



**CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
SUMMARY MINUTES**

July 10, 2024

5:30 p.m., Council Chambers,  
2250 Las Vegas Boulevard North,  
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89030

Website - <http://www.cityofnorthlasvegas.com>

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Chairman Calhoun** called the meeting into order at 5:30 P.M.

**WELCOME**

**Chairman Calhoun** welcome all who were attending the meeting.

**VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW**

**Ms. Rodgers** confirmed compliance with Open Meeting Law.

**ROLL CALL**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Chairman Calhoun  
Vice Chairman Greer  
Commissioner Guymon (By phone)  
Commissioner Riley (By phone)  
Commissioner Villeda  
Commissioner Zeiler

**STAFF PRESENT**

Senior Deputy City Attorney Rhiann Denman Jarvis  
Director of Land Development & Community Services Alfredo Melesio  
Planning and Zoning Manager Robert Eastman  
Principal Planner Sharianne Dotson  
City Clerk Jackie Rodgers  
Chief Deputy City Clerk Cherry Lawson  
Deputy City Clerk Lead Daisy Rivera  
Deputy City Clerk Isabel Rodriguez

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Led by **Commissioner Villeda**

**PUBLIC FORUM**

**Chairman Calhoun** opened the meeting to receive public comment. The following individual provided comments.

**Cecil Moore, 6944 Portolano Dr., North Las Vegas, NV 89084** provided comments about a property in his community that the HOA President owns and does not abide by the rules of the city or the HOA. He provided a packet of information to the Commission for its review.

**Chairman Calhoun** closed the meeting to public comment.

**AGENDA**

- 1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of July 10, 2024. (For Possible Action; Recommendation – Approve)

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Villeda moved to approve the agenda with Item No. 3 being continued to the August 14, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- 2. Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of June 12, 2024. (For Possible Action; Recommendation – Approve)

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Villeda moved to approve the Consent Agenda as published.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

### **BUSINESS**

3. **DA-04-2024 ALIANTE TRU (Public Hearing).** Applicant: North Valley Enterprise, LLC. Request: A Major Modification to the Aliante Development Agreement to allow a hotel in a C-P MPC (Professional Office Commercial Master Planned Community). Location: North of Nature Park Drive, approximately 200 feet east of Aliante Parkway. (APN 124-20-501-008). Ward 4. (For Possible Action) **Continued to August 14, 2024**
4. **FDP-06-2024 OLD ROSE GARDEN.** Applicant: Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority. Request: A Final Development Plan in a PUD (Planned Unit Development District), Currently Zoned R-A/R-2 (Medium Density Residential Subdistrict), to Develop a 192-Unit Multi-Family Housing Development. Location: Southwest Corner of North Fifth Street and Tonopah Avenue. (APNs 139-22-810-041 & 139-22-810-042). Ward 2. (For Possible Action)

**Jennifer Lazovich** for the applicant, **1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Las Vegas, NV** stated that she and the applicant agrees with the summary description provided by **Mr. Eastman**; however stated that they have the elevations have been revised in the front, and they have added some color there as well.

**Commissioner Greer** stated he appreciates the proposal, and looks forward to this project being developed in the area, as it has been vacant for some time.

**MOTION:** *Vice Chairman Greer moved to approve FDP-06-2024 OLD ROSE GARDEN with staff's Conditions.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

5. **SPR-05-2024 PUETOLLANO TRUST COONS CARTER ESQ TRS.** Applicant: Matthew Olden. Request: A Site Plan Review in an R-1 MPC (Single-Family Residential Master Plan Community) to allow a Second Drive Access where One is allowed. Location: 7118 Puetollano Drive. (APN 124-19-513-067). Ward 3. (For Possible Action)

**Planning Manager Robert Eastman** provided an overview of this item stating this is a request for a Site Plan Review in the R-1, MPC or Single-family Residential Master Plan Community to allow a second driveway access, where currently only one access would normally be permitted. The homeowner is using the frozen code that was adopted as part of the Aliante Development Agreement for the Master Plan Community.

He explained the regulations alien to, now substantially different then what we currently have and specifically what the applicant has been doing is parking his RV and a boat in his backyard. In the frozen code, the zoning ordinance did not specifically address recreational vehicles other than the stated vehicles. The homeowner cannot park those recreational vehicles in the front yard; therefore, he had been parking in the rear yard.

