



**AGENDA MEMO - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2025**

**DEPARTMENT: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**ITEM DESCRIPTION: APPLICANT: GREYSTONE NEVADA, LLC - OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS; 180 LAND CO, LLC; FORE STARS, LTD; AND SEVENTY ACRES, LLC**

**\*\* STAFF RECOMMENDATION(S) \*\***

<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>REQUIRED FOR APPROVAL</b>
<b>24-0629-GPA1</b>	Staff recommends APPROVAL.	
<b>24-0629-ZON1</b>	Staff recommends APPROVAL.	24-0629-GPA1
<b>24-0629-SDR1</b>	Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions:	24-0629-GPA1 24-0629-ZON1
<b>24-0629-TMP1</b>	Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions:	24-0629-GPA1 24-0629-ZON1 24-0629-SDR1

**\*\* NOTIFICATION \*\***

**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED** 29

**NOTICES MAILED** 1,713 (by City Clerk)

**PROTESTS** 16

**APPROVALS** 1

**\*\* CONDITIONS \*\***

---

---

**24-0629-SDR1 CONDITIONS**

---

---

**Planning**

1. Approval of a General Plan Amendment (24-0629-GPA1) and Rezoning (24-0629-ZON1) and approval of and conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Tentative Map (24-0629-TMP1) shall be required, if approved.
2. All development shall conform to the Badlands Master Development Plan, Badlands Development Standards and Design Guidelines and related exhibits or Title 19, as applicable.
3. This approval shall be void four years from the date of final approval, unless exercised pursuant to the provisions of LVMC Title 19.16. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
4. All necessary building permits shall be obtained and final inspections shall be completed in compliance with Title 19 and all codes as required by the Building and Safety Division.
5. These Conditions of Approval shall be affixed to the cover sheet of any plan set submitted for building permit.
6. A technical landscape plan, signed and sealed by a Registered Architect, Landscape Architect, Residential Designer or Civil Engineer, must be submitted prior to or at the same time as Final Map submittal. A permanent underground sprinkler system is required, and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner; the landscape plan shall include irrigation specifications. Installed landscaping shall not impede visibility of any traffic control device.
7. No turf shall be permitted in the non-recreational common areas, such as medians and amenity zones in this development.
8. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City Departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

**Public Works**

9. Conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Tentative Map (24-0629-TMP1).

---

**24-0629-TMP1 CONDITIONS**

---

**Planning**

1. Approval of the Tentative Map shall be for no more than four (4) years. If a Final Map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the Tentative Map within four (4) years of the approval of the Tentative Map, this action is void.
2. Approval of a General Plan Amendment (24-0629-GPA1) and Rezoning (24-0629-ZON1) and approval of and conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Site Development Plan Review (24-0629-SDR1) shall be required, if approved.
3. A revised Tentative Map shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development for review and approval depicting the required number of guest parking spaces prior to the submittal of a Final Map.
4. Street names must be provided in accordance with the City's Street Naming Regulations.

**Conditions Page Three****February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

5. In conjunction with creation, declaration and recordation of the subject common-interest community, and prior to recordation of the Covenants, Codes and Restrictions ("CC&R"), or conveyance of any unit within the community, the Developer is required to record a Declaration of Private Maintenance Requirements ("DPMR") as a covenant on all associated properties, and on behalf of all current and future property owners. The DPMR is to include a listing of all privately owned and/or maintained infrastructure improvements, along with assignment of maintenance responsibility for each to the common interest community or the respective individual property owners, and is to provide a brief description of the required level of maintenance for privately maintained components. The DPMR must be reviewed and approved by the City of Las Vegas Department of Field Operations prior to recordation, and must include a statement that all properties within the community are subject to assessment for all associated costs should private maintenance obligations not be met, and the City of Las Vegas be required to provide for said maintenance. Also, the CC&R are to include a statement of obligation of compliance with the DPMR. Following recordation, the Developer is to submit copies of the recorded DPMR and CC&R documents to the City of Las Vegas Department of Field Operations.
6. All development is subject to the conditions of City Departments and State Subdivision Statutes.

**Public Works**

7. Submit vacation application(s) to eliminate any Public Drainage or Sewer Easements in conflict with this site. All vacations related to each subsequent Final Map shall record prior to and concurrent with the recordation of the associated Final Map for this site.
8. Dedicate additional right-of-way on Rampart Boulevard for a right turn lane/bus turnout in conformance with Standard Drawing #234.4 and grant a Bus Shelter Pad Easement to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Additionally, dedicate any right turn lanes or dual left turn lanes for the Alta Drive/Hualapai Way intersection or development access points as required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All rights-of-way shall be dedicated with the associated adjacent related Final Map.

