide "Determinations of No Hazard to Air Navigation" and DOA approval of design. This is required to enhance safety and security by reducing visibility and targeting risks to critical fuel storage and airfield operations. DOA (landuse@lasairport.com) will consider alternative screening methods if they achieve equivalent levels of safety and security mitigation.
- Applicant must preserve existing fire access to the Airport's east side fuel farm.
- Due to the enhanced traffic created by the project and proximity of the project to secure Airport areas, Applicant shall provide 24/7 onsite security patrols or other security measures approved by DOA Security. Applicant must provide to the DOA Security team (landuse@lasairport.com) direct phone numbers for security and onsite property management.
- Applicant is advised that the project site is a private parcel and will not receive Airport-based emergency services. Emergency response will be provided by the appropriate municipal emergency service providers with jurisdiction. Applicant is responsible for ensuring that site access, circulation, and security measures are designed to accommodate timely response by those providers.
- Due to the close proximity of the project to secure Airport areas and Airport operations, Applicant must work with the DOA Security team (landuse@lasairport.com) to develop, review, and approve a safety and security plan prior to the issuance of building permits, as it pertains to Airport security to include: camera placement, camera type, camera fields of view, procedures for Airport access to video footage in the event of an emergency, safety, or security incidents, and video preservation, storage and retention protocols.
- Prior to the issuance of building permits, applicant must provide a construction plan (landuse@lasairport.com) demonstrating they are able to construct the project on its property (including the temporary laydown area) without encroaching onto Airport property.
- Design review as a public hearing for signage and lighting plan will be required, which may require additional Determinations of No Hazards, Permits from the Director of

Aviation or Variances from the AHABA, and/or reflectivity (or glint and glare) analysis.

- Applicant must obtain and comply with all permits, approvals, and authorizations required for the project's commercial uses, whether issued by the DOA or other applicable regulatory authorities, prior to commencing such operations.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Does not appear to meet fire code access requirements. Applicant is advised that fire/emergency access must comply with the Fire Code as amended.

*(Trailed and heard after Item 18)*

**SAMI REAL**

And Commissioners, if we can go back to Item 4.

- Item 4, DR-25-0630. Holdover design review for a proposed parking garage on 3.83 acres in a PF (Public Facility) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-60 & AE-65) Overlay. Generally located south of Kitty Hawk Way and west of Paradise Road within Paradise.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Welcome.

**BOB GRONAUER**

Good morning, Commissioners. My name's Bob Gronauer, 1980 Festival Plaza Drive. I'm here representing Item 4. I represent the applicant and property owner that is requesting for the parking garage. I know there's some opposition here, but I just want to give you a quick overlay to correct some things that has been mentioned to the press, and has been mentioned out there. Number one, as you know, if you drive to the airport or use the airport, there is no parking. There is a parking issue over there at the airport. I know that I travel many times a month at the airport and it's like a coin flip trying to find some parking. This location here is planned, and zoned, and able to come through with a design review for a parking garage.

We have worked with the airport despite what you may hear on record today. That is why the Department of Aviation (DOA) is not here in opposition. They are in support of this application. A matter of fact, Commissioner Gibson and my client, and then I have also met with the airport several times to go through the application and the conditions that are put on the application that's before you. You're going to hear about security today. Just quickly, today as the site sits, it's less secure than the application that's before you with the conditions that would be put on this application. So, as we go through this, I'd like to have some additional time to address any other questions that come up. But in the meantime, please recognize the fact that your staff is recommending approval. This is on the consent agenda. The DOA is not here in opposition because we sat down and worked with them and all the issues that are going to be brought up have been addressed with the DOA. So, I'm here to answer any other questions, but I'd like some additional time after the opposition speaks.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Please state your first, last name, and address for the record.

**ELIAS GEORGE**

Good morning, Vice Chair. Elias George, 5940 South Rainbow Boulevard. I'm here on behalf of my client who is a 45-year veteran pilot who has spent his entire career flying in and out of airports across the country. He understands aviation safety better than most. His concern about the proposed public parking

structure being located less than just a hundred feet away, which is maybe six, seven car lengths away from the airport's open fuel farm is justified because we don't have a public safety analysis or review yet. I understand Mr. Gronauer, and I respect his comments as it relates to working with the DOA as they should. The problem is that those decisions are being made behind closed doors and in a vacuum and outside of the public forum. So, when we have, and the fact that staff is making a recommendation of approval conditioned on the subsequent safety review of the DOA, that's the concern.

When you have a project of this magnitude located within a high-sensitive, high-risk corridor, and we are seeking approval before an independent safety evaluation is being known and made public so that you, the representatives, can make that analysis known, that's when concerns arise. The delegation of that supervisory authority to a non-elected administrative agency scraps transparency, and more importantly, manufactures a great deal of questions. Now, this is not, this improper procedure is not scholastic subterfuge or some abstract process or principle. These are real and operational risks, and the potential hazards that you have given its proximity to a fuel farm, as well as to the flight paths are well known. And when you have either laser or glare risks to pilots, potential visual risk to air traffic controllers, as well as potential for fires and explosions, those need to be stated and known on the record with an independent analysis and review.

And I'd just like to give you three quick examples, and I know I have a minute left, and I may go a minute over with your discretion if I'm allowed. I'd just like to give you three brief examples. Number one, over this past weekend, there was a 5,000 gallon jet fuel spill at the airport. That necessitated the emergency response of almost 20 different emergency personnel. That tells you this is a real and active risk. Number two, we also understand, and many of us have driven by the Ivanpah Solar Facility. Federal agencies for years conducted their own internal independent analyses that were conducted without a public review that determined that the solar flare to pilots was a minimal risk. Here, there are potential for solar panels on the roof of this garage. It wasn't until after the construction of those solar panels, after pilots like my client spoke out against that, that it wasn't until then that we realized the devastating effect that that had on air traffic safety and control.

And in fact, the U.S. Department of Energy conducted their own independent investigation through Sandia Laboratories. And the last example I would give you, which is very important, is the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) long five-year certification process of the 737, Boeing 737-8 MAX. That five-year certification process happened outside of the public corridor, was an administrative delegated authority, and it resulted in congressional hearing and the inspector general issuing a report stating, and I'll quote, "Excessive FAA delegation eroded FAA oversight effectiveness and the safety of the public." And we are only asking not for a closed process and an open tragedy. What we are asking for is simply for an open process and to ask that safety be secured. Invite the applicant to bring these investigations from the DOA so that you, our elected representatives, can adequately vet that and not unfairly delegate that to an administrative agency blindly. Thank you very much.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. All right. Seeing no one else, we'll close the public hearing. Oh, we have one more. Public hearing is still open.

#### **MICHAEL PARK**

Michael Park, 13 Hummingbird Lane, Henderson, Nevada, 89014. I do agree with the applicant that we're in dire need of additional parking at the airport. Likewise, I agree with Mr. George that this project does have inherent safety risks being as close as it will be to the jet fuel farm and high-pressure fuel line. It seems to me that too little consideration has been paid to these inherent risks to date, and certainly not out in the open in a way that we've been able to scope the true risks. Situating these up against the jet

fuel pipeline and fuel farm not only create potential safety risks, but I'd like to look at the risks to our economy. Anytime that we have a situation where tourism is impaired, Clark County families suffer. A full 31% of our county's GDP (Gross Domestic Product) comes from tourism and the airport brings 58 million passengers annually.

So that airport is our single most important leg to our economic table. While it is true that we need additional parking, I would suggest that we not be shortsighted in our rush to accept this solution without properly understanding its potential permanent threats that it creates to our economy, especially when other safer solutions easily could be made to exist nearby.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**ALEX VARONIS**

Thank you. Welcome. Morning, Commissioners. My name's Alex Varonis, 8791 Alta Drive. I'm also here as a concerned citizen, and I share in the concerns of Mr. George and the gentleman who just spoke. Forgive me if there's a little bit of overlap with the things that they've already said. My ask is simple. I'm asking also to please pull this item and require an independent safety and security risk assessment before any approval is made, first concern being proximity and scale. This is a six-story parking fly, sited directly beside the airport's east side fuel farm, as has been stated. That siting concentrates three risks in one spot: a high occupancy public structure cycling thousands of vehicles with hot engines, gasoline, lithium-ion batteries; an elevated platform with direct sight lines into the fuel tanks and secure operations; and added traffic on the same service roads fire uses to reach the fuel farm.

I'm obviously not an expert, but common sense says you probably don't want to cluster ignition sources, vantage, and emergency access pinch points next to a fuel farm, but fortunately, the experts tend to agree. The DOA wrote that the design presents numerous safety and security concerns, including, as I mentioned, elevated direct line of sight into the tanks and secure areas, and warns that glint and glare, as Mr. George said, from roof deck solar this close to the active runways can create a hazard for pilots. I think flying planes is hard enough. I don't think we need to make it any harder. Personally, I was a UNLV (University of Nevada, Las Vegas) grad. I lived a block from Route 91. On October 1, I had friends and coworkers that were injured that day. I think given that event and others like it in today's climate, there are no more sobering words than direct line of sight, and that should give us all pause. I also found out that the October 1 investigators later confirmed that two of the rifle rounds actually did strike an airport jet fuel tank and one even penetrated it. Thankfully, no injuries happened from that, but we all know the tragic results of that day.

On October 1, the line of sight was effectively unavoidable, but in the case of this garage, I think it would be a shortsighted policy choice that would leave our citizens vulnerable. I don't mean to be alarmist, but it doesn't really take a very sophisticated plot to imagine how somebody could access this vantage point and plan to do great harm to lots of people. We already mentioned the recent infrastructure risk earlier this month with the Clark County Fire Department (CCFD), the fuel spill. Thankfully, again, there were no injuries, no flight disruptions, but again, it's a reminder that these fuel infrastructure incidents happen in real life. They're not just in theory.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**ALEX VARONIS**

Thank you. Thank you very much.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

There is no one else. We'll close the public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Gibson.

**JIM GIBSON**

Mr. Gronauer, do you have an opportunity here to, or you have an opportunity to respond to some of that. Would you please be as detailed as you can about it?

**BOB GRONAUER**

Yeah. Number one, what has been brought up and which is a legitimate concern is safety and security. The one thing that I wanted to mention, as I mentioned in the beginning of my presentation, is this property today already has an active business on that property. Anybody in this room can drive to that property today and can do whatever they want without the security, without the 20-something conditions that the DOA is putting on this application. So, the concern that's being raised about this project, respectfully, this group of people who are out here in opposition should be here much earlier and concerned about what's happening there today. They should also be concerned about Sunset Road. I travel Sunset Road once a week. There are thousands of cars, I'm one of them, that watches the airplanes come down and leave. There are hundreds of people sitting in the parking lot there taking pictures and doing the things of the concerns that they're afraid of what may happen on our property.

So respectfully, from a security standpoint, there are more things going around that airport that you should be concerned about than an application that has been vetted with the DOA. We're going to get through with the FAA. We've worked with your planning staff. We've worked with the Commissioner's Office. This application has been vetted. It has conditions. This is no different than any other project that is adjacent to the airport. And I know, Commissioner Gibson, you have the other project. We had the hotel project that there was a list of conditions by the airport also who had concerns. There's other projects adjacent to the airport. When we come in and represent those developers, we are meeting with the airport and going through these conditions. So, if anything, the word out there today is the county and the DOA is doing a good thing today because if this project gets approved, it will be more safe in this area than what you're dealing with today with the concerns that are being brought up.

So, this is compatible and harmonious, as I said it is. Also, it's a need. The airport understands there's a need for parking, and if you use the airport at Harry Reid International, you will understand that this parking garage definitely will fulfill a need in this area. So, with that being said, we'd ask you to approve the application with the conditions that are imposed by the DOA and your Clark County Planning staff, and we can move on from there.

**JIM GIBSON**

Thank you. This one has been one that has gotten a lot of attention, not just from the folks that are here today, but from the county and from the DOA. Our office has spent a lot of time trying to evaluate what we imagine the concerns would be, and we've been guided in some respects by our discussions with the DOA. As we've gone through the process, there were 24, I think it's 24 conditions that were imposed by the DOA. And those conditions will, if something comes up that validates a concern that can't be mitigated, those conditions will result in derailing the construction of a parking garage. I really think that this is the most extensive DOA response I've seen. Even the item you mentioned a few minutes ago didn't get this kind of attention. I think everything is in. We have everything before us. It's all, I think, available to the public. Sami, is there anything that has not become a part of this record that we're missing that we were hoping to get in before we had this hearing today?

**SAMI REAL**

Not that I'm aware with. We had also consulted with the CCFD, and they've reviewed the DOA conditions as well and concur. So, they'll want to see some additional things just as the DOA does in their safety and security plan and in their emergency response plan as well.

**MOTION**

**JIM GIBSON**

So, a safety and security plan will have to be developed. It'll have to meet with the approval of the DOA experts. These are not just people who sit at a desk over there and get rounded up by lot. The reality is that they're highly trained people. Their whole objective is to protect the public and the workforce that is at that airport. I think under the circumstances, the right thing to do is to approve this item. It will then go into the kind of study that on various levels of various items that it must go through. And when it comes out the other end, it will be a safe project or not a project. So, at this point, I'm prepared and I do offer a motion to approve the item subject to the approved conditions that have been imposed in the report.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

There's a motion for approval. Cast your vote.

**VOTE**

<b>VOTING AYE:</b>	William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft
<b>VOTING NAY:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

**BOB GRONAUER**

Thank you very much and have a good day.

**JIM GIBSON**

Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

5. SDR-25-0657-KOVAL LANE HOSPITALITY, LLC:

SIGN DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) increase the area of electronic message units, video; 2) increase the number of electronic message units; and 3) increase the height of a directional sign in conjunction with an existing casino and hotel (Ellis Island) on 5.29 acres in a CR (Commercial Resort) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-60) Overlay. Generally located east of Koval Lane and north of Rochelle Avenue within Paradise. JG/md/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

### Comprehensive Planning

- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

### Public Works - Development Review

- 30 days to coordinate with Public Works - Design Division and submit separate document if required, for dedication of any necessary right-of-way and easements for the Koval Lane widening improvement project;
- Said dedication must occur prior to issuance of building permits, concurrent with the recording of a subdivision map, OR within 30 calendar days from a request for dedication by the County.
- Applicant is advised that signs are not permitted within the right-of-way.

#### 6. AR-25-400066 (UC-22-0081)-GREENGALE PROPERTIES, LLC:

HOLDOVER USE PERMITS THIRD APPLICATION FOR REVIEW for the following: 1) recreational facility; 2) sale of produce/crops not grown on-site; 3) allow customers on-site; 4) farmer's market; 5) allow live entertainment; 6) food processing; 7) retail sales and services; 8) major training facility; and 9) allow temporary outdoor commercial events without a timeframe limit and extended hours.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) reduce the separation of proposed live entertainment from a residential use; 2) alternative landscaping along all property lines; 3) allow existing landscaping adjacent to Elkhorn Road; 4) allow alternative landscaping adjacent to a less intense use; 5) eliminate landscape finger islands; 6) waive on-site loading requirements; 7) reduce parking; 8) allow alternative paving; and 9) waive full off-site improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, streetlights, and partial paving).

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) recreational facility; and 2) finished grade in conjunction with a proposed recreational facility on 24.72 acres in an RS40 (Residential Single-Family 40) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located south of Elkhorn Road and west of Rainbow Boulevard (alignment) within Lone Mountain. MK/my/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

### Comprehensive Planning

- Remove the time limit.

### Fire Prevention Bureau

- Provide a Fire Apparatus Access Road in accordance with Section 503 of the International Fire Code and Clark County Code Title 13, 13.04.090 Fire Service Features;
- Applicant to show fire hydrant locations on-site and within 750 feet.
- Applicant is advised that fire/emergency access must comply with the Fire Code as amended.



7. ET-25-400096 (WS-23-0107)-GROUP XIII PROPERTIES LP:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME for the following: 1) modified driveway design; and 2) alternative landscaping along a street.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) office/warehouse; 2) finished grade; and 3) alternative parking lot landscaping on 8.7 acres in an IP (Industrial Park) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-75, AE-80, & APZ-2) Overlay. Generally located north of Cheyenne Avenue and west of Marion Drive within Sunrise Manor. MK/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Until June 21, 2027 to commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time.
- Applicant is advised a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the County has adopted a rewrite to Title 30 effective January 1, 2024, and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

8. UC-25-0659-RMMJ, LLC:

USE PERMIT for a mini-warehouse.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) modify Maryland Parkway Overlay standards; and 2) allow an attached sidewalk to remain.

DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed mini-warehouse facility on a 0.55 acre portion of 3.98 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone within the Maryland Parkway Overlay. Generally located east of Maryland Parkway and south of Reno Avenue within Paradise. JG/md/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Appropriate land use application is required for the art plan, and art shall be installed prior to Certificate of Completion;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Reconstruct any unused driveways with full off-site improvements;
- Driveway on Reno Avenue to be gated for emergency access only;
- Vacate any unnecessary rights-of-way and/or easements.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other fire apparatus access roadway obstructions.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0109-2022 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

9. ZC-25-0646-NITE OWL, LLC:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 0.66 acres from an RS3.3 (Residential Single-Family 3.3) Zone to a CG (Commercial General) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-65) Overlay. Generally located south of Naples Drive and west of Paradise Road within Paradise (description on file). JG/gc (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Department of Aviation

- Incorporate exterior to interior noise level reduction into the building construction as required by Code for use.
- Applicant is advised that the Federal Aviation Administration will no longer approve remedial noise mitigation measures for incompatible development impacted by aircraft operations, which was constructed after October 1, 1998; and that funds will not be available in the future should the owners wish to have their buildings purchased or soundproofed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that the CCWRD is unable to verify sewer capacity based on this zoning application; to find instruction for submitting a Point of Connection (POC) request on the CCWRD website; and a CCWRD approved POC must be included when submitting civil improvement plans.

*(Companion Items 10, 11, and 12)*

10. ZC-25-0652-ROOHANI KHUSROW FAMILY TRUST ETAL & ROOHANI KHUSROW TRS:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 5.00 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Silverado Ranch Boulevard and east of Dean Martin Drive within Enterprise (description on file). JJ/gc (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEMS 11 AND 12).**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0167-2026 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

## SAMI REAL

Since Item 4 was pulled off routine, however, Commissioner Gibson will be a little late to the meeting. I'd like to move to Items 10, 11, and 12 first.

## WILLIAM MCCURDY II

Yes.

## SAMI REAL

So, with that, Item 10.

- Item 10, ZC-25-0652: Zone change to reclassify 5.00 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Silverado Ranch Boulevard and east of Dean Martin Drive within Enterprise.
- Item 11, VS-25-0654: Vacate and abandon easements of interest to Clark County located between Gary Avenue (alignment) and Silverado Ranch Boulevard, and Dean Martin Drive and Sultana Street (alignment) within Enterprise.
- Item 12, DR-25-0653: Design review for a proposed gas station and retail store on a portion of 5.00 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Silverado Ranch Boulevard and east of Dean Martin Drive within Enterprise.

## WILLIAM MCCURDY II

Welcome.

## TONY CELESTE

Good evening, Mr. Chair, Commissioners. My name is Tony Celeste, address 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, here on behalf of the applicant and property owner, Maverik. As you can see from our aerial, the site is highlighted here in yellow. It's about 5 acres located on the northwest corner of I-15 and Silverado Ranch here.

There are two major components to this application. The first is a conforming zone change. As you can see right here, again, our site is labeled site. The 5 acres, it is planned, the corridor mixed use. However, the underlying zoning is still the RS20. We're asking to go to a Commercial General or CG zoning. It does conform to the master plan. It is along a major arterial in Silverado Ranch and I-15, and we do appreciate staff's recommendation of approval on the zone change portion of it.

With respect to the design review, we are proposing a convenience store with gas pumps. The proposed development is really for the southern 2.5 acres with a future development to be on the northern 2.5 acres. You can see the convenience store will be located right here along the off-ramp and then access to the site will be along Dean Martin here, and we will have the gas or fuel pumps located in this area.

As you heard a little bit earlier in the public hearing, we did have a couple of neighborhood meetings with respect to this. Most recently we did meet with a group of neighbors a week ago from Monday and went over some additional conditions with respect to this request. I appreciate the neighbors meeting with us.

I appreciate their support. And at this time, I'd just like to read in a couple of the additional conditions that we'd like to have added to this application.

The first is we do not have any signage associated with this request, so we have agreed as a design review, as a public hearing was required for signage. The second condition is that, as I mentioned right here, the zone change is for the entire 5 acres to go to CG, but the proposed development itself is only for the bottom 2.5. So, we have agreed as a second additional condition that a design review as a public hearing for the north undeveloped portion of the site. So, we'll come back in as a public hearing showing plans for that. And then the final condition is that we have agreed to, with respect to Dean Martin, that we'd only have one curb-cut on Dean Martin. Also, it is already a condition of approval, but I do want to make sure the neighbors hear, because it was important, that these two developments will have to have cross-access. And so, it's already in the approved conditions and we do agree to that.

One of the final things that we did agree to is on our elevation— you can see this is the elevation of the Maverik store. Originally, we had submitted this canopy elevation. You can see we had this bright red trim. The neighbors asked if we could do something to make it a little bit more low-key. So, we said of course, not a problem. And we have now submitted, and we've provided this to staff, a revised elevation for the gas canopy to make it more earth-tone colors. That was submitted to staff, so they do have that. So, I do want to make sure the neighbors saw that.

Finally, as referenced, we do show Dean Martin as designed to an 80-foot right-of-way. So, what we're doing is dedicating our 35 feet, and then we're going to have our detached sidewalk running along Dean Martin. So, we'll have the 5 feet of landscaping, 5 feet of sidewalk, and additional 5 feet of landscaping. So, we've designed it to a collector standard and 40 feet on our side. Again, I appreciate the neighbors meeting with us and really supporting this application. And of course, we do agree with all the conditions of approval and ask that those three additional ones I read in be part of this as well. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time who's already not spoken? Welcome.

**PAM KAISER**

Hi, my name is Pam Kaiser. I reside at 3485 Vicki Avenue, 89139. I just would like to reiterate what Tony said. We are in support of it. The one thing, there was some confusion at the TAB (Town Advisory Board) meeting and with the owners of the property, was somehow the county was telling them that Dean Martin was an arterial road. It is a collector road. I pulled this map off of the county website showing that Dean Martin is a collector road, and we just want to make sure that this doesn't happen because there were people from the county there that did not correct it at the TAB meeting. So, please get that read into the record. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Naft.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess we'll start at the end. JaWaan, do you want to confirm that Dean Martin is a collector?

**JAWAAN DODSON**

Thank you, Commissioner. Yes, Dean Martin is a collector. It is an 80-foot-wide right-of-way. Those are classified as collectors. Arterials are 100 to 120 [feet], so the right-of-way width generally dictates what the characteristic of the road is. But Dean Martin is a collector.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Great. Thank you very much. We'll let the record reflect that. I'm going to go ahead and move for approvals, but I'm going to reiterate the conditions that were just read into the record. Those approvals will be with signage as a public hearing. The understanding that the future development to the north will have to go through a design review as public hearing. Well, the application will be conditioned to one curb-cut on Dean Martin, and it is already conditioned that there be cross-access to the parcel to the north. And then if I could just confirm from Planning that we have received the revised elevations?

**SAMI REAL**

We have received the revised elevations.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

So, the approval today will also reflect that revised elevation with the more muted color scheme. Mr. Celeste, your client understands all that?

**TONY CELESTE**

We understand all that and agree to it. Thank you.

**MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Okay. Then my motion with those conditions just read into the record is for approval of Items 10, 11, and 12.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

There's a motion. Cast your vote.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Jim Gibson , Justin Jones

**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

11. VS-25-0654-ROOHANI KHUSROW FAMILY TRUST ETAL & ROOHANI KHUSROW TRS:

VACATE AND ABANDON easements of interest to Clark County located between Gary Avenue (alignment) and Silverado Ranch Boulevard, and Dean Martin Drive and Sultana Street (alignment) within Enterprise (description on file). JJ/mh/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEMS 10 AND 12).**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Satisfy utility companies' requirements.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the order of vacation must be recorded in the Office of the County Recorder or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Grant any necessary easements;
- Right-of-way dedication to include a 54 foot property line radius at the southwest corner of the site, 35 feet to the back of curb for Dean Martin Drive and associated spandrels;
- Said dedication must occur prior to issuance of building permits, concurrent with the recording of a subdivision map, OR within 30 calendar days from a request for dedication by the County;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the dedication to back of curb and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control devices;
- Vacation to be recordable prior to building permit issuance or applicable map submittal;
- Revise legal description, if necessary, prior to recording.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- No objection.

12. DR-25-0653-ROOHANI KHUSROW FAMILY TRUST ETAL & ROOHANI KHUSROW TRS:

DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed gas station and retail store on a portion of 5.00 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Silverado Ranch Boulevard and east of Dean Martin Drive within Enterprise. JJ/mh/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEMS 10 AND 11).**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Design review for signage;
- Design review for the north undeveloped portion of the site;
- Coordinate cross access with the northern portion of the site if the northern portion is approved for and constructed with a similar commercial use with consistent level of intensity;

- Enter into a standard development agreement prior to any permits or subdivision mapping in order to provide fair-share contribution toward public infrastructure necessary to provide service because of the lack of necessary public services in the area;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

#### Public Works - Development Review

- One commercial driveway allowed on Dean Martin Drive for the entire site;
- Drainage study and compliance;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;
- Grant any necessary easements;
- Right-of-way dedication to include a 54 foot property line radius at the southwest corner of the site, 35 feet to the back of curb for Dean Martin Drive and associated spandrels;
- Said dedication must occur prior to issuance of building permits, concurrent with the recording of a subdivision map, OR within 30 calendar days from a request for dedication by the County;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require dedication to back of curb and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control devices.
- Applicant is advised that Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) permits may be required.

#### Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0167-2026 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

#### 13. ZC-25-0673-HARDY GLEN & SHIRLEY FAMILY TRUST 1989 & HARDY SHIRLEY ANN TRS:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 20.57 acres from an RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80) Zone to an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone. Generally located west of Moapa Valley Boulevard and south of Waite Avenue within Moapa Valley (description on file). MK/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

#### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

##### Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) – Engineering

- Applicant is advised that there is an active septic permit on APN 041-22-301-017; to remove the septic system in accordance with Section 17 of the SNHD Regulations Governing Individual Sewage Disposal Systems and Liquid Waste Management; and to submit documentation to SNHD showing that the system has been properly removed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that the property appears to have an existing septic system; to contact the Southern Nevada Health District with regard to modifying existing plumbing fixtures; location of existing public sanitary sewer is greater than 400 feet from the parcel; upon approval of change in use of the property and if connecting to public sanitary sewer, CCWRD requires submittal of civil improvement plans and estimated wastewater flow rates to determine sewer point of connection.

14. WS-25-0674-HARDY GLEN & SHIRLEY FAMILY TRUST 1989 & HARDY SHIRLEY ANN TRS:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) waive full off-site improvements; and 2) eliminate the drainage study in conjunction with a proposed minor subdivision on 20.57 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone. Generally located west of Moapa Valley Boulevard and south of Waite Avenue within Moapa Valley. MK/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Waiver of off-sites approved for Leavitt Street and Waite Avenue;
- NDOT approval required for Moapa Valley Boulevard;
- Drainage study with future development;
- Right-of-way dedication to include 30 feet for Leavitt Street and associated spandrel.

Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) - Engineering

- Applicant is advised that there is an active septic permit on APN 041-22-301-017; to remove the septic system in accordance with Section 17 of the SNHD Regulations Governing Individual Sewage Disposal Systems and Liquid Waste Management; and to submit documentation to SNHD showing that the system has been properly removed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that the property appears to have an existing septic system; to contact the Southern Nevada Health District with regard to modifying existing plumbing fixtures; location of existing public sanitary sewer is greater than 400 feet from the parcel; upon approval of change in use of the property and if connecting to public sanitary sewer, CCWRD requires submittal of civil improvement plans and estimated wastewater flow rates to determine sewer point of connection.



15. ORD-25-900645: Conduct a public hearing on an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with AMH NV 4 Development, LLC for a single-family residential development on 2.04 acres, generally located east of Torrey Pines Drive and north of Levi Avenue within Enterprise. JJ/dw (For possible action)

**ACTION: ADOPTED (ORDINANCE 5309; EFFECTIVE 11/20/2025).**

16. ORD-25-900701: Conduct a public hearing on an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Richmond American Homes of Nevada, Inc for a single-family residential development on 2.14 acres, generally located west of Giles pie Street and north of Wellspring Avenue within Enterprise. MN/dw (For possible action)

**ACTION: ADOPTED (ORDINANCE 5310; EFFECTIVE 11/20/2025).**

17. ORD-25-900803: Conduct a public hearing on an ordinance to amend the official zoning map reclassifying certain properties as approved by the Board of County Commissioners on November 18, 2015, January 3, 2024 and August 6, 2025. (For possible action)

**ACTION: ADOPTED (ORDINANCE 5311; EFFECTIVE 11/20/2025).**

## SEC. 5. NON-ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS 18 THROUGH 45

18. MPC-25-0332-MOAPA NORTH VILLAGE, LLC:

CONCEPT SPECIFIC PLAN for a mixed-use master planned community on 2,046.9 acres in an RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80) Zone, an RS40 (Residential Single-Family 40) Zone, an RS5.2 (Residential Single-Family 5.2) Zone, a CG (Commercial General) Zone, an H-2 (General Highway Frontage) Zone, an IL (Industrial Light) Zone, an IH (Industrial Heavy) Zone, and a PF (Public Facility) Zone. Generally located north of Interstate 15 and east and west of State Highway 168 within Moapa. MK/hw/cv (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

#### Comprehensive Planning

- Town Center existing Master Plan land use categories of Corridor Mixed-Use and Entertainment Mixed-Use are to be maintained;
- North Village existing RS80 zoning district is to be maintained;
- Agricultural Overlay to be developed for the North Village;
- Hidden Valley Master Plan land use category to be Business Employment;
- South Village total number of single-family dwelling units is not to exceed 618;
- PFNA/RISE reports to address lighting standards and impacts to dark skies;
- The parks and trails section of the PFNA/RISE reports to address off-highway vehicle, hiking, and equestrian trails;
- And the Geotechnical section of the PFNA/RISE reports to contain a naturally occurring asbestos assessment.
- Applicant is advised that a Specific Plan needs to be submitted in one year or the application will expire unless extended with an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of

time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

#### Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage Study with future development;
- Nevada Department of Transportation concurrence will be required;
- If the streets within the development are to be public, they must be built in accordance with all County standards, including Clark County Code and Uniform Standard Drawings;
- The traffic study shall determine the minimum required number of travel lanes for each street section;
- Any proposed street, which crosses a U.P.R.R. facility, shall have approval of the railroad;
- Developer may be required to provide the County with a maintenance yard for storage of signs, streetlights, road maintenance materials, and equipment, the location and size of the yard is dependent upon the amount of public infrastructure constructed by the development, a yard of sufficient size as determined by the County, must be provided prior to the County's maintenance of any streets.

#### Fire Prevention Bureau

- Provide a Fire Apparatus Access Road in accordance with Section 503 of the International Fire Code and Clark County Code Title 13, 13.04.090 Fire Service Features;
- Applicant to show fire hydrant locations on-site and within 750 feet.
- Applicant is advised to show on-site fire lane, turning radius, and turnarounds; and that dead-end streets/cul-de-sacs in excess of 500 feet must have an approved Fire Department turn-around provided; to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other fire apparatus access roadway obstructions; and that when installing streets using "L" type curbs, a minimum of 37 feet wide is required, back of curb to back of curb; and that if using rolled curbs, minimum 39 feet widths are required, from back of curb to back of curb.

#### Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email [sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com](mailto:sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com) and reference POC Tracking #0540-2024 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

#### **SAMI REAL**

And then I'd like to move on to Item 18 and continue to trail Item 4 until Commissioner Gibson arrives. So, Item 18.

- Item 18, MPC-25-0332: Concept specific plan for a mixed-use master planned community on 2,046.9 acres in an RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80) Zone, an RS40 (Residential Single-Family 40) Zone, an RS5.2 (Residential Single-Family 5.2) Zone, a CG (Commercial General) Zone, an H-2 (General Highway Frontage) Zone, an IL (Industrial Light) Zone, an IH (Industrial Heavy) Zone, and a PF (Public Facility) Zone. Generally located north of Interstate 15 and east and west of State Highway 168 within Moapa.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Welcome.

## DAVE BROWN

Good morning, Commissioners. Dave Brown, 7201 West Lake Mead Boulevard, Las Vegas, here on behalf of the developer. Before you is the concept-specific plan for Moapa West, which is a 2,046 acre master plan development in Moapa generally located at the intersection of Highway 168 and Interstate 15. The development of Moapa West is going to be a long process, as you already know, but I want to make sure the neighbors hear this, that this is the first step of a lot of steps, the concept-specific plan, where we're looking at things from just the master plan level and from a land use perspective. We're looking at places where we could put industrial, where we could put commercial, where we could put high-density housing and obviously low-density housing. In other words, this is a 30,000-foot level of the development of Moapa West.