The problem, there is no access to his rear yard. Without building a second driveway, a second driveway is not permitted under normal circumstances in a residential district. In order to park his vehicles, the homeowner must ask for a waiver of the parking standards to allow a second driveway in the current code. This would be a waiver provided through the Planning Commission and ultimately through the City Council. However, the frozen code would be waiver provided using a Site Plan Review; the request and determines if the second driveway poses a traffic pattern within the neighborhood. They did not. Public Works supports the proposed request for a second driveway.

**Mr. Eastman** stated that the applicant/homeowner has clearly been operating and parking illegally, as there is no way for the boat to get back and forth from the front of the home to the rear of the house. This building permit would assist the applicant after the fact in becoming compliant. He explained some additional work that is needed to improve the driveway to ensure compliance. City staff recommends approval of the second driveway.

He continued stating that the applicant did submit a Site Plan Review showing a number of additions and modifications to his backyard; those are not part of this application. A number of them have not yet been submitted for any building permits or any approvals. The applicant does have a partial approval for a number of items from the Sub-association Architectural Review Committee. The City placed a condition that the Master Architectural Review Committee provide approval for the driveway that needs to be done.

**Liz Olson, 1980 Festival Plaza Drive** here on behalf of the applicant and property owner provided an overview of the property description and stated this home is one of the larger corner homes in the Aliante subdivision. The applicant does need to obtain approval from the local HOA, as well as the master HOA. However, they do have the approval of from the local HOA she provided a copy of the letter for the Commission to view. She continued stating that with the conditional 90 day, approval from the master HOA, which is applied to this application.

**Ms. Olson** explained the original plan that was submitted by the applicant to the HOA for approval stating that he had since withdrawn his request to build a casita due to the base costs. That, the applicant is not looking to move forward on that project at this time. However, he may revisit it later.

As **Mr. Eastman** noted, the applicant did originally build the wall as noted on the site plan, as he is fully permitted for that wall with the gate. As part of the application, there would be pavers up to the sidewalk, but not on the sidewalk. It will have to meet ADA requirements. She stated that they have received some support from his neighbors on the project; however, has not received any complaints. She stated that as for where he can park his on his property is a separate discussion with his HOA. The Planning Commission and the City are not to look at a private agreement, such as the CCNR's, for the HOA.

**Chairman Calhoun** asked whether Public Works has or will allow the applicant to cut into the sidewalk to move out. **Mr. Eastman** replied stating, to put in the driveway, the applicant will most likely need to cut into the sidewalk, but the applicant will have to restore the sidewalk, and it will need to meet ADA requirements. Any changes to the sidewalk are at the applicant's expense, but must comply with the city's regulations and ADA requirements.

**Chairman Calhoun** asked how the applicant is able to currently park in the rear of his home. **Ms. Olson** replied stating that the applicant drives over onto the sidewalk.

**Vice Chairman Greer** asked whether the wall of the fence has any restriction on the height. **Mr. Eastman** stated that there are restriction on the height of the wall in the Aliante community. The maximum wall height is eight feet. That the applicant is at its maximum height. It matches the height of its neighbors to the north, as it is on a curve.

**Commissioner Zeiler** it appears to me that this particular applicant has taken the, pattern of doing something and then asking for forgiveness. Unfortunately, for the applicant, this is not the first time, especially for someone who is asking others to follow rules.

**Matthew Alden 7118 Delano, North Las Vegas, NV** stated that he had submitted all the changes in the original permit requests. He had filed a separate permit request for the wall, but it was originally included in the first large permit for 90% of the work in the backyard. He thought that he was compliant by having included it in the entire permit requests every time that he was asked to do a subsequent separate or individual permit. He stated that he was always upfront in his requests, and did not start any work before any work was permitted. At this time, he does not see putting in the casita due to the cost factor.

**Commissioner Zeiler** inquired as to when the wall was built, as she wanted to know whether it was built before or after the permit is issued. That, she understands that the wall is not part of what is before the Commission for consideration. It demonstrates the pattern of the activity of the homeowner that is important. **Mr. Eastman** replied that their records show that the wall was constructed before the building permit was approved. **Ms. Olson** stated the submitted that **Mr. Eastman** is referring to is the submittal to the HOA. She thinks there was an overlap in the submittal process.