**Conditions Page Four**  
**February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

9. Construct the right turn lane/bus turnout on Rampart Boulevard and any other right turn lanes or dual left turn lanes and traffic signal modifications as required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis concurrent with the associated adjacent phase of construction for this site. Construction phasing of required flood control and sewer infrastructure improvements shall be constructed as required in the respective approved master engineering studies.
10. In accordance with code requirements of Title 13.56 and Section 2.2 of the City's Vision Zero Action Plan, remove all substandard offsite improvements and unused driveway cuts on Hualapai Way and Rampart Boulevard, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) to the satisfaction of the City Engineer concurrent with development of this site. Grant Pedestrian Access Easement(s) if necessary to comply with this requirement. All existing paving damaged or removed by this development shall be restored at its original location, width and depth concurrent with development of this site.
11. Private streets must be granted and labeled on the Final Map for this site as Public Utility Easements (P.U.E.), Public Sewer Easements, and Public Drainage Easements to be privately maintained by the Homeowner's Association.
12. Submit a Wastewater Masterplan to the City of Las Vegas Sanitary Sewer Engineering for review. The Wastewater Masterplan must be approved prior to the recordation of any individual residential lots or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first.
13. The proposed sewer point of connection at Street H is a private sewer. Prior to connection, permission to convert this to a public sewer line must be granted and the private sewer will need to pass standard sewer inspections to be accepted for public maintenance by the City. Alternatively, route sewer around the private sewer and connect to the next downstream public sewer manhole.
14. All sewer connections to existing public sewer lines along with the abandonment of unused sewer lines shall be clearly shown on submitted construction drawings and shall meet all City construction standards prior to approval of such construction drawings. Coordinate the sewer connection to Street G with the Department of Public Works.

Conditions Page Five

February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

15. No walls, signs, lights, parking area, buildings or other structures, or permanent landscaping having a mature height greater than 3-feet shall be placed anywhere in any public easement or in the vehicle ingress or egress pathways to easements. This may require the elimination of affected conflicting lots.
16. Design of horizontal and vertical distance separations for public sewer and flood control infrastructure must meet the City of Las Vegas' design criteria prior to the issuance of permits for this site, unless otherwise allowed by the City Engineer. This may require streets to be wider than what is shown on the approved Tentative Map.
17. Contact the City Engineer's Office at 702-229-6272 to coordinate the development of this project with the Rampart Boulevard, Charleston Boulevard to Vegas Drive Roadway Improvement Project (MWA781) and any other public improvement projects adjacent to this site. Comply with the recommendations of the City Engineer.
18. All landscaping and private improvements installed with this project shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections. A gated queuing analysis is required for all proposed gated entries. Queueing in the public right-of-way is prohibited.
19. A Master Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Map subdividing this site, whichever may occur first. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall include a pedestrian circulation/access plan to identify nearby pedestrian attractors and recommend measures to accommodate pedestrians, such as but not limited to pedestrian access, crosswalk, pedestrian activated flashers and temporary sidewalks. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing traffic signal progression on Rampart Boulevard and a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements for bus turnouts adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights of way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 for exclusive right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

**Conditions Page Six**  
**February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

20. Proposed driveways on Hualapai Way are limited to right-in/right-out only. Construct median modifications on Hualapai Way for the southern entrance to deter left-turn movements into this site while maintaining full access for the opposing private drive on Hualapai Way. If a roadway grant is obtained for left-turn storage on the west side of Hualapai Way, then left turn access may be constructed and the restricting median modification is not required, provided it is allowed in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. One additional access point on Charleston Boulevard and Rampart Boulevard may be administratively approved by the Department of Public Works provided that legal access rights are obtained and such access points are shown in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis.
21. This site is in a Federal Emergency Management Area (FEMA) designated flood zone. A Master Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements including Clark County Regional Flood Control facilities as are recommended by the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Drainage Studies and approved Drainage Plan/Studies concurrent with development of this site. Additionally, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) must be obtained from FEMA prior to the issuance of any construction permits within the current flood zone. Areas not encumbered by the flood zone are not subject to CLOMR requirements.
22. The proposed drainage facility design shall meet the approval of the Department of Public Works and any other agency required in the approved Master Drainage Study and Technical Drainage Studies. Grant minimum 20-foot wide Public Drainage Easements, acceptable to the Flood Control Section of the Department of Public Works, for all existing storm drain facilities in Common Elements A & B and the approved box culvert alignment. Construct a maintenance path for the proposed drainage facility design as required in the approved Master Drainage Study and individual Technical Drainage Study for the drainage facility.
23. As per Unified Development Code (UDC) 19.16.060.G, all requirements must be complied with or such future compliance must be guaranteed by an approved performance security method in accordance with UDC sections 19.02.130.