The next step, if this was approved, we'd go onto the specific plan where we actually address about 13 different studies called the Public Facility Needs Assessment (PFNA). Those studies would be the Water Supply Report, the Wastewater Treatment Report, the Transportation Report, the Geotechnical Report, the Flood Control and Drainage Report, Fire Protection and Emergency Services Report, Police Services Report, Educational Services, Neighborhood Economic and Employment Reports, Park Trails, Federal Lands, Desert Conservation Program, and Air Quality and Water Quality Reports.

The Planning Commission also conditioned the following reports be added to the PFNA, which are lighting standards and impact to dark skies. The parks and trails section to address off-highway vehicles, hiking, and the equestrian trails. And also add to the geotechnical report that we address naturally occurring asbestos in that assessment.

During our neighborhood meetings, TAB meetings, and Planning Commission, we heard from the Moapa residents they had concerns about drainage, and traffic, and obviously about densities. And we plan to address all that in the next step, which is the specific plan when we have to do all those reports. We committed to meeting with the residents during that report process. So, as we're doing the drainage studies, because there's particularly a lot of angst about the drainage in this area. We'll meet with the neighbors as we're going through that drainage study, so they understand how it's being prepared and also with the traffic studies how that's being prepared. And they also asked us specifically to address access to North Village, which is the northern piece here. Whether there'll need to be in a secondary roadway to service North Village. And so, we plan to put that in the traffic report as well. Also, they had issues or worries about the water to service the area. So, in the water report we'll keep them involved as well.

That being said, this concept-specific plan, we have eight different areas that we're addressing. The North Village, which is in the yellow. The Industrial Center, which is the light blue. You'll see the Inland Port, which is the dark blue area. Hidden Valley in the orange. Commercial Center, which is red. Town Center, which is pink. The South Village, which is in the purple here. And Industrial Center South, which is a cyan color.

Specifics to these different planning areas, North Village, it's noted that we aren't asking for any changes to the existing land use. So, we are including the concept-specific plan, but we're not asking for any changes to the land use in North Village. In Industrial Center, the northern and western portions, they're already established as Business Employment (BE) and IL zoning. On the southern portion, it's an existing land use of mixed agricultural (AG), Outlying Neighborhood (ON), Edge Neighborhood (EN), and Ranch Estate Neighborhood (RN), and we're asking that to be changed to Business Employment and IL.

In the Inland Port, it's existing EN. We're asking it to go to BE land use. Hidden Valley, it shows on this map EN that we're asking to go to Mid-Intensity Suburban Neighborhood (MN). I think we're going to

have some discussion about that shortly. So, I'll leave that one as floating. And Commercial Center, which is the red here, it's 44 acres. Its existing land use is ON. We're asking to change that to Corridor Mixed-Use (CM).

In Town Center, it's existing ON and CM. We're asking that to go to MN, noting that we will put a 100-foot buffer along the western boundary and any boundary that abuts existing residential. And that will be a 100-foot Open Lands (OL) buffer. In South Village, that's going from the western and southern portions are quarter CM to MN, and that also will have a 100-foot OL buffer adjacent to the existing rural agricultural. And then finally on the industrial south, we're changing that from ON and RN, to BE.

So, again, just to reiterate, this is the very first step of this, which we're just looking at a 30,000-foot level at the master planning. And if this is approved, we intend to come back with all those studies, include the neighbors in those studies, and then we'll be back in front of the TAB, Planning Commission, and Board of County Commissioners (BCC) again for that next step, which is the specific plan. And I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll close—oh.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

No, we have people. And they may need a handheld microphone, too.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Please come forward.

**MARCUS JENSEN**

Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Marcus Jensen. I live at 5409 North Moapa Valley Boulevard in Moapa Valley, and I'm a property owner in the Moapa Township. I and many of my neighbors have tried to engage with the developers on the proposed Moapa West mixed use development ever since the project was first revealed at a meeting of the Moapa TAB on May 13, 2025. Unfortunately, thus far our ability to work with the Moapa West developers has been more frustrating than successful. At the May TAB meeting, I offered three foundation statements as an introduction to the whole topic of development in Moapa Valley.

One, our small community needs some development to stimulate economic opportunity, build economic strength, and provide more jobs for residents. Two, it is unrealistic and ultimately unwise for us residents to seek to stop all growth in our community. And three, property owners have the right to develop their property as long as that development is consistent with previously established and approved land use plans and zoning designations. And as long as that development does not unfairly or unconstitutionally take property values from some property owners for the benefit of others.

These statements of principle apply not only to the Moapa West proposal, but also to all other development projects that might arise. This includes the proposed massive industrial cement project in Moapa Valley that has been brewing for four years now, and which was a topic of the Planning Commission agenda last night. In order for residents to apply these principles, and in considering our position for or against any development proposal, we residents need the opportunity for cooperation with the developer proponents. And I'm sorry to report that that doesn't seem to be what's provided from the Moapa West developers as of this point in time. They say they are interested, but they don't act like they're interested in cooperating with us.

At the October 7 Planning Commission meeting, on this Moapa West proposed concept-specific plan, the Planning Commissioners noted the unusually incomplete nature of the plan. And repeatedly and even sternly encouraged the developer to engage in more active and intense collaboration with existing residents on their development concepts. We residents and property owners are willing, even anxious to have that collaboration. Other than the details of roads, drainage, water supplies, and so on that has just been mentioned, there are two main issues of concern for us.

One is the incompatible mix between the existing densities of the communities up near the North Village in this area. And the other is the substantial increase in the amount of industrial development and industrial zoning that's proposed. Over 800 acres of new industrial zoning is proposed by Moapa West developers here and here. That's non-conforming changes to the master plan. In addition, this is piggybacking on a significant additional non-conforming zoning for the cement project here and here. So, these massive changes in our industrial designations are of significant concern for us. Thank you for your time.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Maybe you could leave that map up there, Mr. Jensen, so others could see it as they're going forward. But if I can— And Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind folks that we can only talk about the Moapa West project here today. I know there's another project, but the lawyers will remind us that today what's before us is the Moapa West, so if we could stick to that, that would be helpful.

**JESSICA PARKER**

Good morning, Commissioners. I appreciate the difficult decisions you face in balancing growth with communities—

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

You've got to state your name for the record.

**JESSICA PARKER**

My name is Jessica Parker, 725 North Henry Road in Moapa Town. I'm here today regarding MPC-25-0332. The Planning Commission reduced the residential unit count by 65% from 5,690 to 2,000 units. Commissioner Stone's recorded concern that the original count quote, "cannot be supported", provides a clear finding that the application contains significant challenges. However, reducing unit count does not address the underlying legal conflicts. My review indicates continued inconsistencies with six subsections of NRS 278.250, 3 Title 30 provisions, and 16 master plan policies.

Mr. Brown referred to angst about drainage in the community because the application places approximately 1,037 acres, more than half of the project within FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) flood zones adjacent to the Muddy River and Meadow Valley Wash. Second, land use conversion conflict. The proposal eliminates 536 acres of agricultural land, 426 acres of low-density residential, while expanding industrial designation from 278 to 1,094 acres. This appears inconsistent with the master plan policies preserving Moapa's rural character, and I've circled the decreases and underlined the increases in this visual.

Third, we talk about community impacts. Full build-out would increase Moapa's population from about a 1,000 residents to over 14,000. The North Village's 2,652 units would use Henry Road as the only access

point funneling traffic past Perkins Elementary School right here on the corner. This road currently serves approximately 95 homes and 8 family farms. Beyond these concerns, there are two points regarding the application's acceptance criteria. One is that the applicant listed is Moapa North Village, LLC. I am unable to locate as of this morning in the Nevada Secretary of State Records any entity registered under this name. Does the named applicant have legal standing to submit this application? Two, Title 30.06.03 requires all parcels to be contiguous. The developer's own maps, which, pardon the orientation, show that the parcels are not contiguous.

Commissioners, the facts are clear. Approval would require you to make legal findings that contradict the application itself and are inconsistent with established law. I respectfully urge you to deny MPC-25-0332. Denial honors the legal framework you are sworn to uphold and protects the community that depends on your stewardship. Thank you for your service and this opportunity to be heard.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**JESSICA PARKER**

Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Please come forward. State your name, and last name, and address for the record.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Mr. Chairman, you do have someone to the right.

**LYN REN**

My name is Lyn Ren. I live at 1340 Isola in Moapa. I want to talk about drainage. You call it "drainage". Out there we call it "flooding". Since 1906—This is from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In 1906, 1907, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1919, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1928, 1934, 1935, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1945, 1946, 1960, 1981, 1998, 2005, 2010, and 2014, those are the flood events that we've had in Moapa. That's from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

In 2014— We'll start with 2005. That's at the end of my street, the end of Isola. That's on the Meadow Valley Wash. That was my neighbor, who is a surveyor. I asked him to take some measurements. That was a mile wide, 80 feet deep, and it ran for three months. It looked like the Mississippi River. It was absolutely gorgeous. This is Interstate 15 at Glendale, just right above Glendale in 2014 flood. More recently. This is out in the Hidden Valley area. This is where 811 homes are proposed and that watermark is over 6 feet. That was just a couple of years ago. And that's Maggie. I lost her in 2023 in a flood. It was only 14 inches deep. It knocked her off her feet. Floated her around out in the back fields, and she had to be euthanized, so I couldn't save her, but that was only 14 inches of flooding. So, my concern is certainly for public safety and I think that's it. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**SALLY WIRTH**

Hi, I'm Sally Wirth. I live at 975 East Gadianton Avenue, Moapa. My main concern is the North Village housing density. At present, Moapa is a rural community consisting mostly of outlying neighborhoods, one dwelling for 2 acres. In a letter of April 23, 2025, from Phelps Engineering to Comprehensive Planning, they say, "Moapa West will capitalize on the opportunity to sustainably grow Moapa while

protecting and respecting the rural character that makes it unique." Out of the 730 plus residential acres proposed by Moapa West, there are zero acres allotted for ON, zero acres for EN, and only 11.8 acres of RN. Aside from those 11 acres, the rest is low [Low-Intensity Suburban Neighborhood (LN)] and Mid-Intensity Suburban [Neighborhood] (MN). Very little of anything rural in there. Within the Las Vegas Valley, the Rural Neighborhood Preservation areas are designated [RNP]. Maximum of two dwellings per acre. Why should rural Moapa be any different?

The master plan in place since only 2021, has very clear goals and policies for developing Unincorporated Clark County, including: reinforcing the rural character of established communities and townsites; enhance the quality of development by ensuring the design and intensity of new development is compatible with established neighborhoods; and adopt compatible development by transitioning densities with larger lots, and clustering higher intensity away from the shared edge. The concept plan for Moapa West North Village fails these entirely. I would ask that Moapa West adjust the housing densities in North Village and have a better transition zone from the current housing to their LN and MN. Moapa can grow and still respect its rural character. The master plan tells us how. Many people work numerous hours to develop it and let's not ignore it. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**ROBERT DREYFUS**

Good morning, Robert Dreyfus, 455 South Austin Drive, Moapa. I just offer the following for the Commissioners to consider exactly what Moapa West master plan is calling for. In their proposal, they're asking for 5,690 units, over 2,046 acres. That would translate roughly to 22,760 new residents and the current residents of Moapa, which is about 1,060. That would represent a 2,240, so 2,240% increase. This massive influx would transform the quiet rural community into a densely populated area, potentially straining local resources and altering the traditional lifestyles. Just so you have an idea for comparison, so Moapa's density is 59 people per square mile and that's over a 17.9 square mile area. The density would change if the plan went forward. As it stands, that would be 1,307 people per square mile, adding if you considered all the residents, which would be 22,820. For context, that's double the density of nearby Mesquite.

Mesquite's population was 24,500 people in a 31.8 square mile, so about 770 people per square mile and the affected area at Moapa only represents about 56% of Mesquite's land size, amplifying the overcrowding concerns. We know that with residential developments, infrastructure tends to lag and so such growth would overwhelm existing structures. Can include narrow rural roads prone to congestion. Underfunded schools which may not accommodate all the new students that we would expect to see. Limited water resources and emergency services like fire and police that are currently skilled for small population. This isn't planned sustainable expression. It's a potential crisis for things that come later. I'd also ask the council to consider enforcing legal protections under NRS Chapter 278, specifically 278.0177, which defines RNP requiring at least 10 residential dwelling units, a maximum density of two units per acre, and provisions for non-commercial animal keeping criteria that Moapa squarely meets making it, eligible for these safeguards under urban sprawl. Thank you for your consideration.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**LINDY OMER**

Good morning. My name's Lindy Omer. I live at 1012 East McKnight Avenue in Moapa. I am right about here, that's where our farm is. We're Meadow Valley Farm. I urge you to deny this application. I would

like to give some good information that I would like to see the developers withdraw their application and rethink and reconsider. And I got some really good ideas and they're not mine, but they're very good and I'm sure they would be very useful.

My credentials include that my residence in Moapa since 1981 where my husband and I raised nine children. In January 2009, we moved on to establish and own and operate 20 acre Meadow Valley Farm. For the past 16 years, we have lived the daily discipline of farming, raising pigs, goats, chickens, and year-round produce. Our neighbors, Blake and Kessa Stratton leased a major portion of the 20 acres and have alfalfa and pasture for their livestock. I am speaking from experience and invested energy. I love Moapa. I love it. With an attitude of peaceful diplomacy, I submit this proposal to the developers to consider. And I sent a letter about this to them, and I sent one to Commissioner Kirkpatrick.

On October 8 and 9 of 2025, we rallied with over 200 farmers from all over America and Washington D.C. We visited our Nevada congress and senate representatives to discuss current farming issues and legislation. During the gathering, we heard from several successful American meat farmers who utilize regenerative practices in raising their beef, pork, chicken, sheep, and goats. The pigs root, the chicken scratch, and the cows, goats, and sheep graze as nature intended. These animals produce better and more meat because they live longer, happier lives. This is the model of sustainability.

Here are some examples. Let's see. Joel Salatin, Polyface Farm, the face of regenerative farming. We heard from him, we see his farm. In neighboring Utah, Sunnyside Up Pastures has Utah's best beef. They're on 500 acres and they raise meat. I again suggest that the proposal is denied until the developers will listen to us and do things that would be better for all of our community, and them, and you. We could be a food oasis in the food desert of Southern Nevada. We could help provide a lot of good things for people. Thank you.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Kirkpatrick.

#### **MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for coming out. I want to start with a little bit of history first. So—and I believe that this may have where the concept plan started. So, in 2011, long before I was here, the Riverview project was put into play years and years ago, right. And so, what happened with that is they never finished this specific plan, and I got to assume because there's infrastructure issues and all these other things. So, I believe that the developers started with that and the whole idea of a concept planned, here's what I wish could have happened and I see going forward should happen, right. So, in Clark County in the more urban parts of Clark County, people just come in, and they develop one 20-acre parcel and don't think about the whole enchilada, right? What's going to happen? And that's within their legal limit that they can do that.

We work in District B, and I hope that you all know no one's more agricultural friendly than myself. I'm the biggest supporter of 4H (Head, Heart, Hands, and Health) out there. I support all the animals what they do. And I feel like maybe that's got lost in the conversation. You guys think I've changed? I have not. But I do wish that the residents can come to the table. But what we ask the developer to do, not do hodgepodge zoning, give us a plan so that we can start with. We up here don't see a lot of concept plans. We just don't because it's easier, faster, and less painful to just go in and do it one time and zone 20 acres at a time. You guys should know me better than that. I'm not that kind of person. I do agree with you that there are some issues in North Village. Sally and Lyn, you'll remember that we were on a Zoom call, and I committed to doing an agriculture overlay, right.



It's not changed from that. My word is good. I've always said I would do that. And two, that we would protect the two-acre parcels. Now within the North Village, there are quite a few RS80, which is one house per two acres. We don't want them to change that. We would not even support them even going down that road because that's not what we committed to. In between though, I really do need the residents to work with me consistently to finish that agriculture overlay. I just can't have a street. A concept plan is meant to really chart your future. What do you want to see? Do you want to see barn dominium type homes out there? Do you want to see more ranchette type homes out there? Do you want to— We all want to address the flooding. Nobody wants to address the flooding more than myself.