**Ms. Olson** asked whether the Commission would feel comfortable with adding a condition that if the homeowner comes forward with a casita in the future, a condition can be added to do a site plan review in front of the Planning Commission for that Casita.

**Commissioner Zeiler** replied stating her concern is that any condition that is placed will not be respected with much merit. **Ms. Olson** asked that the Commission give the condition some consideration, as a legal condition would require the homeowner to follow.

**Commissioner Zeiler** deferred to **Senior Deputy City Attorney Rhiann Jarvis Denman** asking whether a condition such as this can be added to the homeowner. **Ms. Jarvis Denman** stated it would be a reach.

**Commissioner Zeiler** stated that she feels the frustration of the neighbor who has looked at the noncompliance for an extended amount of time and had little recourse when the HOA president who is creating the problem.

**Vice Chairman Greer** commented to **Mr. Eastman** that he had indicated that the homeowner had received approval from one level of the homeowner's association. **Mr. Eastman** replied stating yes, ARC both. **Vice Chairman Greer** stated that the homeowner would need to provide both approvals.

**Mr. Eastman** stated that the homeowner has submitted a letter showing that the sub-association of the neighborhood that he lives within, and its' Architectural Review Committee have reviewed his plans. However, the City does not have proof that the Master HOA Architectural Review Committee has approved the plans. In the Aliante Design Standards, it does list it there that it is a requirement. Aliante is the only community with that responsibility.

**Vice Chairman Greer** asked of **Mr. Eastman** that if the Commission places a condition and it is approved, the homeowner have to obtain approval from the master. If he does not, it voids the condition that was set by the Commission. **Mr. Eastman** stated yes, as that is Condition No. 3. The homeowner has 90 days. If he is unable to obtain the approval, the homeowner have to return the property back to its original state at his own expense, and would void out whatever decision the Commission would make this evening.

**Ms. Olson** stated that this was the plan that the homeowner submitted to the master HOA, and he did receive an approval letter. However, the approval letter was not specific to the driveway. The revised letter from his local HOA just noted pool and the casita. They have requested a new letter that is specific to the driveway, but have seen this specific plan and have signed off on the plan that includes the driveway. She explained that is why the Land Development Department was kind enough to give them an additional 90 extension to obtain the updated letter.

**Commissioner Villeda** stated that she shares the same concerns as **Commissioner Zeiler** as far as doing things without permission.

**Commissioner Riley** stated that he agrees with both **Commissioner Zeiler** and **Guymon**, as it seems like it is an ongoing problem, and believe that those of us who are in positions of leadership, especially within homeowners associations, need to set the

example because we are under a microscope.

**Ms. Olson** ask once again whether the Commission would be open to placing a condition of approval on the property.

**Commissioner Guymon** stated she remember this year, a couple of months ago, we had another neighbor come in and asked for permission for a wall that, they had already built. The Commission [we] did not allow the neighbor to pass that. She believes the Commission needs to be consistent in not allowing this to pass when it did not allow the other to pass. She is in agreement with the other Commissioners.

**Commissioner Zeiler** stated she too referenced the previous agenda item as a concern for how it affects this one, as the main difference is this is a legal side yard. Although it looks like the front yard versus a legal front yard.

**Ms. Olson** stated it might be helpful to the Commission to add the condition that way the homeowner has to come back if he plans to add a future casita. She does understand the Commission concerns.

**Vice Chairman Greer** stated one of the big concerns that he has is that a homeowner conducting work on its property, and considering whether he needs a permit as an afterthought. Those are the concerns that the Commission have. A lot of work has been done without the consideration of getting a permit for all of the work that has been done prior to the start of the work.

**Mr. Alden** reiterated that he had never done any work on his home without any permits. The Commission is continuously telling him that he has done work without obtaining permits. He stated that he has not moved one shovel of dirt without a permit. The very first permit was broad for the pool and included the wall. He commented on the inconsistent directions related to the permits, but had not build anything without first having applied for pool.

He stated that he would do anything that is asked of him to ensure that he assuage the concerns of the Commission regarding the casita. That, he will not build one.

**Chairman Calhoun** asked whether the work that **Mr. Alden** completed was permitted and authorized by the HOA. **Mr. Alden** affirmed that it was permitted and authorized.