Conditions Page Seven

February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

24. The approval of all Public Works related improvements shown on this Tentative Map is in concept only. Specific design and construction details relating to size, type and/or alignment of improvements, including but not limited to street, sewer and drainage improvements, shall be resolved prior to approval of the construction plans by the City. No deviations from adopted City Standards shall be allowed unless specific written approval for such is received from the City Engineer prior to the recordation of a Final Map or the approval of subdivision-related construction plans, whichever may occur first. Approval of this Tentative Map does not constitute approval of any deviations. If such approval cannot be obtained, a revised Tentative Map must be submitted showing elimination of such deviations.

**Fire & Rescue**

25. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures. Minimum clear widths required at entry and exits with dividing median is 24 feet.



**Staff Report Page One**  
**February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

**\*\* STAFF REPORT \*\***

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The applicant is proposing a Planned Development District consisting of 1,480 single-family attached and detached units, as well as condominium units on 253.51-acres located at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard.

**ISSUES**

- The applicant is proposing a General Plan Amendment from GTC (General Tourist Commercial), M (Medium Density Residential) and PR-OS (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space) to PCD (Planned Community Development). Staff supports this request.
- The applicant is proposing a Rezoning from PD (Planned Development), R-3 (Medium Density Residential), and R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) to PD (Planned Development). Staff supports this request.
- As part of the rezoning request, the applicant is proposing a Master Development Plan, which staff is supporting.
- A Site Development Plan Review is proposed for the overall development of the Planned Development District. Staff is recommending approval of the Site Development Plan Review.
- A Tentative Map is proposed to establish the 1,480 lots consisting of condominium units, townhomes, and single family detached residential units. Staff is recommending approval of the proposed Tentative Map.
- The overall density proposed is 5.84 dwelling units per acre.

**ANALYSIS**

The applicant is proposing a 253.51-acre Planned Development District at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard, within an area known as the Badlands Golf Club. The golf club and course have been closed for several years and the land has reverted back to its natural, undeveloped state. The applicant is proposing an infill master development plan consisting of 1,480 dwelling units and an overall density of 5.84 dwelling units per acre. Due to the subject site being a former golf course, the boundaries of the proposed Planned Development are irregular, but is generally bounded by Alta Drive to the north, Rampart Boulevard to the east, Charleston Boulevard to the south, and Hualapai Way to the west. There is also existing residential development adjacent to the boundaries and within the subject site.

**Staff Report Page Two**  
**February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

The proposed PCD (Planned Community Development) land use category allows for a mix of residential uses and permits a density of up to eight dwelling units per gross acre (8.00 du/ac). At the maximum permissible density, up to 2,028 dwelling units can be developed within the plan area; however, the Master Development Plan indicates that 1,480 dwelling units are proposed, which equates to an overall density of 5.84 dwelling units per acre. The types of dwelling units proposed consist of condominiums, townhomes and single family homes.

While commercial, public facilities and office projects may be used as buffers (depending on compatibility issues) within the PCD, due to the subject site being an infill site that is surrounded by existing residential units, no commercial is proposed for the subject site. The applicant is proposing only residential uses, including detached and attached products in varying orientations to remain compatible with the existing adjacent development.

The proposed PD (Planned Development) zoning district is consistent with the PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation. The intent of the Planned Development (PD) District is to permit and encourage comprehensively planned developments of 40 acres or more whose purpose is redevelopment, economic development, or cultural enrichment or to provide a single-purpose or multi-use planned development. The intent for the proposed planned development is met by fulfilling the following objectives stated by Title 19:

- Providing for an orderly and creative arrangement of land uses that are harmonious and beneficial to the community;
- Providing for a variety of housing types, employment opportunities or commercial or industrial services, or any combination thereof, to achieve variety and integration of economic and redevelopment opportunities;
- Providing for the redevelopment of areas where depreciation of any type has occurred.
- Providing for the revitalization of designated areas;
- Providing for flexibility in the distribution of land uses, in the density of development, and in other matters typically regulated in zoning districts;
- Promoting or allowing development to occur in accordance with a uniform set of standards which reflect the specific circumstances of the site;
- Encouraging area-sensitive site planning and design; and
- Contributing to the health, safety and general welfare of the community and providing development which is compatible with the City's goals and objectives.