I put my boots on more than once and help people dig out their homes and their kitchens. But here's the problem. Last meeting, we approved the Moapa flood control. There is nothing on there for you all. There's not. And the only way to try and get some of that is to make the developers pay their fair share. I'm not afraid of the developers. I lose today, all the way around, one, because I've been on the phone so many times about this, my husband's mad at me, walking out the door this morning. The developers can't have everything they want and you also can't have— We got to figure out what's the compromise, right? And I think we're going to have a start of that today. So, what I would tell you, we can't go to Town [Advisory] Board (TAB) meetings. I don't go to them on purpose because one, everybody's mad, friendships are lost, and at the end of the day, I can do better in this building with my staff saying these are things that are important to people. How do we get there, right? And I wish the TAB could be a little bit better. I am going to have my legal attorney address because he did read Ms. Parker is saying you brought a lot of legal stuff in there, that I'm no attorney that he needs to address. But I do think that we got to have further discussions for Moapa today.

Moapa could never have 22,000 people. Mesquite is feeling terrible pains by having that many people, but I don't want the school to close because there's no kids that go to it. There's less than 150 kids that go to those schools. So, what's the balance? So, here's what I would like to propose and I'm not sure even the developers can agree with it because I didn't ask his input. I would propose that we— can you—Mr. Janssen's map. Can we put that up? That's probably the easy. I've had so many maps that I'm fatigued of them, but I'm going to propose some ideas and I'm going to notice from shaking of the heads or not. And then I'm going to ask my attorney to address some of the legal issues because I think they're important. I think North Village, too soon to talk about. I honestly think that that's a big portion of where I committed to Sally and Lyn of having an agriculture overlay so that we can protect those farmers over there.

Down at the bottom here, the ranch would have not been for sale if somebody wanted to farm it. I promise I tried. I tried to bring hydroponic people in. I tried to bring tomato people in. I didn't want the hemp farm. You didn't want the hemp farm. That was a form of agriculture, but it wouldn't have sold if there was a use for— We even tried cold-calling site selectors to see if they could come in and do some big agricultural components, hydroponically different things, and it was not possible. We couldn't find anybody. I'm looking at maybe Sally and Lyn, four or five years I've been trying to work on this out of my 10-year stint. We don't agree with the little orange piece there at the bottom. We don't like residential near industrial. It's just no good comes from it. People will never be happy. We would much prefer that to be BE or Light Industrial (IL), something along that way.

But we like the idea of an inland port because here's what I would tell you for those of you that don't know. Within Clark County, there's 4,000 acres that are part of a foreign trade zone. And my colleagues, I'm sorry, but I feel like this has all got to be said because it doesn't happen at the TAB meeting because people just are mad at each other. And maybe it can help educate some other folks of why Moapa is unique and special, but how can we do both. The inland ports, there is a need to our friends and a lot of you have friends in Lincoln County, White Pine County, all of that. And that is the only rail spur that it

could actually work. It will help your friends and your family in Lincoln County actually get products that they can't get today for a variety of reasons. It will help friends in Utah, Winnemucca also get— So, we like that industrial component of it because it helps that entire region as a whole.

We do have to approve some density today, but we don't believe it's in the best interest in the North Village. We think we need to keep our word, we need to continue to work with the folks out there that all want to work on that. And we think they could come back at another time when as you all said, you want the developer to work with you, so we do. And so, we think we could create something to protect our rural nature and to have some homes. I mean here's the other thing, I've heard for 10 years representing this area and truth is during redistricting, they asked me to give it up. And I said, "No. I'd rather take the browbeating from them once a quarter than give it up because I really want to preserve what we have out there because we have something special."

So, we do and have heard from you all for a long time that we need some commercial pieces. We agree with that. We also know that there's going to be some need for some NDOT (Nevada Department of Transportation) revisions on that interchange because that interchange can't handle any of it. And the other thing I would tell you is if it's commercial town center, the site selectors are going to say, "What's the easy access?" Now when I go to Utah in my home, I stop every time in Moapa, specifically at the gas station, been doing it for years. And I got to tell you, my husband gets irritated with me because the truth is it takes longer to get off, go around in a circle and come back. That's not going to help if we don't address that.

So, I do think that we could move forward with the bottom half of this, give them some density. Many kids are wanting to stay home. Many older folks are wanting to live out there, but they need some services. They're tired of moving to Vegas in a dense area when they would prefer to be out there. So, I do think— but understand what a concept plan is. A concept is what do we want to see? What is it— We can chart the course, but if we say no, no, no, they can chart the course. And when I'm not here, I don't know what you get. So, I'm trying to protect you because today what the master plan has a little over— Sami, if I'm remembering, it's a little over 10,000 units, right? For the entire master plan of that area?

**SAMI REAL**

For what they're proposing or what they would be allowed?

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

What they would be allowed.

**SAMI REAL**

It's greater than what they're proposing.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Right. So, we are trying to protect you to protect your rural area because the problem is in 2011 it got approved, it never got unapproved on the master plan. I specifically have gone out there five times with the master plan update only to sit in the gym by myself. Well, with my staff, but that's not helpful. So, I really want you to understand, I'm trying to help you to maintain what you have but have enough of growth along the corridor to have an economic engine.

I've been around long enough to when that coal plant closed, a lot of people lost their jobs. A lot of people had to move away. We have approximately 358 homes out there. I'm not asking to put 20,000 homes. That wouldn't be fair. But if I only have 358 homes and I do nothing to help keep those 358 families there, it's going to be like Ute Road. I don't know how many people call me and say, "What is Ute

Road? Where does it go to?" And I'm like, "I don't even know where it goes to." It's just a sign on the highway and I don't want that for you. And I'll ask the developer.

I want you to go do those reports because we need to see if it's even feasible, right? That's the problem. In 2011, it was too big of a heavy lift, and we need to know what's even plausible. We would like to ensure when you do those reports, we want a little bit more unique thing when it comes to police and fire. We'd like a joint facility for BLM (Bureau of Land Management), NDOT, OPD, all of those people where they could go in and have an office because the truth is when there is an accident on the freeway, when there's flooding, when there's anything, it locks people in a location. And we as public safety people can't even all get to one location to figure out what's the next best thing. So, and honestly, I think like Austin, Nevada, they have a joint large warehouse type facility where they can have an office for all those people so that they could be on-site to address those concerns. We also would like you to work with us on the agriculture preservation area that we've talked about.

And we want you to, we want to ensure that those public facility needs. So let me explain to the residents why that's a big deal. So PFNA is what we call them. You don't have to do them if you just go build five acres at a time. You don't even have to do them if you build 40 acres at a time. It generates pennies, right? Pennies on the dollar. It doesn't ever get you what you need. I get your list every year of your wants and needs. All of that should be included in the PFNA. And I can share that with you on a regular basis. Long-winded, but I think it's important that the residents, the rest of the constituents, the developer, know that we can have both and protect what we have. So, Rob, do you want to answer any of the legal stuff? Because I don't know all of those statutes by heart.

#### **ROBERT WARHOLA**

Yeah, the concept plan is the earliest stage of the process and does not give the applicant any right to develop. They have to go through the complete process, which includes a specific plan. Public facilities needs assessment that has to be approved, possibly a land use plan amendment which have to be approved, zone changes, and development agreements. And then, only then would they be able to go forward with any kind of development. The concept plan doesn't give any kind of entitlement or right to develop. Also, the proposals in a concept plan do not have to conform with the existing master plan designations. The whole point of it is to make a proposal, go through the process, and see if land use plan changes are warranted and zone changes are warranted. So, they do not have to conform with the land use plan designations.

#### **MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Okay, is everybody clear on that? I'm looking for some shaking of some heads. So, what we would like to do today is to— And I really have lost sleep over this because I can't believe you all thought that we would shove 22,000 homes in Moapa. That wouldn't be good for anybody. And after 10 years, I can't believe you didn't know me better than that, but so what we'd like to say today is the concept plan could move forward with the exception of no north valley, no North Village at this time today. And that should you come back with a modification and work with us on the agricultural overlay to protect and maintain those RS80 lots, which is two acres per one house. And then there's a piece on RS40 that are in there, which is one acre per one house, right? We'd like to protect that rule. And crazy enough, Mr. Brown is probably the second-biggest 4H and rodeo guy. So, he too doesn't want to change all of that agricultural stuff because he fights it off in his own neighborhood. Two, we are fine with Hidden Valley today. We know that there's only two trailers that are there today.

We're much better with it being BE, IL. It's one and the same. We think that's a better fit for that. The public facilities needs to address all of those studies that you have plus. And then we're okay with South Village having some density, which I think could be up to 618 units. But all of that's going to depend quite

frankly on whether or not you have the water, whether or not you have the infrastructure. And just for the residents, why this is so important that you stay engaged and we come up with something that works. This entire build out is not expected before 2051. I don't know about you, but I'm not going to be reading maps at that time in my life. So, I hope not. But we need to bring younger folks in so we're not redoing as we did with Riverview. Am I forgetting anything that I needed to address, Sami? So, the town center is going to stay, that's existing. Land use, so we're following that. The commercial, that's existing. Hidden Valley, I think, is the only one that we're significantly changing. And then excluding the North Village component until we can have more information, modification. We will work with you and the neighbors to get that agriculture overlay done as well as talk about what could really work. So, right?

**SAMI REAL**

Yes. I didn't know if you wanted them to be able to analyze what their PFNA, the possibility of additional density, if there are the appropriate services that are available and could be provided or not.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

I think that's a natural thing, right? It'll tell you through per test or water flow what you could have for the future.

**DAVE BROWN**

So, would you like us to address North Village and our PFNAs even though it's being excluded from the concept plan because we can do that?

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Yes.

**DAVE BROWN**

Okay. That way it's going to help. It's going to be easier to shape with the meetings with residents and you, Commissioner.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

But listen, we got to have meetings where we're not fighting, and yelling, and screaming over the top of everybody. And I will come to them, but if you start fighting, I'm going home because I'll drive 30 miles in peace as opposed to 10 minutes of fighting. So, anything else? Nope, that would—

**DAVE BROWN**

No, thanks. (Inaudible).

**MOTION**

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

That would be my motion, Sami. And I want to thank my colleagues for entertaining the history and what a concept plan is. We don't see a lot. I've been here 10 years, and this is only my second one that I've ever seen, but it's a better way to plan when you have large acres in my opinion. So that's my motion.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

All right, there's a motion. Cast your vote.

## VOTE

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft  
**VOTING NAY:** None  
**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones  
**ABSTAIN:** None

### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

### **DAVE BROWN**

Thank you. Appreciate it.

#### 19. PA-25-700036-USA:

PLAN AMENDMENT to redesignate the existing land use category from Mid-Intensity Suburban Neighborhood (MN) to Compact Neighborhood (CN) on 20.1 acres. Generally located north of Cactus Avenue and east of Buffalo Drive within Enterprise. JJ/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

#### 20. ZC-25-0571-USA:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 20.1 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to an RS2 (Residential Single-Family 2) Zone. Generally located north of Cactus Avenue and east of Buffalo Drive within Enterprise (description on file). JJ/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

#### 21. WS-25-0573-USA:

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for reduced driveway separation in conjunction with a proposed single-family residential subdivision on 20.1 acres in an RS2 (Residential Single-Family 2) Zone. Generally located north of Cactus Avenue and east of Buffalo Drive within Enterprise. JJ/jor/cv (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

#### 22. PUD-25-0572-USA:

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT for a 210 lot single-family residential development with modified development standards on 20.1 acres in an RS2 (Residential Single-Family 2) Zone. Generally located north of Cactus Avenue and east of Buffalo Drive within Enterprise. JJ/jor/cv (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

#### 23. TM-25-500142-USA:

TENTATIVE MAP consisting of 210 single-family residential lots and common lots on 20.1 acres in an RS2 (Residential Single-Family 2) Zone. Generally located north of Cactus Avenue and east of Buffalo Drive within Enterprise. JJ/jor/cv (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

24. ET-25-400092 (UC-20-0493)-5051 SLV, LLC:

USE PERMITS THIRD EXTENSION OF TIME for the following: 1) expand the Gaming Enterprise District; 2) a resort hotel; 3) public areas including the casino, showrooms, live entertainment, retail center, indoor and outdoor dining, entertainment, offices, conventions, back of house and parking structures; 4) associated accessory and incidental commercial uses, buildings, and structures; and 5) deviations from development standards.

DEVIATIONS for the following: 1) increase the height of high-rise towers; 2) encroachment into airspace; 3) reduce setbacks; 4) alternative landscaping; and 5) all other deviations as shown per plans on file.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) for non-standard improvements (landscaping) within the right-of-way; and 2) alternative driveway geometrics.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) a resort hotel with all associated and accessory uses, structures and incidental buildings and structures; and 2) finished grade on 4.68 acres in a CR (Commercial Resort) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-65) Overlay. Generally located on the east side of Las Vegas Boulevard South, 500 feet south of Russell Road (alignment) within Paradise. JG/al/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Until August 20, 2027 to commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time;
- Construction crane to be removed from the property within 30 days;
- Enclose the site with a solid 8 foot high wood construction fence;
- 24-hour manned security must remain until permanent perimeter fencing has received final inspection and only after final inspection of the fence is completed can the 24-hour manned security transition to 24-hour surveillance security;
- Work with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for the installation of security cameras and surveillance operation.
- Applicant is advised a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time and application for review; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; the County has adopted a rewrite to Title 30 effective January 1, 2024, and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

Department of Aviation

- The Applicant shall be required to file a valid FAA Form 7460-1 "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" with the FAA, in accordance with 14 CFR Part 77, or submit

to the Director of Aviation a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" and request written concurrence from the DOA.

- If the Applicant does not obtain written concurrence to a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement," then it must also receive either a Permit from the Director of Aviation or a Variance from the Airport Hazard Areas Board of Adjustment ("AHABA") prior to construction as required by Section 30.02.26B of the Clark County Unified Development Code. The Applicant is advised that many factors may be considered before the issuance of a permit or variance, including, but not limited to, lighting, glare, graphics, etc.
- No building permits will be issued until the Applicant provides evidence that a "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation" has been issued by the FAA and is still valid, or a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" has been issued by the DOA.
- The Applicant shall be advised that the FAA's determination is advisory in nature and does not guarantee that a Director's Permit or an AHABA Variance will be approved; that the FAA's airspace determinations (the outcome of filing the FAA Form 7460-1) are dependent on petitions by any interested party and the height that will not present a hazard as determined by the FAA may change based on these comments; and that the FAA's airspace determinations include expiration dates and that separate airspace determinations will be needed for construction cranes or other temporary equipment.

#### **SAMI REAL**

Next is Item 24.

- Item 24, ET-25-400092 (UC-20-0493). Use permits third extension of time for the following: expand the Gaming Enterprise District; a resort hotel; public areas including the casino, showrooms, live entertainment, retail center, indoor and outdoor dining, entertainment, offices, conventions, back of house and parking structures; associated accessory and incidental commercial uses, buildings, and structures; and deviations from development standards. Deviations for the following: increase the height of the high-rise towers; encroachment into airspace; reduced setbacks; alternative landscaping; and all other deviations as shown per plans on file. Waivers of development standards for the following: for non-standard improvements (landscaping) within the right-of-way; and alternative driveway geometrics. Design reviews for the following: a resort hotel with all associated and accessory uses, structures and incidental buildings and structures; and finished grade on 4.68 acres in a CR (Commercial Resort) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-65) Overlay. Generally located on the east side of Las Vegas Boulevard South, 500 feet south of Russell Road (alignment) within Paradise.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Good morning. Welcome.

#### **TONY CELESTE**

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Tony Celeste, address 1980 Festival Plaza Drive. I am here on behalf of Shopoff Realty. Along with me in the audience is Greg Gilbert. He is here on behalf of McCarthy Construction. As you can see, the site is highlighted here in yellow. It's about five acres located on the east side of Las Vegas Boulevard and south of the Russell alignment. Just a quick little background on the site. When this application was submitted, Shopoff and the entity related to Shopoff was the property owner and did timely submit this third extension of time. During the application review, the property did change hands from Shopoff to McCarthy Construction, so that's why you see both of us here tonight. However, or this morning. However, we are both here jointly representing this project and the request for the extension of time.

This project was originally approved in October of 2021. We worked a lot and diligently with the DOA. That resulted in five pages worth of conditions that you can see right here in the NOFA that was issued on October 18 of 2021. Since then, the developer at the time worked extensively with the DOA and had submitted all the security analysis reports and abided by these five pages of conditions that were listed in the approval. Since then, we then came back with an extension of time last year, it was our second extension of time. At that time, there was some additional conditions added to that application, namely that we were to make sure to provide our 24-month status report, which we did, that we had to on the backside, if you recall, there was a construction wall or there was a perimeter wall, security wall.