**Mr. Eastman** provided a point of clarification between this case and the previous case. The records that the department have showed both applicants have built their wall without having secured a permit. In the previous case, the applicant built a wall that violated the height allowance for the front yard. That applicant came before you asking to allow his wall to remain in violation of the design standards that we have. However, in this case, the applicant wall does meet Aliante standards for height and for location on the side. It matches up with its neighbor's yard wall. According to our records, the applicant built the wall prior to obtaining a city permit.

Furthermore, the applicant did submit his permit for an as built to get approval for the work that he previously completed. The City approved the permit. Regarding the pool permit, it was reviewed and approved. He stated that construction was started and stopped as well as amendments were made to the permit. The permit have been under review requesting for additional information. The pool is partially built. The city has never seen nor issued any permits for the casita. **Mr. Eastman** provided the definition of a casita within the Aliante community. In essence, it is a room.

He continued explaining that the Commission can place a condition that additionally state modification or additional construction projects or something would need the approval of the Planning Commission. It is something that has never been done, but is within the purview of the Commission.

**Mr. Alden** stated for clarification that he pool is completed, and it was never amended. He has had the final permit since June 2023. He had hired an outside company to fill it with a fire hose. He continued to explain the process that he went through with the pool permit. He discussed the HOA involvement stating it requires a list of things, and the pool is the largest part. He thought the deck might cover the landscaping treatment on the ground; however, the HOA is now requesting a weird driveway that was not previously available to him. Therefore, he sought after additional letters to say please amend.

**Vice Chairman Greer** asked for clarification from **Mr. Alden** as to whom he was referring to in terms of "they" and whether he is referring to the City or the HOA. **Mr. Alden** stated the City told him yes for the permit. He initially though everything was approved including the wall, as it was part of the original submission.

**Mr. Alden** continued to explain his interaction with the City regarding the pool having too many linear feet, and having to have a new permit and inspection to close it out and have it approved. The City came out to inspect the pool and wall and it was approved. However, everything is entirely to code. There appears to be some confusion in terms of the initial permitting request in terms of its inclusiveness of everything.

**Commissioner Zeiler** asked whether who cited **Mr. Alden** for his boat. **Mr. Alden** replied stating it was the City Code Enforcement. **Mr. Alden** stated that he had asked for a suspension until the matter was heard before the Planning Commission.

**Commissioner Zeiler** asked the Commission to consider one of her concerns being that the 2026 Master Aliante Code will sunset. Given that, there will be other rules that govern that community. She does not know what effects a condition placed on this particular property will have knowing that the current Code will sunset in 2026.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Zeiler moved to approve SPR-05-2024 PUETOLLANO TRUST COONS CARTER ESQ TRS with staff's Conditions.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**  
**AYES:** 5  
**NAYS:** 1 (Guymon)

ABSTAIN: 0

- 6. **FDP-04-2024 CULINARY ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS.** Applicant: Bloc9 Architectural LLC. Request: A Final Development Plan in a PUD (Planned Unit Development District) to Develop a 15,264 Square Foot Expansion to an Existing Educational Facility. Location: 710 West Lake Mead Boulevard. (APN 139-22-201-017). Ward 2. (For Possible Action)

**Principal Planner Sharienne Dotson** provided an overview of the item stating this request is for a Final Development Plan to develop a 15,264 sq. ft. of an expansion to an existing Culinary Academy that is located at 710 West Lake Mead Boulevard, on the northeast corner of Lake Mead Boulevard and Revere Street. All of the expansions are to the existing building with the exception to the storage building. They are adding restrooms, lobby areas, coffee shops extension for classrooms, training spaces, and break rooms. The elevation that was submitted is similar to what they currently have.

She explained the only concern that the City has is when they prepare to do the CMU that they are going to maintain the pattern. The decorative block and a smooth face that the City would like for them to maintain. Other than that, the site does comply with parking, and a landscape plan was submitted, as the landscaping along Lake Mead and Riviera will remain intact. However, additional foundation landscaping around the new expansion will be added. **Ms. Dotson** stated that she forgot to mention that this item is a PUD, and as such, a Final Plan is required. Staff recommends approval.