## Staff Report Page Three

February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

Per Title 19.10.040, development of property within a PD (Planned Development) district is subject to a master development plan and development standards. The provided Badlands Development Standards and Design Guidelines manual dictates the residential development standards, site planning guidelines, architectural and landscape design guidelines, wall standards, street and streetscape standards and color palette standards that will govern development within the plan area. The following four land use designations will be utilized within the plan area:

<b>Bandlands Land Use Category</b>	<b>Permissible Density Range</b>	<b>Badlands Development Standard</b>
L (Residential Low)	Max 15 du/ac with an average of 5.49 du/ac	Badlands R-1; Badlands R-SL; Badlands R-CL
ML (Residential Medium-Low)	Max 15 du/ac with an average of 8.49 du/ac	Badlands R-1; Badlands R-SL; Badlands R-CL
MLA (Residential Medium-Low Attached)	Max 25 du/ac with an average of 17.99 du/ac	Badlands R-CL; Badlands R-TH; Badlands R-3
PF (Public Facility)	N/A	C-V

Each development standard type will dictate standards such as minimum lot size, building setbacks, lot coverage, building height, etc. All projects within the proposed Badlands plan area will require review and approval by the master developer prior to submittal to the City of Las Vegas or other applicable public agencies. The permissible product types for each of the Badlands development standard categories are as follows:

<b>Badlands Development Standard/District</b>	<b>Allowable Product Types</b>
Badlands R-1	Single Family Detached
Badlands R-SL	Single Family Detached
Badlands R-CL	Single Family Detached, Duplex (Conventional, Cluster or Alley Configurations)
Badlands R-TH	Single Family Attached
Badlands R-3	Duplex and Townhome Units (Conventional, Cluster or Alley Configurations) and Medium Density Apartments and Condominiums

The proposed Tentative Map illustrates east/west cross sections depicting maximum natural grade greater than two percent across this site. Per the Tables in Title 19.06.050, a development with natural slope greater than two percent is allowed a maximum six-foot retaining wall. Per the detail sheet, no single wall height appears to have an exposure taller than six feet. The submitted north/south cross section depicts maximum natural grade less than two percent across this site.

**Staff Report Page Four**  
**February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

Per the Tables in Title 19.06, a development with natural slope less than two percent is allowed a maximum four-foot retaining wall. Per the detail sheet, no single wall height appears to have an exposure taller than four feet. The Badlands Development Standards will govern allowable wall heights.

*The proposed Tentative Map depicts the following:*

<b>Lot Type</b>	<b>Number of Units</b>
3-Story, 4-Plex Condominium	20
3-Story, 8-Plex Condominium	128
3-Story, Duplex	160
2-Story Townhomes	156
3-Story Townhomes	140
Marine Way Triplex Townhomes	159
Marine Way 4-Plex Townhomes	88
Marine Way 5-Plex Townhomes	70
40-Foot by 90-Foot Single Family Residential	180
50-Foot by 110-Foot Single Family Residential	134
72-Foot by 80-Foot Single Family Residential	180
85-Foot by 120-Foot Single Family Residential	65
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,480</b>

The proposed Tentative Map also indicates 36 common elements that include 98.80 acres of open space. While the Badlands Development Standards and Design Guidelines allow a minimum lot size of 800 square feet, the minimum lot size indicated on the Tentative Map is 825 square feet (Lot #927), with a maximum lot size of 18,868 square feet (Lot #59).

The proposal meets all applicable requirements for the PD (Planned Development) zoning district, as well as all Title 19 zoning and NRS 278 technical requirements regarding Tentative Maps. Staff finds the proposed Planned Community Development (PCD) Land Use Designation and associated Planned Development (PD) Zoning District are compatible with the existing surrounding residential development and recommends approval of the General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Site Development Plan Review and Tentative Map.

**FINDINGS (24-0629-GPA1)**

Section 19.16.030(I) of the Las Vegas Zoning Code requires that the following conditions be met in order to justify a General Plan Amendment:

1. **The density and intensity of the proposed General Plan Amendment is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations,**

The subject site is adjacent to existing various densities of residential development and is compatible with those densities and land use designations.

2. **The zoning designations allowed by the proposed amendment will be compatible with the existing adjacent land uses or zoning districts,**

The zoning designation allowed by the PCD designation is PD (Planned Development), which allows an overall maximum density of 8.00 dwelling units per acre and is compatible with the adjacent R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) zoned residential development.