You see right here highlighted in yellow, that is a wall that is a security wall that is reinforced that was developed in conjunction with the DOA. We had left a back area open for construction access when construction was active. Because construction had stopped, the DOA and the County Commission had asked us to completely enclose and secure that wall. That was completed, and it is completely built today. We also placed an 8-foot wood fence around the site. That was completed. We've maintained the 24-hour security on the site, and we have continuously provided our 90-day status report per the performance agreement that we entered into. We also entered into the development agreement, which has been approved and recorded, as well as the performance agreement that I just mentioned. I think when you look at evaluating extensions of time, you really look, have there been change in circumstances in the area?

If anything, this corridor continues to trend towards supporting resort hotel, gaming enterprise district. You can see right here the former Tropicana site, which is now the A's Baseball Stadium, which is under construction. There's been a lot of news about a proposed hotel, resort hotel that will go around and be integrated into the baseball stadium. You have the tribe properties that have started to accumulate property in this area. So, everything is still trending towards that resort hotel, which makes this use still viable in our minds. As well as one of the other changes, we have a new property owner that is taking over the property right now and would like to continue with these entitlements. And hopefully at the end, Shopoff will be part of the development team with that.

So, as I mentioned, Shopoff and McCarthy are jointly representing this together, seeking this extension of time. We appreciate Paradise TAB review of this application. They did recommend approval for two years until August 20 of 2027. There are additional conditions I know that have been submitted, and I will let McCarthy speak to those, but I believe we are in agreement with those additional conditions that'll be read into the record. With that, we're more than happy to answer any questions you may have.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Gibson.

#### **JIM GIBSON**

Why don't we invite the McCarthy representative to put those things on the record?

#### **GREG GILBERT**

Morning, Commissioners. Greg Gilbert on behalf of McCarthy, 955 Hillwood. I'd like to just say outward or for everyone that we're in favor of the conditions that have been suggested and I'll read those for the record. Until August 20, 2027, commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time. That is number one. Construction, a crane must be removed from the property within 30 days, and I believe the construction crane has actually been taken down, so we're ahead of schedule on that. Enclose the site with a solid 8-foot wood construction fence, with which Mr. Celeste mentioned. We're happy with that condition and we'll reinforce the perimeter so it is completely safe and



then have a 24-hour man security that should remain until permanent perimeter fencing has received, bless you, final inspection. Once the final inspection is completed, 24-hour security can transition to 24-hour surveillance security. We're absolutely fine with that condition as well.

## **MOTION**

### **JIM GIBSON**

When we were last year, I was direct about what I expected to happen. It did not happen. The complicating thing for me and the way that I was headed is that McCarthy, I think I explained during that hearing that it is paramount that we get people paid. The way that McCarthy has been paid is by taking title to the property, a significant action. And I really feel still that I much prefer to see appropriate development, even including resort hotel development along this stretch of the boulevard, rather than airplane wings. It's fun to look at the general aviation airplanes as I sit there, but I think this property is too valuable. I think that what we have in place, what we put in place years before any of us were here maintained the H1 designation. I mean, this property was always envisioned to be developed eventually. I think we can get a project there. I hope we get one.

So, I'm prepared at this point to and do move that the extension requested be granted for two years, subject to conditions that have been read into the record. I'm told that this morning, the crane is down and that the crane that took the crane down will be gone tomorrow. I'll hold you to that. There are temporary fences. They have to be made permanent, which means a building permit and working with the Building Department.

We've been very concerned about surveillance over there, but you're going to erect a system that will enable remote surveillance. I'm fine with that, but it's got to be a good, and it's got to provide the coverage that is necessary in order to really give you and anyone that looks at it a good view of what's happening there. In fact, one of the things that we ought to explore is whether or not there would be a way to provide some connectivity to the fusion center, much like we do in apartment complexes and other things that we build. So, we need to look at that. And if that is available to us, then that's an additional condition. I want you to be able, I'd like the fusion center to be able to have this on their screen. If there's nothing more, then Mr. Chair, that's my motion.

### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

All right. There's a motion to cast your vote.

## **VOTE**

<b>VOTING AYE:</b>	William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft
<b>VOTING NAY:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None

### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

### **TONY CELESTE**

Thank you.

### **GREG GILBERT**

Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

25. ET-25-400108 (UC-23-0648)-SKY HI, LLC:

USE PERMITS FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME for the following: 1) cannabis establishment (consumption lounge); and 2) modify design and development standards for the Midtown Maryland Parkway Design Overlay District.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) a cannabis consumption lounge; 2) additions to an existing commercial building; and 3) site modifications to include but not limited to façade changes, parking, and landscaping on 1.6 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-60) and Maryland Parkway Overlays. Generally located on the north of Desert Inn Road and west of Maryland Parkway within Winchester. TS/my/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Review required 6 months from date of valid Clark County Business license for this cannabis consumption lounge;
- Until November 8, 2027 to obtain a valid Clark County business license for this cannabis consumption lounge, or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time.
- Applicant is advised that this application is contingent upon obtaining a license from the State of Nevada and Clark County Business License Department; failure to abide by and faithfully comply with the conditions of approval, Clark County Code, and the provisions of the Nevada Revised Statutes or Nevada Administrative Code may result in revocation of this application; the County has adopted a rewrite to Title 30 effective January 1, 2024, and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

**SAMI REAL**

Next is Item 25.

- Item 25, ET-25-400108. Use permits first extension of time for the following: cannabis establishment (consumption lounge); and modify design and development standards for the Midtown Maryland Parkway Design Overlay District. Design reviews for the following: a cannabis consumption lounge; additions to an existing commercial building; and site modifications to include but not limited to façade changes, parking, and landscaping on 1.6 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone within the Airport Environs (AE-60) and Maryland Parkway Overlays. Generally located on the north of Desert Inn Road and west of Maryland Parkway within Winchester.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Good morning. I don't believe the applicant is here, but I have spoken with Commissioner Segerblom, and he wishes to grant the extension of time for this application. Mr. Warhola?

**ROBERT WARHOLA**

Open up the public hearing.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Oh. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing, and I believe we have a comment from Commissioner Kirkpatrick.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

May I ask a technical question maybe to the attorney? So, I've never voted for cannabis lounges. I want to be consistent. So, I'm just voting for an extension of time, not actually the use, correct? I just want to make sure, because if I'm good, and everybody knows that I'm a no if it's a cannabis lounge, I just don't—

**ROBERT WARHOLA**

Well, it's an extension of time for the original approval.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Oh yeah, so it'd just be a no. Okay, got it. Thank you.

**MOTION**

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

All right. Our motion is for approval. Please cast your vote.

**VOTE**

<b>VOTING AYE:</b>	William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Michael Naft
<b>VOTING NAY:</b>	Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

**26. UC-25-0601-DARUL IMAN ETHIOPIAN MUSLIM COMMUNITY, INC.:**

HOLDOVER USE PERMIT for a place of worship.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increase maximum parking; 2) eliminate street landscaping; 3) reduce and eliminate parking lot landscaping; 4) reduce buffering and screening; 5) modify residential adjacency standards; 6) alternative driveway geometrics; and 7) waive full off-site improvements.

DESIGN REVIEW for an existing place of worship and proposed storage building on 1.01 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) and Airport Environs (AE-60) Overlays. Generally located north of Ponderosa Way and east of Jones Boulevard within Spring Valley. MN/dd/cv (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

### Comprehensive Planning

- Landscaping shall be installed in compliance with the landscape plan on file under UC-0509-17 with a revision date of 06/20/17 including new trees east of the storage building as shown on plans presented at the November 3, 2025 Zoning meeting;
- Storage building limited to storage only;
- Maintain residential appearance and no signage to indicate this is a place of worship;
- Certificate of Occupancy of place of worship limited to 42 people at any one time;
- Minimum of 42 code compliant parking spaces shall be provided which may require restriping of portions of the parking lot;
- Parking spaces to be used for parking only (no outdoor events, no overnight or long-term parking allowed);
- Parking lighting to be shielded and minimized in height and brightness to minimize impact on neighborhood;
- Standing or idling vehicles shall be directed to parking lot and shall not remain in the front of the building;
- Gates to be set back in front of building;
- Decorative stucco 8 foot high walls on north and east sides of property adjacent to residential property;
- No amplification of sound outdoors or indoors that is projected or heard outdoors;
- Hours of occupancy limited to 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.;
- No retreats or overnight stays;
- No rental or other use the structure(s) or parking lot for any purpose (i.e. storage, celebrations, parties, garage sales, or rummage sales);
- No on-site food preparation allowed, except BBQ on rear patio; no outdoor activities or congregating allowed, except on existing patio at rear of property;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance, and payment of the tree fee-in-lieu is required for any required trees waived.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

### Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Applicant to construct a 5 foot asphalt path along Ponderosa Way.
- Applicant is advised that block walls shall not encroach into sight-visibility zones.

### Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that the property is already connected to the CCWRD sewer system; and that if any existing plumbing fixtures are modified in the future, then additional capacity and connection fees will need to be addressed.

**SAMI REAL**

Next is Item 26.

- Item 26, UC-25-0601. Holdover use permit for a place of worship. Waivers of development standards for the following: increase maximum parking; eliminate street landscaping; reduce and eliminate parking lot landscaping; reduce buffering and screening; modify residential adjacency standards; alternative driveway geometrics; and waive full off-site improvements. Design review for an existing place of worship and proposed storage building on 1.01 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) and Airport Environs (AE-60) Overlays. Generally located north of Ponderosa Way and east of Jones Boulevard within Spring Valley.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Good morning. Is there anyone wishing to present on this item? I turn it over to Commissioner Naft.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't see the representative for the application here. Is there anybody here who wants to speak to the item? And if not, maybe you can— It's possible for us to trail this item until the end of today's meeting if you want to contact the representative.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER**

(Inaudible)

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Perhaps he stepped out. I'll— If that's all right, Chair, we'll trail this item until the end of the meeting and hear it then.

*(Trailed and heard after Item 31)*

**SAMI REAL**

Commissioners, before we go to the ordinances for introduction, I'd like to go back to Item 26, which we've already read into the record.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Go ahead. Welcome.

**MOHAMMAD ABUTARBOUSH**

Hi, my name is Mohammad Abutarboush. I'm representing MK Architecture. We're located at 50 East Serene Avenue and on behalf of the Muslim community for Darul Iman. So, we're proposing storage— like accessory structure on the existing building with existing place of worship. All the side is existing to remain. We did do a neighborhood meeting and discuss some of the waivers. And we mutually agreed on just adding some trees on the east side and north, just because of the adjacent neighbor requested that. And we mutually agreed to do this. And also, the front landscape, some of the trees are low maintenance. They're a little bit dried up, so replanting them, and we spoke with Commissioner Michael Naft on that on Monday. And, again, there's also the waivers for the off-sites, and the curb, and sidewalk to remain as existing. And the existing driveways 30 feet and instead of the 32 feet that's required, but that was already like in the previous land use in 2019, or 2017. But, yeah, that's pretty much it.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**MOHAMMAD ABUTARBOUSH**

There's like a rendering that we showed the neighbors of that, but yeah.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time?

**AL ROJAS**

My name is Al Rojas and I'm going to support this project, but I do want to say something. That this church came by, and the residents were complaining that the music was too loud and that they couldn't enjoy the residence. And I don't think it's fair that somebody start a church or start any kind of, not only— It's not a church. Any kind of activity where the noise is too loud.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Mr. Rojas, I think you're conflating a couple different projects.

**AL ROJAS**

Right. Okay, that's fine. Anyways, I just think that, you know, the noise should be something that should be addressed and that should be calmed down. I wanted to say that the last time. I don't think it's fair—

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Totally different people. Totally different application.

**AL ROJAS**

I got it. That's fine. I get it.

**PATRICK DIERSON**

I am Patrick Dierson, 5780 West Oquendo Road, on behalf of the community. Most of our neighbors show up to these meetings to protest projects. This is one of the nice times at which we'd like to show support for the Muslim community here. They've been really great neighbors. They've met with the adjacent neighbors, as well as other members of the community. Very hospitable. They've worked with everybody through this and they've really been a pleasure to work with, so we do support them on this.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. If there is no one else, we'll close the public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Naft.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Dierson, for those kind words, but for your leadership in this process. There were a couple conditions I'm going to add to this application. Not so much a condition, but an obvious statement. There's some landscaping that's kind of fallen into some disrepair. This application was originally approved in 2017. I'm going to require with this approval that you bring the landscaping back up to what was approved in 2017. So, where that landscape plan calls for landscaping, there needs to be landscaping. So, where that's died in the last couple of years, go ahead and take this as an opportunity to replant it and bring it up to those standards.

I'm also going to condition that, as you just outlined, those trees facing the residential behind the new structure that those be planted. And then lastly, I'll condition that this— it's been portrayed that this is only for the purpose of storing things like tables, and other equipment, chairs. So given that that's my understanding, I'm going to condition the application that it be only for the use of storage. You and your client understand those three conditions?

**MOHAMMAD ABUTARBOUSH**

We do, yes.

**MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Okay, great. And if there's nothing further, I move for approval of Item 26.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

There's a motion for approval. Please cast your vote.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft  
**VOTING NAY:** None  
**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

27. UC-25-0665-WARM SPRINGS CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC:

USE PERMIT to allow gas station.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) reduce buffering and screening; 2) allow an attached sidewalk to remain; and 3) reduce throat depth.

DESIGN REVIEW for a retail store and gas station on 0.95 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone.

Generally located north of Warm Springs Road and west of Eastern Avenue within Paradise. MN/bb/kh  
(For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the vacation of excess right-of-way and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control devices.

- Applicant is advised that off-site improvement permits may be required.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0168-2026 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS #2 WAS WITHDRAWN.

**SAMI REAL**

Next is Item 27.

- Item 27, UC-25-0665. Use permit to allow a gas station. Waives of development standards for the following: reduce buffering and screening; allow an attached sidewalk to remain; and reduce throat depth. Design review for a retail store and gas station on 0.95 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Warm Springs Road and east of Eastern Avenue within Paradise.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Welcome.

**JENNIFER ESCOBEDO**

Good morning. Jennifer Escobedo, 4436 Mural Glen Court. Here on behalf of the applicant, Murphy USA. So, this project is a c-store (convenience store) and a gas station located on Warm Springs Road, just east of Eastern [Avenue]. We have been requesting a waiver for the setback from the fuel canopy to residential. There's multi-family to the north. We set the canopy as far to the south as we can along Western, or sorry, along Warm Springs, and feel that we've done the best job we can to get it as far away from the multi-family as we can. In addition, we have an 8-foot screen wall and a 15-foot wide heavily landscape buffer with trees along that north border.

We were asking for a waiver on the detached sidewalk. However, I have spoken with Commissioner Naft, and what I'm showing you right now is the revised site plan that does show detached sidewalks so we can eliminate that waiver request. And I understand that that will also require a vacation of right-of-way that we'll move forward with afterwards if this is approved. Otherwise, if there's any other questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Welcome.

**AL ROJAS**

Yes. My name is Al Rojas. I live at 2095 Homestake Mine Court. I'm a community safety advocate trying to keep track of this homeless problem that we know is projected to get worse and worse and we're doing really well with the new ordinance, but I do want to— I am familiar with a little bit with Eastern and I'm getting a lot of reports through our neighborhood watch group, which has 8,000 members on it. There's a lot of homelessness over at Sunrise Park by Sunset Park, which is on Eastern and Sunset.

So, for the applicant, I'd like to know where their dumpsters going to be and I request that maybe they should that the Board requests that they have a closed encampment over these dumpsters because they do attract homeless people. People are living off of these trash cans, and I think it's something that we got to look long-term and try to put a stop on it because we don't really know where this homeless



problem is going to end up. It's projected to get worse. The new ordinance that we have, the no camping ordinance is doing tremendously well in the Sunrise Manor area where we're mostly at, but I am concerned because of the reports that I'm getting from Sunset Park. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

If there is no further comments, we'll close the public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Naft.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Regarding those comments from the public, this was a boarded-up building. This development I think will only diminish the risk of encampments on this site. I don't know if the applicant wants to speak to the location of the trash enclosure. If you can pinpoint that?

**JENNIFER ESCOBEDO**

The trash enclosure is located on the west side of the building.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Perfect.

**JENNIFER ESCOBEDO**

So, it's kind of set back and interior to the site.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you. Director Real, Planning has received the revised plans, is that accurate?