**John Vornsand, of Vornsand Consulting 62 Swan Circle, Henderson, NV 89074** for the applicant provided an overview of the hospitality institution that provides training to students for employment in the resort industry. The campus is looking to refresh and expand so to provide additional classroom units, as well as adding 417 parking spaces.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Villeda moved to approve FDP-04-2024 CULINARY ACADEMY OF LAS VEGAS with staff's Conditions.*

**ACTION: APPROVED**  
 AYES: 6  
 NAYS: 0  
 ABSTAIN: 0

- 7. **FDP-05-2024 BLISS CAR WASH.** Applicant: Bliss Car Wash Nevada LLC. Request: A Final Development Plan in a PUD (Planned Unit Development District) to Develop a 5,526 Square Foot Commercial Building (Automatic Car Wash). Location: North of Ann Road, Approximately 400 Feet West of North 5th Street. (APNs 124-27-817-002 and 124-27-817-005). Ward 4. (For Possible Action)

**Ms. Dotson** provided an overview of Item Nos. 7 and 8 as both were related; however, stated that each would require a separate vote. Item No. 7 is an application for a Final Development Plan to develop a 5,526 sq. ft. commercial building that is going to be an automatic vehicle-washing establishment within a PUD. The subject site consists of 1.74 acres located north of Ann Road, approximately 400ft west of North Fifth.

A decorative ellipse element that is over some glass windows and the east and west elevations have the gray metal roll up building build gray roll up doors for the entrance and exit on the car wash and the polish tunnel. This is an existing commercial center. The proposed building should actually incorporate some of the architectural features and colors from the existing buildings that are already out there.

**Liz Olson, 1980 Festival Plaza Dr., Las Vegas, NV** for the applicant provided a brief overview of the Bliss Car Wash project. She stated as staff mentioned, this is a portion of a larger PUD that was previously approved several years ago. The corner along Ann and Fifth has been and was always approved for commercial uses. We concur with all of staff's conditions, including the additional landscaping, moving the, the equipment here out of the landscaping.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Greer moved to approve FDP-05-2024 BLISS CAR WASH with staff's Conditions.*

**ACTION: APPROVED**  
AYES: 6  
NAYS: 0  
ABSTAIN: 0

- 8. **SUP-39-2024 BLISS CAR WASH (Public Hearing).** Applicant: Bliss Car Wash Nevada LLC. Request: A Special Use Permit in a PUD (Planned Unit Development District) to allow a Vehicle Washing Establishment. Location: North of Ann Road, Approximately 400 Feet West of North 5th Street. (APNs 124-27-817-002 and 124-27-817-005). Ward 4. (For Possible Action)

The applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit for the 5,000 sq. ft., 526 sq. ft. vehicle washing establishment within the PUD. There is some signage indicated on the site plan that would have to be done through a through a separate building permit. The proposed vehicle washing establishment is in line with the PUD, is compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and existing communities. It does not propose a negative impact, and staff recommends approval of the SUP, with the listed Conditions.

[6:28 P.M.] **Chairman Calhoun** opened the public hearing for public testimony.

**Ms. Rodgers** stated that the city had received two (2) comment cards in support and four (4) comment cards in opposition of this project.

[6:28 P.M.] **Chairman Calhoun** closed the public hearing for public testimony.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Villeda moved to approve SUP-39-2024 BLISS CAR WASH with staff's recommendations.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

9. **SUP-40-2024 DUNE PROCESSING (Public Hearing).** Applicant: Dune ProCol LLC. Request: A Special Use Permit in an M-2 (General Industrial District) to allow the Production of Edible Marijuana Products or Marijuana-Infused Products. Location: 1011 East Alexander Road. (APN 139-11-102-001). Ward 2. (For Possible Action)

**Ms. Dotson** provided an overview of the application for a Special Use Permit to allow the production of an edible marijuana products or marijuana infused product facility located at 1011 East Alexander Road. The location currently has an existing cultivation facility for marijuana, which SCP-71-2021 and the applicant was of does have an active business license for that cultivation facility. The applicant has provided the Distance Separation survey, showing that the facility meets the required distance separations from community facilities, residential property, schools or any non-restrictive gaming facilities. Access to the site is from two driveways located on Alexander Road. The site appears to comply with the parking requirements for the proposed use.