3. **There are adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed General Plan Amendment; and**

If approved, the developer will be required to provide adequate transportation, utility and any other facilities deemed necessary for the planned development as required by both the proposed development and design guidelines and residential subdivision building codes. Adequate recreation is provided throughout the proposed development plan in both passive and active forms. In addition, the surrounding transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities are adequate to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed General Plan Amendment.

4. **The proposed amendment conforms to other applicable adopted plans and policies.**

The proposed amendment will allow uniform development compatible with the surrounding area, which supports the adopted policies of the 2050 Master Plan.

**FINDINGS (24-0629-ZON1)**

In order to approve a Rezoning application, pursuant to Title 19.16.090(L), the Planning Commission or City Council must affirm the following:

**1. The proposal conforms to the General Plan.**

If approved, the proposed PD (Planned Development) District is compatible with the PCD (Planned Community Development) Land Use Designation.

**2. The uses which would be allowed on the subject property by approving the rezoning will be compatible with the surrounding land uses and zoning districts.**

The residential densities allowed by the PD zoning district are compatible with those existing in the surrounding area.

**3. Growth and development factors in the community indicate the need for or appropriateness of the rezoning.**

The subject site is a former golf course surrounded by residential development zoned R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) that is undeveloped and in need of redevelopment. The combination of a stagnant site and surrounding residential development indicate the need and appropriateness of the proposed PD (Planned Development) zoning designation.

**4. Street or highway facilities providing access to the property are or will be adequate in size to meet the requirements of the proposed zoning district.**

If approved, the developer will be required to provide adequate transportation, utility and any other facilities deemed necessary for the planned development as required by both the proposed development and design guidelines and residential subdivision building codes. Adequate recreation is provided throughout the proposed development plan in both passive and active forms. In addition, the surrounding transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities are adequate to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Rezoning.

### FINDINGS (24-0629-SDR1)

In order to approve a Site Development Plan Review application, per Title 19.16.100(E) the Planning Commission and/or City Council must affirm the following:

1. **The proposed development is compatible with adjacent development and development in the area;**

If approved as proposed, the Master Development Plan contains a maximum density of approximately 5.84 dwelling units per acre, well below the maximum allowed 8.00 dwelling units per acre. Both the proposed and maximum allowed densities are compatible with the existing adjacent R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre).

2. **The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, this Title, and other duly-adopted city plans, policies and standards;**

The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan and other duly-adopted city plans, policies and standards; and the requirements set forth in Title 19.10 for the (PD) Planned Development District.

3. **Site access and circulation do not negatively impact adjacent roadways or neighborhood traffic;**

Site access and circulation do not negatively impact adjacent roadways or neighborhood traffic.

4. **Building and landscape materials are appropriate for the area and for the City;**

The proposed building and landscape materials depicted in the design guidelines are appropriate for the area and the City.

5. **Building elevations, design characteristics and other architectural and aesthetic features are not unsightly, undesirable, or obnoxious in appearance; create an orderly and aesthetically pleasing environment; and are harmonious and compatible with development in the area;**

The building elevations and design characteristics of the proposed master development plan associated development standards create an orderly and aesthetically pleasing environment that is harmonious and compatible with development in the area.

**Staff Report Page Eight**  
**February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting**

6. **Appropriate measures are taken to secure and protect the public health, safety and general welfare.**

The proposed planned development is subject to building permit approval therefore protecting the public health, safety and general welfare.

**FINDINGS (24-0629-TMP1)**

All Title 19 zoning and NRS 278 technical requirements regarding Tentative Maps are satisfied. Therefore, staff recommends approval subject to conditions.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i></b>	
12/17/80	The Board of City Commissioners approved the Annexation (A-0018-80) of 2,243 acres bounded by Sahara Avenue on the south, Hualapai Way on the west, Ducharme Avenue on the north and Durango Drive on the east. The annexation became effective on 12/26/80.
04/15/81	The Board of City Commissioners approved a General Plan Amendment (Agenda Item IX.B) to expand the Suburban Residential Land Use category and add the Rural Density Residential category generally located north of Sahara Avenue, west of Durango Drive.
	The Board of City Commissioners approved a Generalized Land Use Plan (Agenda Item IX.C) for residential, commercial and public facility uses on the Peccole property and the south portion of Angel Park lying within city limits. The maximum density of this plan was 24 dwelling units per acre.
05/20/81	The Board of City Commissioners approved a Rezoning (Z-0034-81) from N-U (Non-Urban) to R-1 (Single Family Residence), R-2 (Two Family Residence), R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence), R-MHP (Residential Mobile Home Park), R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development), R-PD8 (Residential Planned Development), P-R (Professional Offices and Parking), C-1 (Limited Commercial), C-2 (General Commercial) and C-V (Civic) generally located north of Sahara Avenue, south of Westcliff Drive and extending two miles west of Durango Drive. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.