**SAMI REAL**

If they were provided to the Planner then, yesterday, then yes.

**MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Okay. Well, the understanding is what is before us is what I will be moving for approval of which demonstrates the detached sidewalk. So, I am moving for approval of Item 27, noting that waiver development standard number 2 has been withdrawn and is no longer needed.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

There is a motion by Commissioner Naft. Cast your vote.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones

**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

28. WS-25-0664-ELIASON FAMILY TRUST ETAL & ELIASON BOYD TRACY & KARI DIANE TRS:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) reduce setbacks; 2) allow a gated community; 3) increase fill height; 4) increase retaining wall height; and 5) waive full off-site improvements.

DESIGN REVIEW for a single-family residential subdivision on 4.72 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located east of Mustang Street and south of Deer Springs Way within Lone Mountain. MK/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEM 29).**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Wall along Mustang Street is to incorporate wrought iron fencing and/or tiered walls and shall be reviewed and approved with an Administrative Design Review;
- The separation between any perimeter redundant walls shall be 4 inches or less or at least 30 inches wide with the gap at the end of any redundant walls to be secured with a see thru, locked gate which allows for access, visibility, and maintenance, and areas between said walls shall be kept free of debris and weeds;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance.
- Applicant is advised within 4 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Execute a Restrictive Covenant Agreement (deed restrictions);
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the vacation of excess right-of-way and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control devices.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other fire apparatus access roadway obstructions.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that CCWRD does not provide sanitary sewer service in this portion of the unincorporated county; for any sanitary sewer needs, applicant is advised to contact the City of Las Vegas to see if the City has any gravity sanitary sewer lines located in the vicinity of the applicant's parcel; and an interlocal agreement with City of Las Vegas will also be required.

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS #2 WAS WITHDRAWN.

**SAMI REAL**

Next are Items 28 and 29.

- Item 28, WS-25-0664. Waivers of development standards for the following: reduce setbacks; allow a gated community; increase fill height; increase retaining wall height; and waive full off-site improvements. Design review for a single-family residential subdivision on 4.72 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located east of Mustang Street and south of Deer Springs Way within Lone Mountain.
- Item 29, TM-25-500163. Tentative map consisting of 8 single-family residential lots on 4.72 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located east of Mustang Street and south of Deer Springs Way within Lone Mountain.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Welcome.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Good morning. Robert Cunningham, 6030 South Jones Boulevard, with Taney Engineering representing the applicant. First, to point out our site, it's approximately 5 acres located between the Maverick alignment which has been vacated and Mustang right-of-way. We're just about 300 feet south of Deer Springs, adjacent to the future expansion of the Palm Mortuary to the east of us.

We're proposing an 8-lot subdivision with access directly from Mustang into our site into a gated cul-de-sac—or a non-gated cul-de-sac. One of the things that we have done is we have requested to withdraw waiver number 2. We submitted officially to the Planning Department last week in writing and other departments in the county to withdraw the gated community. We revised the plan to show no gate on this plan that's here before you today. These plans are, it's our understanding, in Planning's possession, showing no gate. So, we are not asking for the gate at all.

We have all 8 lots meeting all lot size requirements and all standards of the county as far as zoning is required. We have had to ask for a few waivers. The first waiver we asked for was the reduced front setback to 20 feet. Staff did note in the agenda, or in the write-up, that an ordinance has been recently passed, and I believe this is not going to be needed any longer. So, if that is the case, it could be withdrawn, I guess, if that is the case.

**SAMI REAL**

So, I can clarify because this application was submitted at a time when the front yard setback was determined to be 40 feet from the edge of the private street, this application is subject to that standard. So, I would just recommend that we keep that standard. It's recommended for approval and then that way there's no question when they come time for building permits.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Thank you for clarifying. Appreciate that. We also ask for waivers for additional fill above the 3 feet standard and additional retaining walls. The site drains from Mustang to Maverick alignment generally in a northwest to southeast direction. In order for flood protection be met on the first few lots here, we have to elevate this slightly above existing ground and then elevate the lots to drain into the street. In doing so, it's necessary to exceed the required 3-foot max fill on these 4 lots really in this area. We've asked for this to go up to 5 feet, or just around 5 feet in height. We're working through that now with grading and drainage. We're hopeful that we can get the fill down to about 4 feet or 3.5 to 4 feet on

these lots in this area. With that, we would be having primarily over-height retaining walls allowed in the west, I'm sorry, on the south and the north portions of the site.

Just to the north of us is this development here and I brought this up because we will be putting in our lots adjacent to this. They have a very similar wall height situation to what we're asking to do. So, we will be abutting them and almost have the same wall height, about 3.5 to 4 feet of retaining here and then having another wall on top of it. We do have something different than them. They have a wall that is about 8 to 9 feet in height, maybe even 10 feet in height in areas along the street frontage. We have landscaping of 6 feet in width that we're proposing adjacent to the street and our wall will be set back further than that at the 6-foot mark where we'll be putting in the retaining and the screen wall. Landscaping and trees will be located in front of that.

The last waiver that we had was for the waiver of off-site improvements, to not put curb, gutter, streetlights, and sidewalk along Mustang. Which this is the picture of Mustang to the north of us. We'd like to keep it rural in nature. We do also have four different plans that Liberty Homes, is the builder, looking at building in here. They range from 2,400 square feet to 3,400 square feet. They all have three and four car garages. RV garages either detached or attached are also an option on each one. If the Board would like to see the elevations and floor plans, I'd be more than happy to provide that information. That's going to conclude my presentation today and I'd be happy to answer additional questions. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? All right. Seeing no one. We'll close a public hearing and turn it over to Commissioner Kirkpatrick.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, one, thank you for taking the gates down. It's a very rural in nature community and we want to keep it that way. So along with that goes no HOA (Homeowners Association), which I know that your developer does not do HOA. But we want to make it very clear because what happens, a lot is— Every person on those streets have horses, chickens, and all kinds of things. And what happens is somebody new moves in and then they want to call and complain all the time. We don't take those code complaints. You moved into their neighborhood knowing that peacocks walked the street, you know that chickens get out, and goats run through the neighborhood. We do our best to maintain them, but it just happens. So, we appreciate you coming around to our way of thinking and it will help preserve that neighborhood.

I do— So as far as we can support the reduced setback because that's what it is today. We changed that code back. We agree that you should withdraw waiver number 2. I am concerned about the wall because what I don't want is for you guys to set up above everybody. It's very flat and I'm concerned about a wall having too much width between the two walls, right? I don't want it to be a place for people to come and hide and I'm assuming it's going to be specifically for a drainage thing to run out back to Maverick. But we want to make sure either you gate it or whatever that open space is so that it's not easily accessible. You know what I'm talking about?

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Yeah. There's a drain and I—

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

If you could put the other map back up.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Sure.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

I think it's easier for all of us and then I'm going to let JaWaan weigh in because I think he's chomping at the bit.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

This picture?

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

So, we know that you're going to put a wall next to a wall?

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Correct.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

And what we're saying that if there's any width between it, we want it gated so that it doesn't become a hiding spot, it doesn't become a trash collector, right? So that's what we're asking.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Correct. We have no problem. The county used to have a requirement that the walls be 4 inches or less apart and capped between the two walls. We could agree to some previous condition of that nature if need be.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Yeah, we just want to avoid trouble if we can. So, we are going to ask that you guys come back with an administrative review so we can see what that wall looks like because we do want the front to stay 3 foot. I believe it's 3 foot with the wrought iron piece so it turns open– I didn't approve that. I would've never done that. And you're in the center of a neighborhood so we do want the front to be more of the ranch-style drive-in to it. JaWaan, do you want to–

**JAWAAN DODSON**

Thank you, Commissioner. With the applicant withdrawing the gate, we would like to remove our Public Works condition of a traffic study on Items 28 and 29 since the gate would not be installed.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Okay. So, we want the wrought iron in the very front and then as you move out we want it tiered landscaping because what we don't want is– I don't want to have to drive down that street and sit at somebody's house and look at a block wall. So, Jennifer, am I saying it correctly and we're going to administratively work with you to see what that looks like visually?

**JENNIFER AMMERMAN**

Yep, that's correct.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

You get what I'm saying?

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Yes, you're speaking–

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Don't repeat what the people to the north did because we don't like that.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

We're trying not to.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Okay, good. We're clear.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

I was pointing that out by stating the landscaping is adjacent to it, but what I understand is the Mustang frontage is what the wall is of concern. Sure. We will gladly work with staff and bring that back as an administrative–

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

There's some pretty creative things that you can do. There's the rural fencing like they have in Lamplight. There's some creative things. I'm sure that your client can come up with some creative ideas and that's why we just administratively work with you and not hold up the project.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Okay. To clarify, that would be through Planning?

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Yes.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Okay, thank you.

### **MOTION**

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Okay, that's my messy motion. My messy motion is for approval with the changes read by JaWaan, and the withdrawal of waiver number 2, and that waiver number 4 say that the wall along Mustang is to incorporate a wrought iron fencing or a tiered type wall, and we can review it administratively. Is that correct?

**JENNIFER AMMERMAN**

Yes. Just the applicant would have to submit an administrative design review.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Just on the wall though?

**JENNIFER AMMERMAN**

Correct.

**MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK**

Okay. You could do no wall, and a lot of people would be happy with that over there. So, just saying. You got options.

**ROBERT CUNNINGHAM**

Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

There's a motion. Cast your vote.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones

**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

**29. TM-25-500163-ELIASON FAMILY TRUST ETAL & ELIASON BOYD TRACY & KARI DIANE TRS:**

TENTATIVE MAP consisting of 8 single-family residential lots on 4.72 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located east of Mustang Street and south of Deer Springs Way within Lone Mountain. MK/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEM 28).**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

**Comprehensive Planning**

- Applicant is advised within 4 years from the approval date a final map for all, or a portion, of the property included in this application must be recorded or it will expire; an application for an extension of time may only be submitted if a portion of the property included under this application has been recorded; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if there has been no substantial work towards completion; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

**Public Works - Development Review**

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Execute a Restrictive Covenant Agreement (deed restrictions).

**Building Department - Addressing**

- Approved street name list from the Combined Fire Communications Center shall be provided;
- All streets shall have approved street names and suffixes.

**Fire Prevention Bureau**

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other fire apparatus access roadway obstructions.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that CCWRD does not provide sanitary sewer service in this portion of the unincorporated county; for any sanitary sewer needs, applicant is advised to contact the City of Las Vegas to see if the City has any gravity sanitary sewer lines located in the vicinity of the applicant's parcel; and an interlocal agreement with City of Las Vegas will also be required.

*(Companion Items 30 and 31)*

30. WS-25-0666-SVIC LAND, LLC:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) allow off-site temporary construction activities; 2) waive off-site improvements (sidewalk, streetlights, and paving); and 3) waive dedication of right-of-way on a 12.5 acre portion of 21.37 acres in the RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80) and CR (Commercial Resort) Zones. Generally located west of Las Vegas Boulevard South and south of SR 161 within the South County planning area. MN/md/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEM 31).**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Comprehensive Planning

- Temporary on-site construction activities to cease within 3 years of approval date unless extended with approval of an extension of time.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time and application for review; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time and application for review; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

Public Works - Development Review

- 3 year review of off-sites;
- Any future applications will require full off-site improvements or pay a contribution for local roadway, drainage, or trail related improvements in District A in lieu of constructing full off-site improvements and any right-of-way dedication, as determined by Public Works.

Department of Aviation

- If temporary power poles are to be erected onsite, the applicant is required to file a valid FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" with the FAA, in accordance with 14 CFR Part 77, or submit to the Director of Aviation a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" and request written concurrence from the Department of Aviation;
- If temporary power poles are to be erected onsite and the applicant does not obtain written concurrence to a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement," then applicant must also receive either a Permit from the Director of Aviation or a Variance from the Airport Hazard Areas Board of Adjustment (AHABA) prior to construction as required by Section 30.02.26B of the Clark County Unified Development Code. Applicant



- is advised that many factors may be considered before the issuance of a permit or variance, including, but not limited to, lighting, glare, graphics, etc.;
- If temporary power poles are to be erected onsite no building permits should be issued until applicant provides evidence that a "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation" has been issued by the FAA or a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" has been issued by the Department of Aviation. The Determination of No Hazard must not be expired.
  - Applicant is advised that the FAA's determination is advisory in nature and does not guarantee that a Director's Permit or an AHABA Variance will be approved; that FAA's airspace determinations (the outcome of filing the FAA Form 7460-1) are dependent on petitions by any interested party and the height that will not present a hazard as determined by the FAA may change based on these comments; and that the FAA's airspace determinations include expiration dates and that separate airspace determinations will be needed for construction cranes or other temporary equipment.

#### Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other fire apparatus access roadway obstructions.

#### SAMI REAL

Next are companion Items 30 and 31.

- Item 30, WS-25-0666. Waivers of development standards for the following: allow off-site temporary construction activities; waive off-site improvements (sidewalks, streetlights, and paving); and waive dedication of right-of-way on a 12.5 acre portion of 21.37 acres in the RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80) and CR (Commercial Resort) Zones. Generally located west of Las Vegas Boulevard South and south of SR 161 within the South County planning area.
- Item 31, WS-25-0667. Waivers of development standards for the following: allow off-site temporary construction activities; waive full off-site improvements; and waive dedication of right-of-way on 28.78 acres in the RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80), CG (Commercial General), CR (Commercial Resort), and PF (Public Facility) Zones. Generally located east of Las Vegas Boulevard South and north of Prison Road within South County planning area.

#### WILLIAM MCCURDY II

Welcome.

#### LARRY BITTON

Good morning, Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission. My name is Larry Bitton with Energy Project Solutions, representing the applicant GridLiance West. And just a brief introduction, these two applications are for temporary construction lay-down yards of a three-year duration to support a large transmission line upgrade project that extends approximately 160 miles from Boulder City, out through Nye County, past Indian Springs to connect into the desert substation up off of I-95 there. That project was approved under a special use permit a couple of years ago and is active right now. It's currently going through the BLM NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process to get all the final permits for the overall project.

These are two parcels down in Jean, one on each side of Las Vegas Boulevard South. The parcel on the west is the former Terrible's Hotel & Casino site. The lay-down yard will use the northern portion of that parcel with no improvements because it's already paved. And we'll store transmission line equipment generally: monopoles, conductors, lattice, and some equipment and storage. It'll also have a small

container office and some parking there. It'll utilize existing driveways. Two of the driveways will be closed off, and so access will be both from Goodsprings Road and South Las Vegas Boulevard. The parcel on the east is currently a vacant parcel, and it'll be used for storage as well with minimal grading. It's already flat so there'll be no changes to the land or the drainage going through there.

This is similar to applications that were previously heard by the Commission, one for a parcel a little bit to the north. It ended up that the lease wasn't negotiated fully with that landowner, so that's why this application is coming in front of you now. And then in Commissioner Becker's district up in Indian Springs, there was a recent lay-down yard approval. Similar proposal and similar conditions. So, with that, if you have any more questions on the project, or itself, or on the lay-down yards, I'm happy to answer them. But we appreciate staff's cooperation. We concur with staff's recommendations for the conditions, if approved, and appreciate your consideration.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing. Turn it over to Commissioner Naft.

**MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Appreciate the presentation. I'm going to agree with the staff's recommendation of a three-year review as a public hearing on this application and move for approval of Items 30 and 31.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

All right, there's a motion. Cast your vote.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick

**ABSTAIN:** None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

**LARRY BITTON**

Thank you very much.

**31. WS-25-0667-SVIC LAND, LLC:**

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) allow off-site temporary construction activities; 2) waive full off-site improvements; and 3) waive dedication of right-of-way on 28.78 acres in the RS80 (Residential Single-Family 80), CG (Commercial General), CR (Commercial Resort), and PF (Public Facility) Zones. Generally located east of Las Vegas Boulevard South and north of Prison Road within the South County planning area. MN/ji/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEM 30).**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

### Comprehensive Planning

- Temporary on-site construction activities to cease within 3 years of approval date unless extended with approval of an extension of time.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time and application for review; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

### Public Works - Development Review

- 3 year review of off-sites;
- 50 foot setback between the lay-down yard and Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone A;
- Any future applications will require full off-site improvements or pay a contribution for local roadway, drainage, or trail related improvements in District A in lieu of constructing full off-site improvements and any right-of-way dedication, as determined by Public Works.