They are not proposing any exterior modifications at this time. However, they are going to do interior, they will have to get temporary, ties for the building from the building permit process. In looking at the aerial photos, it appears that they do have some areas that are missing some trees. They will be required to put that back in and make the landscaping come into compliance. A production of edible marijuana products and marijuana infused products facility is permitted within the M-2 with the approval of Special use permit by the Planning Commission. The applicant has addressed all the requirements, according to Title 17. Staff have no objections to the proposed use, and recommends approval with listed conditions.

**Daniel Corbett 1011 East Alexander Road, Las Vegas, NV** stated that he had no comments to offer, that he respectfully ask for approval of the business.

[6:35 P.M.] **Chairman Calhoun** opened the public hearing for public testimony.

[6:35 P.M.] **Chairman Calhoun** closed the public hearing for public testimony. No testimony provided.

**MOTION:** *Commissioner Villeda moved to approve SUP-40-2024 DUNE PROCESSING with staff's recommendations.*

**ACTION: APPROVED**

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

10. **VN-05-2024 TJ MAXX BUILDING EXPANSION (Public Hearing)**. Applicant: NBC Fourth Realty Corp. Request: A variance in an M-2 (General Industrial District) to allow an overall fence/wall height of 14 feet where a maximum height of 12 feet is allowed. Location: 4100 East Lone Mountain Road. (APN 123-31-702-002). Ward 1. (For Possible Action)

**Ms. Dotson** provided a brief overview of the application for a Variance No. 05-2024 for TJ Maxx building expansion to allow a wall that is 14 ft. where a maximum height of 12 ft. is allowed. The applicant is expanding the building that is going to cut into their parking lot. Existing the expansion is making it where they need to make the two floors equal. The requirements for the approval of a variance for state law under NRS 278.300 sets forth the requirements that must be met before the Planning Commission have empowered to grant the variance.

The proposed site plan and application meet the requirements for a variance and should not pose any complications or issues to the subject property and again, not only is that the slope, but the existing streets are already in, so they really do not have any other option besides the wall at this time. Staff does recommend approve subject to conditions listed.

**Diana Kougias 6671 Las Vegas Boulevard, Las Vegas, NV** stated that she agrees with the description that **Ms. Dotson** provided; however, have offered a few comments. She stated that the location is an existing facility is a warehouse that they are looking to expand. The finished floor will match, and they will have to cut into the existing slope in the back of the property. In some areas, it will be a 10 ft. cut. They will have to install retaining walls because they are surrounded by a right-of-way, and maintain that right-of-way. Only TJ Maxx employees and truck drivers will be able to see the wrought iron fence and retaining wall from inside of the property.

[6:40 P.M.] **Chairman Calhoun** opened the public hearing for public testimony.

[6:40 P.M.] **Chairman Calhoun** closed the public hearing for public testimony.  
No testimony provided.

**MOTION: Commissioner Villeda moved to approve VN-05-2024 TJ MAXX BUILDING EXPANSION with staff's recommendations.**

**ACTION: APPROVED**

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

## STAFF COMMENTS

**Director of Land Development & Community Services Alfredo Melesio** thanked the Commissioners for their service and acknowledged the departure of Commissioner Warner. He stated that the City is working to replace the vacancy on the Commission and would have the seat filled soon.

## COMMISSION COMMENTS

**Commissioner Zeiler** thanked the City for having the ability to attend a three (3) day NALEAO Conference in June along with **Commissioner Villeda and Councilwoman Garcia-Anderson** for the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, and acting as the host city. Las Vegas was able to welcome over 2,000 elected and appointed officials from across the country. We had the opportunity to learn more about issues like workforce needs, housing, economic mobility and educational opportunities for our constituents.

One of the highlights of the event for us personally was the opportunity to hear a presentation given by our very own City Clerk Jackie Rodgers, who was part of a forum called, "The Dark Data Driven Decisions Leveraging AI for Local Government Efficiency."

## PUBLIC FORUM

**Cecil Moore 6944 Port Toronto Drive, North Las Vegas, NV** commented on the outcome of Item No. 5 stating that the Commissioner are correct, that the homeowner will violate the rules again. The next time it will be a matter of how the rules will be violated.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Chairman Calhoun** adjourned the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM.

## CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing are true and correct minutes of the City of North Las Vegas Planning Commission Regular Meeting held on July 10, 2024. I further certify that a quorum was present.

---

Jackie Rodgers, City Clerk