<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
05/07/86	The City Council approved the Master Development Plan for Venetian Foothills on 1,923 acres generally located north of Sahara Avenue between Durango Drive and Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval. This plan included two 18-hole golf courses and a 106-acre regional shopping center. [Venetian Foothills Master Development Plan]
	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-0030-86) to reclassify property from N-U (Non-Urban) (under Resolution of Intent) to R-PD4 (Residential Planned Development), P-R (Professional Offices and Parking), C-1 (Limited Commercial), and C-V (Civic) on 585.00 acres generally located north of Sahara Avenue between Durango Drive and Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval. [Venetian Foothills Phase One]
02/15/89	The City Council approved a revised master development plan for the subject site and renamed it Peccole Ranch to include 1,716.30 acres. Phase One of the Plan is generally located south of Charleston Boulevard, west of Fort Apache Road. Phase Two of the Plan is generally located north of Charleston Boulevard, west of Durango Drive, and south of Charleston Boulevard, east of Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval. A condition of approval limited the maximum number of dwelling units in Phase One to 3,150. [Peccole Ranch Master Development Plan]
	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-0139-88) on 448.80 acres from N-U (Non-Urban) under Resolution of Intent to R-PD4, P-R, C-1 and C-V to R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre), R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence) and C-1 (Limited Commercial). [Peccole Ranch Phase One]

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
04/04/90	The City Council approved an amendment to the Peccole Ranch Master Development Plan to make changes related to Phase Two of the Plan and to reduce the overall acreage to 1,569.60 acres. Approximately 212 acres of land in Phase Two was planned for a golf course. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval. [Peccole Ranch Master Development Plan]
	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-0017-90) from N-U (Non-Urban) (under Resolution of Intent to multiple zoning districts) to R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence), R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) and C-1 (Limited Commercial) on 996.40 acres on the east side of Hualapai Way, west of Durango Drive, between the south boundary of Angel Park and Sahara Avenue. A condition of approval limited the maximum number of dwelling units for Phase Two of the Peccole Ranch Master Development Plan to 4,247 units. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval. [Peccole Ranch Phase Two]
04/17/96	A Final Map for a 36-lot single family residential subdivision (Peccole West – Lot 9, Phase 1) on 13.61 acres generally located north of Charleston Boulevard, west of Rampart Boulevard was recorded. [Book 73 Page 34 of Plats]
12/05/96	A (Parent) Final Map (FM-0008-96) for a 16-lot subdivision (Peccole West) on 570.47 acres at the northeast corner of Charleston Boulevard and Hualapai Way was recorded [Book 77 Page 23 of Plats]. The golf course was located on Lot 5 of this map.
12/12/96	A Final Map for a 44-lot single family residential subdivision (Peccole West – Lot 11) on 51.02 acres generally located south of Alta Drive, east of Hualapai Way was recorded. [Book 77 Page 31 of Plats]
08/14/97	The Planning Commission approved a request for a Site Development Plan Review [Z-0017-90(20)] for a proposed 76-lot single family residential development on 36.30 acres south of Alta Drive, east of Hualapai Way. Staff recommended approval.
03/30/98	A Final Map [FM-0008-96(1)] to amend portions of Lots 5 and 10 of the Peccole West Subdivision Map on 368.81 acres at the northeast corner of Charleston Boulevard and Hualapai Way was recorded [Book 83 Page 57 of Plats].
	A Final Map (FM-0190-96) for a four-lot subdivision (Peccole West Lot 10) on 184.01 acres at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and Hualapai Way was recorded [Book 83 Page 61 of Plats].
10/19/98	A Final Map (FM-0027-98) for a 45-lot single family residential subdivision (San Michelle North) on 17.41 acres generally located south of Alta Drive, east of Hualapai Way was recorded [Book 86 Page 74 of Plats].