### Department of Aviation

- If temporary power poles are to be erected onsite, the applicant is required to file a valid FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" with the FAA, in accordance with 14 CFR Part 77, or submit to the Director of Aviation a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" and request written concurrence from the Department of Aviation;
- If temporary power poles are to be erected onsite and the applicant does not obtain written concurrence to a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement," then applicant must also receive either a Permit from the Director of Aviation or a Variance from the Airport Hazard Areas Board of Adjustment (AHABA) prior to construction as required by Section 30.02.26B of the Clark County Unified Development Code. Applicant is advised that many factors may be considered before the issuance of a permit or variance, including, but not limited to, lighting, glare, graphics, etc.;
- If temporary power poles are to be erected onsite no building permits should be issued until applicant provides evidence that a "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation" has been issued by the FAA or a "Property Owner's Shielding Determination Statement" has been issued by the Department of Aviation. The Determination of No Hazard must not be expired.
- Applicant is advised that the FAA's determination is advisory in nature and does not guarantee that a Director's Permit or an AHABA Variance will be approved; that FAA's airspace determinations (the outcome of filing the FAA Form 7460-1) are dependent on petitions by any interested party and the height that will not present a hazard as determined by the FAA may change based on these comments; and that the FAA's airspace determinations include expiration dates and that separate airspace determinations will be needed for construction cranes or other temporary equipment.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other fire apparatus access roadway obstructions.

32. PA-25-700038-CHURCH BAPTIST FIRST KOREAN:

PLAN AMENDMENT to redesignate the existing land use category from Ranch Estate Neighborhood (RN) to Mid-Intensity Suburban Neighborhood (MN) on 3.44 acres. Generally located north of Eldora Avenue and west of Westwind Road within Spring Valley. JJ/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

33. ZC-25-0590-CHURCH BAPTIST FIRST KOREAN:

ZONE CHANGES for the following: 1) reclassify 3.44 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to an RS3.3 (Residential Single-Family 3.3) Zone; and 2) remove the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located north of Eldora Avenue and west of Westwind Road within Spring Valley (description on file). JJ/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

34. VS-25-0591-CHURCH BAPTIST FIRST KOREAN:

VACATE AND ABANDON easements of interest to Clark County located between Sahara Avenue and Eldora Avenue, and Duneville Street and Westwind Road; a portion of a right-of-way being Eldora Avenue located between Duneville Street and Westwind Road; and a portion of right-of-way being Westwind Road located between Sahara Avenue and Eldora Avenue within Spring Valley (description on file). JJ/rr/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

35. WS-25-0592-CHURCH BAPTIST FIRST KOREAN:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increase retaining wall height; 2) modify residential adjacency standards; and 3) eliminate street landscaping.

DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed single-family residential subdivision on 3.44 acres in an RS3.3 (Residential Single Family 3.3) Zone. Generally located north of Eldora Avenue and west of Westwind Road within Spring Valley. JJ/rr/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

36. TM-25-500150-CHURCH BAPTIST FIRST KOREAN:

TENTATIVE MAP consisting of 27 single-family lots and common lots on 3.44 acres in an RS3.3 (Residential Single Family 3.3) Zone. Generally located north of Eldora Avenue and west of Westwind Road within Spring Valley. JJ/rr/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

37. ZC-25-0661-CDC LAND, LLC SERIES D:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify a portion of 2.06 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to an IL (Industrial Light) Zone. Generally located north of Gomer Road and east of Redwood Street within Enterprise (description on file). JJ/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO DECEMBER 3, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

38. UC-25-0662-CDC LAND, LLC SERIES D:

USE PERMIT for truck parking/staging.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) eliminate street landscaping; 2) eliminate access gate setbacks; 3) eliminate parking; and 4) waive full off-site improvements.

DESIGN REVIEW for truck parking/staging and an outdoor storage facility on 2.06 acres in an IL (Industrial Light) Zone. Generally located north of Gomer Road and east of Redwood Street within Enterprise. JJ/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO DECEMBER 3, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

*(Companion Items 39, 40, and 41)*

39. ZC-25-0669-B & O INVESTMENT, LLC:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 2.38 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Windmill Lane and west of Gilespe Street within Enterprise (description on file). MN/rk (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEMS 40 AND 41).**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -**

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised that fire/emergency access must comply with the Fire Code as amended.

Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) - Engineering

- Applicant is advised that there is an active septic permit on APN 177-09-403-031; to connect to municipal sewer and remove the septic system in accordance with Section 17 of the SNHD Regulations Governing Individual Sewage Disposal Systems and Liquid Waste Management; and to submit documentation to SNHD showing that the system has been properly removed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0169-2026 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

**SAMI REAL**

And then Commissioners, we have next Items 39 through 41.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

## **SAMI REAL**

- Item 39, ZC-25-0669. Zone change to reclassify 2.38 acres from an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone to a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Windmill Lane and west of Gilespe Street within Enterprise.
- Item 40, VS-25-0672. Vacate and abandon a portion of right-of-way being Windmill Lane located between Gilespe Street and Rancho Destino Road, and a portion of right-of-way being Gilespe Street located between Windmill Lane and Mesa Verde Lane within Enterprise.
- Item 41, WS-25-0670. Waivers of development standards for the following: increased building height; reduced throat depth; and alternative driveway geometrics. Design review for a proposed hotel on 2.38 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Windmill Lane and west of Gilespe Street within Enterprise.

## **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Good morning.

## **SIMONA STEVENS**

Hello. Simona Stevens, 1950 East Warm Springs on behalf of the applicant. The applicant has several parcels located at the northwest corner of Windmill and Gilespe. The total area combined between the parcels would be just over two acres. Currently, it is zoned RS20 and we are proposing to do a zone change to a CG. The hotel is proposed to be four stories high. Originally, we had 150 rooms proposed, but we had some changes done in the past couple of weeks, so we went down to 95 rooms. I'll go over that. I just want to kind of go over some of the branding first.

The owner has been— it was a concern that was brought up that the owners around, the neighbors did not want something like budget suites or something along those lines. So, I just wanted to show that there has been correspondence with the owner that they are working with the Hilton and the Holiday Inn, as well as Marriott. Because they do provide variety of types of hotel rooms that range from standard rooms to suites. And there's no casino component to it in there, but they do provide breakfast, and there's fitness, and conference room and a pool, as part of the amenities.

Also, I mentioned that we did make some changes. We went from 150 rooms to 95. This was the originally proposed site that had like an L-shape and this portion right here was 91 feet away from the residential. We did have a meeting with the Commissioner Naft, and we did discuss some of the options. So, we took out the L-shape, the short leg, and kept just this. So that's why we went down to 95. That also— I lost my track.

Oh, yeah, parking. So, when we were originally at the 150 rooms, we were required to provide 105 parking stalls and we provided 105. This was a big concern by neighbors because they were saying that it was just not enough, even though we were meeting Title 30 requirements. Another concern was regarding providing some parking for RVs and we did not have any of that. So, once we reduced the building size and we took that, the short leg, I guess, of an L. We are now required to provide 67 spaces and we actually ended up with 97 spaces, including five spaces for RV, which is 45% over based on Title 30 requirements. And also, now the building sits almost 200 feet away from the north.

Also, just to mention, because parking was a big issue with the neighbors. Usually, neighborhood types of hotels, they usually are 80% occupied and that kind of automatically reduces the requirement for the parking. Also, large percentage of people who fly to Las Vegas do not rent cars. They actually utilize the ride-share services and then the hotel will be providing shuttle services as well, which also reduces the requirement for parking. But we are over-parked.

Let's see. Another concern was the traffic. We do provide— we do have two driveways. There was a concern that this would create like a bottleneck or traffic. So, we did work with staff, and we did increase with this throat right here. So, this revision was done earlier. And then I think that it is being supported by Public Works. But the recent revision, when we reduced the building size because we were already having so many over-parking, so we were actually able to lose some parking stalls right here and provide the depth throat right here required. So that eliminated the waiver for those.

Another issue was overall height. So, the original we had the original building was at 49 [feet] 6 inches. With the revision, we did go down to 46 [feet] 10 [inches], but this was based on some of the comments that we received from Holiday Inn. We did have some shared roofs before, but we kind of squared it off just because it meets the brand better. By zoning, CG technically does allow us to have 50-foot overall height, but because we are against the RNP neighborhood, so that puts us at 35 feet max. And even though the finish height is at 46 [feet] 10 [inches], the finish roof is at 40 [feet]. We have 6 feet of variations to provide architectural articulations and to screen the rooftop equipment.

Also, if it comes from point of privacy, the person standing on the fourth floor would technically be at 37 feet or so, assuming the person is 6 feet tall. The building now sits 200, almost 200 feet away from the north, and by the time the trees are all mature, it's definitely going to be screening that view. Other concerns were light pollution, possible noise from the AC window units. The light, we won't have any light on in the parking lot. We'll provide just enough emergency lighting light, low light I guess, and the signage will be only on the front of the building.

#### **MICHAEL NAFT**

Mr. Chair, if I could, I'll just ask you to pause your presentation there. They've been real patient waiting, so let's give them an opportunity to open the public comment. And then you can respond to anything, if need be, if that's all right.

#### **SIMONA STEVENS**

Yeah, I was just pretty much done with that. I just wanted to let you know that we did revise the plans, and we did send those to the planner and staff. And we actually had some emails from the sign-in sheet with the distributed revised floor plans to people that we were— and then we actually did door-to-door. We tried to talk to them just a few days ago. So that's pretty much it.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Anyone wishing to come forward at this time? Please state your first and last name and your address. Welcome. Good morning.

#### **KATHERINE SETFIN**

Good morning. My name is Katherine Setfin. I have lived at 7985 Giles pie Street for the past 37 years, and it continues to become difficult to get out of my driveway onto Giles pie with the traffic. And I don't see it getting any better with having a hotel there on the corner, but there is progress. My concern is for safety. On the original plan that we were presented with at the Enterprise TAB meeting, there was either, I believe ingress from Giles pie, but I don't see how they can provide that with the way the street is designed now.

And then there was only one egress ingress driveway on Windmill. Has that changed? Okay. When we moved into our home there on Giles pie, the 25 mile an [per] hour (mph) street was generally 25 mph except for a few hurried commuters going to work, and now it's a 50 mph street with exasperating spurts of 60 [mph] and 70 [mph]. It's scary. It's not what we signed up for, but I do understand progress, and I understand that a traffic study has not been done for that corner, which is pretty busy. We've had a

number of fatalities even after the light was installed. That's my major complaint is it's a poor location for what they want to do.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**MARK CONLEY**

Can I speak, I'm Mark Conley, I'm a neighbor in the area. I know Kathy mainly through this topic.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Can you just lift that mic up just–

**MARK CONLEY**

Oh sure, sure. Sorry about that. Anyway, and I live at 7960 Gilespe Street, and we bought, let me see, we bought in 1998, right? So not as long as Kathy, but we've been there a minute. Okay, first of all, the numbers that I'm hearing, they don't seem to make sense to me. I was told that each unit needs 1.4 parking places, right? They only have about two acres to work with, so height-wise I don't see how that can come down to something. And on the subject of height, I mean there's Randall Cunningham's Church quarter mile away. There's an older round circular church, but that's it from Bermuda to I believe Las Vegas Boulevard. Right? We very much do appreciate the traffic light that went in on Gilespe Street.

For those that haven't been in that area of town lately, it runs to the, what's it called, where the Rent-A-Car Center is, the Rent-A-Car Center. It's on Gilespe. So, the white buses take the passengers that are going to rent a car from now it's Harry Reid Airport, and they get their Rent-A-Car. And oftentimes they come up Gilespe, still trying to figure out where their place is and things like that, which is some of the increased traffic anyway. It's 25 miles this way and streets in that– It's horse-zoned half acre. Two stories are rare. Almost everything is single story. Okay?

And like I said, we bought in 2005-2006 is when we bought there. So, we've lived there since then. Anyway, there's no– the closest type of budget suites or whatever extended stay place is all the way to almost Las Vegas Boulevard. There's eateries, there's a few over there. And then going this way, you got to go all the way to Vons. Everything is single story half acre, we're disowned. So, I actually find it absurd that this project's really even being presented in front of the Board and occupying your fine wisdom and time, because it's so out of place where they're planning to put it. Anyway, I guess I've already done my time, so I'll give up the mic. Thank you. But I've gotten to know and seen you Commissioners in the news. It's an honor to be before you all. Thank you so much.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**UMBERTO BOBADILLA**

Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Umberto Bobadilla, 210 East Windmill Lane, is in the corner with Gilespe, east of Gilespe. So, I'm one of the most affected from this project. I wasn't notified of this. If it wasn't for my neighbors, I wouldn't know that this was going to be built. When they told me about this project, I was surprised and I said, "I don't think it's going to be approved," because first I think the zone is not for that. I asked some friends, I said, "No, don't worry, I don't think they are going to approve this." But either it doesn't matter go and support because building that high is not going to be look good for your property, for your neighbors, and for the area. So, I could say that we should keep the hotels close to Las Vegas Boulevard where they have been building new hotels, but this area of Windmill, I think



we should keep it like a business professional and no more than that. Tall buildings there, I don't think it'll be good. Thank you. Have a great day.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you.

**EMMA FAULK**

Hello, I'm Emma Faulk, F-A-U-L-K. My address is 8045 Gillespie Street, Las Vegas, 89123, and I am vehemently opposed to this project as it is directly adjacent to my property. I had some questions that I haven't had answered, and I understand that they are— At first, did they do a feasibility study? There are hotels very close in the area right off of Las Vegas Boulevard. And I just wondered, did they do a feasibility study on this? Is it something that's really warranted for the area? They are building right up to my property, which is a cul-de-sac. There's a gentleman building a home there on that cul-de-sac now and it's a million-dollar house, he says. And this hotel that they're proposing, they've said that they've spoken to the Hyatt, and the Hilton, and the Marriott, but what are the results? Is it in fact going to be an extended stay low budget hotel? That's what I've heard, but I don't know. I haven't had that answered. The other thing that I had is did they do a feasibility, I mean a traffic study? Has there one been done? I haven't heard anything about that. Are you about to say something to me?

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We can't—

**MICHAEL NAFT**

We're not allowed to speak at this time, but I'm writing down your questions and we'll address them when we are able to.

**EMMA FAULK**

All right, thank you. And the other question is where are they putting all those dumpsters? Since it's adjacent to my property, are they going to be in the back of the hotel right next to the fence line? Those are the questions I had. The height of the hotel is obviously going to be intrusive because the hotels would be looking right onto my property, right into my back windows, and my house faces toward Windmill. So those are the questions that I've had.

They're saying it's a four-story building. I mean they will be looking right into the back of my house. That's where my bedrooms are, that's where everything is. And let's see, oh, they've also mentioned that they've requested RV parking there, or allotted places for five RVs in the correspondence that they've sent me, and I'm wondering about that also. They didn't address that, although they addressed it on the— they sent out a letter or a form and they had said they'll be using it for RV parking. Those are my questions. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Welcome.

**ROBERT DELGIUDICE**

Good morning. My name is Robert DelGiudice. I'm at 8025 Gillespie Street just adjacent to the property.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Can you pull that mic right up? There you go, so we can hear you better.

**ROBERT DELGIUDICE**

Just adjacent to the property. And my concern is, I mean this is really an overbuild for this 2 acres or 2.5 acres. It's massive and the height is just ridiculous for Windmill. There's nothing over 25-30 feet on the entire street. This is basically going to be right in our backyard looking down upon us. There's going to be for sure light issues, traffic issues. The density, you're talking about 95 units now on 2 acres. Most of the homes in the area are one home per acre or half acre, is honestly just kind of ridiculous. This is better use for maybe a professional office complex or something like that, a low-density type of project.

And I mean there's plenty of hotels in Vegas and most of them are empty right now, so it doesn't make sense to even the thought of it. It's like why would you even build it at this point? But that's up to them. Anyway, just wanted to share that. The issue also with traffic and on Giles pie, the pulling into the property, pulling out, there's already issues. It's very tight as it is. People are flying by on Windmill. I just see it as just kind of a dangerous addition and it's unfit for the area. Something a little lower density I think would be a much better use.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward at this time? Please state your first and last name for the record and your address. Thank you.

**FEMPING KONG**

Good morning. My name is Femping Kong. I live in 2726 Summer Chase Lane. I am the property owner with Steadfast Giles pie Real Estate. My replace is Anthony Stannulus, all speaking on my behalf is okay. Thank you.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Yes.

**ANTHONY STANNULUS**

My name is Anthony Stannulus. I live at 2726 Summer Chase Lane, Henderson, Nevada, 89052. I'm representing Femping Kong, the owner of Steadfast, LLC. She owns property right behind where this hotel is supposed to be built. It would be, it would be—

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

You might have to point at the paper.

**ANTHONY STANNULUS**

Where would that be at?

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

In the middle. It's a paper right in the middle.

**ANTHONY STANNULUS**

Oh this. Oh, right here. So, the camera above. So, her property is, this was Emma's property, the lady who just spoke two people before me. Her property is right here on the cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac comes in here. The gentleman that just spoke, he has properties over here and there's another man over there. She purchased something about two years ago. Finally getting to the part of building and probably could build about a \$1.4 million home there, 5,000 square feet. Nice, beautiful addition to the neighborhood. Fix that cul-de-sac up to and bring it up to what county standards are right now. It doesn't have any curbs or sidewalks or anything else. And we were looking into talking to that and getting with her neighbors to get this developed.

That would be one thing, because I know the county doesn't like the fact that it doesn't have curbs or anything in it. And what would be the point of putting the money into this and anything if this thing's going to come here, because this is nothing but a— The reason why they're buying this is because it was less expensive land for sure, off the Strip more – and more off Las Vegas Boulevard. So, they got it for a good price, and they got another guy behind me, behind Steadfast LLC, in this property right here, to sell out to them for super cheap for \$175,000. So, it brought our property way down on a half-acre. Really, whatever they're doing, I don't know. It's not nice.

They can buy a piece. There's plenty of land up on Las Vegas Boulevard to build a hotel like this. We all know that. This is nothing that you need to put right here or a storage facility. This is a neighborhood. A lot of these people have been there for 20 years, 25 years. That's their neighborhood. You all have neighborhoods. I mean I have a neighborhood. We don't really need to have something like this there. There's a professional plaza going across the street over here on the corner of Gillespie and Windmill on the southeast corner, and there's plenty of room for whatever on that strip. I realize it is a commercial corridor and it's going to be that one day. I understand, but not today. There's really no need for it. You don't have the infrastructure; you don't have the traffic study. Nothing.

I see people zipping up and down Gillespie already. It's getting a little bit crazy because it's a collector street. I just think it's really ridiculous. At the end of the day, they show where the dumpster is going to go, but who's going to get that land next to them, and then how is that going to affect those people? Or will that become another commercial thing? I just don't think it's a really great fit for this area right now. Could be any time, but we appreciate your time. We totally do not— we're not in approval of any of this. We thank you so much for your time and God bless.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Is there anyone else? Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing and turnover to Commissioner Naft.

#### **MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay, just to start, and I apologize because I wouldn't have approved what came before the TAB either. And that's why what we're looking at in front of us, and I know it hasn't been really digested by the neighborhood. But when this was brought to me last week, I essentially cut off half of this built. Well, I did cut off almost the entire structure that was up against the residential. So, I just want to make sure everybody's looking at what's before us today and not what was presented at the TAB. It's a very different project. I'll get to the height in just a second.

So, what was raised, from my understanding at the TAB from my office that was in attendance, were things like the property is too small for the proposed project, okay? Eliminating almost an entire half of the building, I believe, in my opinion, solves for that problem. The project does not meet residential adjacency standards. Because they've eliminated that building, it is now 200 feet and it's right up against the most impactful commercial piece of property over there, right up against Windmill. The parking lot is buffering by 200 feet to the residential. So, I think that comment is at least addressed that way.

The building mass is too large when compared with the surrounding area on Windmill. Again, by eliminating half the mass of the building, in my view, that addresses those issues that were raised. It's under-parked by national parking standards for hotels. Again, it's now actually over-parked. If they were applying with this, they would need a waiver for over-parked because of the removal of those 55 rooms. The throat depth issue, with what we're looking at now versus what was originally submitted, there is no throat depth issue. They were able to work with Public Works on the ingress on Windmill and the ingress on Gillespie. And to the question that was raised during public comment, those are the two points of

ingress and egress. It's outlined, I can't point to it, but it's outlined right here on Windmill and there on Gillespie, and they worked with Public Works on that.

And then lastly, the internal traffic flow. By removing half the building, it solves for a lot of those issues related to traffic flow on-site. I'm going to go through some of the issues that were raised today. We covered ingress, egress, traffic study. Traffic study will be required. In everything that we've approved today, after we approve it. JaWaan, you want to comment on how a traffic study's conducted?

**JAWAAN DODSON**

Thank you, Commissioner. Yes, they do have a condition for a traffic study. They will submit that to our department. Our department reviews that. Any mitigation that needs to be done will be done at that point.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Thank you. Some of those mitigations would've been potentially a traffic signal. Some of you already commented. I already put a traffic signal there not too long ago. So, this is a signalized intersection of a collector meeting with an arterial Gillespie and Windmill. And then also for context, we are about 2 small blocks off of Las Vegas Boulevard and off of H1 zoning, and about 2.5 blocks away from the 160 acres being developed by Brightline.

Questions related to RV parking. Some of the comments that came out of TAB meetings were that if there are trucks that—are people who have trucks that are spending the night there, that they would have nowhere to put their trucks and they might put them on Gillespie. That's why I suggested that by cutting the building they would leave some room for oversized vehicles. This is not places for people to leave their RVs and plug in. It was really to accommodate the requests by people in the neighborhood who brought that up at the public meeting, that there should be a couple spaces for oversized parking. And so that's what they've done here. The trash enclosure that was raised, it's on here. I don't know if you can point to it. That's where the trash enclosure is. Is Public Works comfortable with that location for the trash enclosure?

**JAWAAN DODSON**

Yes, we're comfortable, Commissioner. That's fine.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Okay. And you can see it's removed from where the existing residential is. I'm trying to think what else was raised today. I think at the end of the day, oh, and then I would just point to the overall height. I can't disagree with you. This will be bigger than anything else that is currently within a couple hundred feet of you, but minus the parapet, it's 45 feet. You all are entitled by code to go to 35 feet. And while there is the residential adjacency issue, this is commercially zoned and they could, in that zoning, go to 50 feet. So, the 5 feet difference with the closest residential being 200 feet away, I don't think that that 5 feet is really going to have that big of an impact minus the screening. I think a total height of 46 feet. So, I'm going to stop there. I don't know if the applicant wants to address anything that I hadn't. Probably not, but I'll turn to you.

**SIMONA STEVENS**

Just the branding. They keep on commenting, the branding, but—

**MICHAEL NAFT**

I don't want to keep showing that because I can't condition that that'd be a Hilton. But what I can condition is that it not be extended stay, and that's my intention. Part of my logic of removing that, I don't

know what you call it, the L part of the building was that was what was intended to be the extended stay portion. And since it came up time and again during public comments, I would limit the application against extended stay. Your client's aware of that?

**SIMONA STEVENS**

Yes. Yep. He's good with that.

**MOTION**

**MICHAEL NAFT**

Okay. If there is nothing further, prepared to move for approval. Given all how different this is from what was originally proposed and given everything I stated about the evolution of Windmill over there. The mass of this building is right up against Windmill and Giles pie. So, I'm going to move for approval with the conditions I've added to the record, which is prohibition on extended stay, Director Real, something?

**SAMI REAL**

I wanted to know if you wanted to approve these plans or approve the project per plans. That way if there is any modifications, they would have to come through the public hearing process versus being able to do that administratively. Also, I make that suggestion, and if you didn't want to do the whole thing, then at least maybe somehow we can address the increased parking through conditions because that is non-compliant with code.

**MICHAEL NAFT**

No, I'm happy to approve per plans just to explain what she was getting. If I didn't do it that way, then they're over-parked, so they would need a waiver to have as much parking as they're actually offering. And they don't have that waiver for more parking. So, I'm going to approve it per plans will be in my motion, with the condition limiting against extended stay. Anything else was put on the record. Moving for approval of Item 39, 40, and 41.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We have a motion. Cast your vote.

**VOTE**

<b>VOTING AYE:</b>	William McCurdy II, April Becker, Jim Gibson, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Michael Naft
<b>VOTING NAY:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Tick Segerblom, Justin Jones
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	None

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Motion is adopted.

**40. VS-25-0672-B & O INVESTMENT, LLC:**

VACATE AND ABANDON a portion of a right-of-way being Windmill Lane located between Giles pie Street and Rancho Destino Road, and a portion of a right-of-way being Giles pie Street located between Windmill Lane and Mesa Verde Lane within Enterprise (description on file). MN/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEMS 39 AND 41).**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

### Comprehensive Planning

- Satisfy utility companies' requirements.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the order of vacation must be recorded in the Office of the County Recorder or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

### Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- 30 days to coordinate with Public Works - Design Division and submit separate document if required, for dedication of any necessary right-of-way and easements for the Windmill Lane improvement project;
- Said dedication must occur prior to issuance of building permits, concurrent with the recording of a subdivision map, OR within 30 calendar days from a request for dedication by the County;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the recordation of this vacation of excess right-of-way and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control devices;
- Vacation to be recordable prior to building permit issuance or applicable map submittal;
- Revise legal description, if necessary, prior to recording.

### Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised that fire/emergency access must comply with the Fire Code as amended.

### Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- No objection.

#### 41. WS-25-0670-B & O INVESTMENT, LLC:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increase building height; 2) reduce throat depth; and 3) alternative driveway geometrics.

DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed hotel on 2.38 acres in a CG (Commercial General) Zone. Generally located north of Windmill Lane and west of Gilespe Street within Enterprise. MN/bb/kh (For possible action)

**ACTION: APPROVED (COMPANION ITEMS 39 AND 40).**

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

### Comprehensive Planning

- Per revised site plans dated October 28, 2025;
- Long-term lodging (stays longer than 30 days) are prohibited;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without approval of a Certificate of Compliance.
- Applicant is advised within 2 years from the approval date the application must commence or the application will expire unless extended with approval of an extension of time; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added

conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; changes to the approved project will require a new land use application; and the applicant is solely responsible for ensuring compliance with all conditions and deadlines.

#### Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;
- 30 days to coordinate with Public Works - Design Division and submit separate document if required, for dedication of any necessary right-of-way and easements for the Windmill Lane improvement project;
- Said dedication must occur prior to issuance of building permits, concurrent with the recording of a subdivision map, OR within 30 calendar days from a request for dedication by the County;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the vacation of excess right-of-way and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control devices.

#### Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised that fire/emergency access must comply with the Fire Code as amended.

#### Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) - Engineering

- Applicant is advised that there is an active septic permit on APN 177-09-403-031; to connect to municipal sewer and remove the septic system in accordance with Section 17 of the SNHD Regulations Governing Individual Sewage Disposal Systems and Liquid Waste Management; and to submit documentation to SNHD showing that the system has been properly removed.
- Applicant is advised to contact the SNHD Environmental Health Division, Public Accommodations Plan Review Program at [pa@snhd.org](mailto:pa@snhd.org) or (702) 759-1633 to obtain approval for the construction or remodeling of a public accommodation facility; and to submit construction plans with all schedules to [pa@snhd.org](mailto:pa@snhd.org) at least 30 days prior to beginning construction.

#### Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email [sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com](mailto:sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com) and reference POC Tracking #0169-2026 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

## SEC. 6. APPEAL

### 42. WS-25-0557-TAXPAYER & TAXPAYER:

APPEAL WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS to increase wall height in conjunction with an existing single-family residence on 0.49 acres in an RS20 (Residential Single-Family 20) Zone within the Neighborhood Protection (RNP) Overlay. Generally located south of Darby Avenue and west of Rolling Acres Circle within Spring Valley. JJ/tpd/cv (For possible action)

**ACTION: HELD TO NOVEMBER 19, 2025, PER THE APPLICANT.**

## SEC. 7. INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES

### 43. ORD-25-900529: Introduce an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with 10800 LVB LLC for a congregate care facility and tavern on 5.0 acres, generally located east of Las Vegas Boulevard and north of Erie Avenue within Enterprise. MN/dw (For possible action)

**ACTION: INTRODUCED AND SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2025, AT 9 A.M. (BILL 11-5-25-1).**

#### **SAMI REAL**

Next are ordinances for introduction.

- Item 43, ORD-25-900529. Is to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with 10800 LVB LLC for a congregate care facility and tavern on 5 acres.
- Item 44, ORD-25-900736. Is to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Signature Land Holdings LLC for a single-family residential development on 3.98 acres.
- Item 45, ORD-25-900854. Is to amend the official zoning map reclassifying certain properties as approved by the Board of County Commissioners on July 21, 2021, and August 20, 2025.

Commissioners, I ask that you set the public hearing for November 19, 2025.

#### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

We'll introduce the set of ordinances for Wednesday, November 19, 2025.

### 44. ORD-25-900736: Introduce an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Signature Land Holdings LLC for a single-family residential development on 3.98 acres, generally located west of Rainbow Boulevard and north of Cactus Avenue within Enterprise. JJ/dw (For possible action)

**ACTION: INTRODUCED AND SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2025, AT 9 A.M. (BILL 11-5-25-2).**

### 45. ORD-25-900854: Introduce an ordinance to amend the official zoning map reclassifying certain properties as approved by the Board of County Commissioners on July 21, 2021 and August 20, 2025. (For possible action)

**ACTION: INTRODUCED AND SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2025, AT 9 A.M. (BILL 11-5-25-3).**



## PUBLIC COMMENTS

### **SAMI REAL**

And then this is the last time set aside for public comment.

### **AL ROJAS**

Hold on here real quick. Okay. My name is Al Rojas. I live at 2095 Homestake Mine Court. I wanted to take this time to address the Board the tremendous success that we are having with the homeless encampment ordinance in the Sunrise Manor area. We've seen a lot of reduction in the encampments. I really do feel that within a year or maybe six months, 95% of the encampments that we're seeing that footprint is going to be lowered tremendously. So, I do want to thank you for that.

I do want to briefly mention that I will talk about the noise ordinance, and I apologize to Commissioner Naft for being out of line, but the noise is an issue over there. The only problem that I'm seeing right now is with some of these encampment homeless people that are repeat offenders there. We tear them down and they come up. Most of them don't come back, but there's a few. And I do believe that we're going to have to go into a second phase where we start red carding them, actually taking them in a jail, enforcing that part of it, and getting them some kind of rehab.

I've been working a lot with the outreach programs. Some of them are getting off street. Many of these guys that are being on the street or that we offer services to at a certain park, they say, "We're trying to stay because I got a place to stay. I'm staying with a friend," or they're going to start going to a shelter. So, we're seeing them being channeled into these services with this new ordinance.

The other thing I want them to talk about is the noise ordinance, and that's why I mentioned that during this public comment where the church is at. To get the noise down, somebody has to press charges. So somewhere down the road, we're going to have to modify that ordinance. Or do something like where I lived before, when I lived on the beach, we had a thing called the LUGO, the Loud Unruly Gathering Ordinance. It was imposed when, and nothing against Mr. Dennis Rodman, there's nothing wrong with being a person who likes to have fun, but he kind of went overboard, helicopters on the sand and stuff like that.

So, we created an ordinance where the law enforcement can enforce it if it was too loud and the residents don't have to press charges. So that Ethiopian Church is that when they go over the noise, who's going to enforce that? So that, and then later I'll get into the ticketing of the RVs at some other time. But generally speaking, we're doing really well. The noise ordinance is something we got to look at, and we got to start ticketing some of these RVs that are repeating. They just keep moving around. So basically, we're doing really well and I want to appreciate, thank the Commissioners for that ordinance that's doing really, really well. Thank you.

### **WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward at this time? Seeing no one, we'll adjourn this meeting.

## END PUBLIC COMMENTS

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, at the hour of 11:36 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.

**PLEASE NOTE:** THE COUNTY CLERK KEEPS THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF ALL PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNTY COMMISSION, THE CCWRD BOARD OF TRUSTEES, THE UMC HOSPITAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, THE CLARK COUNTY LIQUOR AND GAMING LICENSING BOARD, AND THE CLARK COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY. TO OBTAIN A COMPLETE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF ALL PROCEEDINGS, ANY PHOTOGRAPH, MAP, CHART, OR ANY OTHER DOCUMENT USED IN ANY PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD/TRUSTEES, REQUESTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY CLERK.

TO REFERENCE AGENDA ITEM ATTACHMENTS ONLINE: REFER TO THE MEETING LINK BELOW, SELECT THE ITEM (FILE # COLUMN), AND CLICK THE LINK FOR THE DESIRED ATTACHMENT.

[ONLINE MEETING LINK](#)

**APPROVED:** /s/ Tick Segerblom  
TICK SEGERBLOM, CHAIR

**ATTEST:** /s/ Lynn Marie Goya  
LYNN MARIE GOYA, CLARK COUNTY CLERK