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
12/17/98	A Final Map (FM-0158-97) for a 21-lot single family residential subdivision (Peccole West – Parcel 20) on 20.65 acres generally located south of Alta Drive, east of Hualapai Way was recorded [Book 87 Page 54 of Plats].
09/23/99	A Final Map (FM-0157-97) for a 41-lot single family residential subdivision (Peccole West – Parcel 19) on 15.10 acres generally located south of Alta Drive, east of Hualapai Way was recorded [Book 91 Page 47 of Plats].
02/05/03	The City Council approved a General Plan Amendment (GPA-1333) to change the land use designation from SC (Service Commercial) to MLA (Medium Low Attached Density Residential) on 16.87 acres on the south side of Alta Drive, approximately 2,100 feet west of Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission recommended approval; staff recommended denial.
	The City Council approved a Rezoning (ZON-1340) from U (Undeveloped) [SC (Service Commercial) General Plan Designation] to R-PD10 (Residential Planned Development – 10 Units per Acre) on 16.87 acres on the south side of Alta Drive, approximately 2,100 feet west of Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission recommended approval; staff recommended denial.
	The City Council approved a Variance (VAR-1342) to allow 0.79 acres of open space where 2.72 acres are required on 16.87 acres on the south side of Alta Drive, approximately 2,100 feet west of Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission recommended approval; staff recommended denial.
	The City Council approved a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-1341) for a proposed 166-lot single family residential development on 16.87 acres on the south side of Alta Drive, approximately 2,100 feet west of Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission recommended approval; staff recommended denial.
06/18/15	A four-lot Parcel Map (PMP-59572) on 250.92 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard was recorded [Book 120 Page 49 of Parcel Maps].
11/30/15	A two-lot Parcel Map (PMP-62257) on 70.52 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard was recorded [Book 120 Page 91 of Parcel Maps].

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
01/12/16	The Planning Commission voted [6-0] to hold requests for a General Plan Amendment (GPA-62387) from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to H (High Density Residential), a Rezoning (ZON-62392) from R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) to R-4 (High Density Residential) and a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-62393) for a proposed 720-unit multi-family residential development in abeyance to the March 8, 2016 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant.
03/08/16	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to hold GPA-62387, ZON-62392 and SDR-62393 in abeyance to the April 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant.
03/15/16	A two-lot Parcel Map (PMP-63468) on 53.03 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard was recorded [Book 121 Page 12 of Parcel Maps].
04/12/16	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to hold GPA-62387, ZON-62392 and SDR-62393 in abeyance to the May 10, 2016 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant.
	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to hold requests for a Major Modification (MOD-63600) of the 1990 Peccole Ranch Master Plan; a Development Agreement (DIR-63602) between 180 Land Co., LLC, et al. and the City of Las Vegas; a General Plan Amendment (GPA-63599) from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) and H (High Density Residential); and a Rezoning (ZON-62392) from R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) to R-E (Residence Estates) and R-4 (High Density Residential) on 250.92 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard in abeyance to the May 10, 2016 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant.
05/10/16	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to hold GPA-62387, ZON-62392 and SDR-62393 in abeyance to the July 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting at the request of City staff.
	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to hold MOD-63600, GPA-63599, ZON-63601 and DIR-63602 in abeyance to the July 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting at the request of City staff.
07/12/16	The Planning Commission voted [5-2] to hold GPA-62387, ZON-62392 and SDR-62393 in abeyance to the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.
	The Planning Commission voted [5-2] to hold MOD-63600, GPA-63599, ZON-63601 and DIR-63602 in abeyance to the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
08/09/16	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to rescind the action taken on 07/12/16 to hold GPA-62387, ZON-62392 and SDR-62393 in abeyance to the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Action was then taken to reschedule the hearing of these items at a special Planning Commission meeting on 10/18/16.
	The Planning Commission voted [7-0] to rescind the action taken on 07/12/16 to hold MOD-63600, GPA-63599, ZON-63601 and DIR-63602 in abeyance to the October 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting. Action was then taken to reschedule the hearing of these items at a special Planning Commission meeting on 10/18/16, at which they were recommended for denial.
11/16/16	At the applicant's request, the City Council voted to Withdraw Without Prejudice requests for a Major Modification (MOD-63600) of the 1990 Peccole Ranch Master Development Plan; a Development Agreement (DIR-63602) between 180 Land Co., LLC, et al. and the City of Las Vegas; a General Plan Amendment (GPA-63599) from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) and H (High Density Residential); and a Rezoning (ZON-62392) from R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) to R-E (Residence Estates) and R-4 (High Density Residential) on 250.92 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission recommended denial; staff recommended approval.
	The Planning Commission voted to hold in abeyance to the January 18, 2017 City Council meeting a General Plan Amendment (GPA-62387) from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to H (High Density Residential), a Rezoning (ZON-62392) from R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) to R-4 (High Density Residential) and a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-62393) for a proposed 720-unit multi-family residential development on 17.49 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
01/10/17	The Planning Commission voted to hold in abeyance to the February 14, 2017 Planning Commission meeting GPA-68385 [PRJ-67184].
01/18/17	The City Council voted to hold in abeyance to the February 15, 2017 City Council meeting GPA-62387, ZON-62392 and SDR-62393 at the applicant's request.

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
01/24/17	A four-lot Parcel Map (PMP-64285) on 166.99 acres at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and Hualapai Way was recorded [File 121 Page 100 of Parcel Maps].
02/15/17	The City Council approved a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA-62387) to change the land use designation from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to H (High Density Residential) [amended to M (Medium Density Residential)] on 17.49 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
	The City Council approved a request for a Rezoning (ZON-62392) from R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units per Acre) to R-4 (High Density Residential) [amended to R-3 (Medium Density Residential)] on 17.49 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
	The City Council approved a request for a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-62393) for a proposed 720-unit multi-family residential (condominium) development consisting of four, four-story buildings [amended to 435 condominium units] on 17.49 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
06/21/17	The City Council denied a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA-68385) from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to L (Low Density Residential) on 166.99 acres at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission recommended denial (failing to reach supermajority vote); staff recommended approval.
	The City Council denied a request for a Waiver (WVR-68480) to allow 32-foot private streets with a sidewalk on one side where 47-foot private streets with sidewalks on both sides are required within a proposed gated residential development on 34.07 acres at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
	The City Council denied a request for a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-68481) for a proposed 61-lot single family residential development on 34.07 acres at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
	The City Council denied a request for a Tentative Map (TMP-68482) for a proposed 61-lot single family residential development on 34.07 acres at the southeast corner of Alta Drive and Hualapai Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
08/02/17	The City Council denied a request for a Development Agreement (DIR-70539) between 180 Land Co, LLC, et al. and the City of Las Vegas on 250.92 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
01/17/18	The City Council denied a request for an appeal of the Director's decision (DIR-72290) to not require applications for a General Plan Amendment and Major Modification in conjunction with applications related to three Planning Projects (PRJ-71990, PRJ-71991, and PRJ-71992) generally located on 282.08 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard.
05/16/18	The City Council struck a request for a General Plan Amendment (GPA-72220) from PR-OS (Parks/Recreation/Open Space) to ML (Medium Low Density Residential) on 132.92 acres on the east side of Hualapai Way, approximately 830 feet north of Charleston Boulevard. The Planning Commission recommended denial and staff recommended approval.
	The City Council struck a request for a Waiver (WVR-72007) to allow 40-foot private streets with no sidewalks where 47-foot private streets with five-foot sidewalks on both sides are required on a portion of 126.65 acres on the east side of Hualapai Way, approximately 830 feet north of Charleston Boulevard. The Planning Commission and Staff recommended approval.
	The City Council struck a request for a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-72008) for a proposed 106-lot single family residential development on a portion of 126.65 acres on the east side of Hualapai Way, approximately 830 feet north of Charleston Boulevard. The Planning Commission and Staff recommended approval.
	The City Council struck a request for a Tentative Map (TMP-72009) for a 106-lot single family residential subdivision on a portion of 126.65 acres on the east side of Hualapai Way, approximately 830 feet north of Charleston Boulevard. The Planning Commission and Staff recommended approval.

<b><i>Related Relevant City Actions by Planning, Fire, Bldg., etc., continued</i></b>	
1/14/25	<p>The Planning Commission (6-0 vote) to APPROVE on a Land Use Entitlement project requests on 253.51 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard (APNs 138-32-301-005 and 007; 138-32-210-008; 138-32-202-001; 138-31-601-008; 138-31-702-003 and 004; 138-31-712-004; 138-31-801-002 and 003; and 138-31-201-005), Ward 2 (Seaman). Staff recommends APPROVAL on the Land Use Entitlement project.</p> <p>24-0629-GPA1 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT - FROM: GTC (GENERAL TOURIST COMMERCIAL), M (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) AND PR-OS (PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE) TO: PCD (PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT)</p> <p>24-0629-ZON1 - REZONING - FROM: PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT), R-3 (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) AND R-PD7 (RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - 7 UNITS PER ACRE) TO: PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT)</p> <p>24-0629-SDR1 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW - FOR A PROPOSED PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS, SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED [TOWNHOME] RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND MULTI-FAMILY [CONDOMINIUM] UNITS FOR A TOTAL COUNT OF 1,480 UNITS</p> <p>24-0629-TMP1 - TENTATIVE MAP - BADLANDS - FOR A SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED AND DETACHED RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION WITH MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM UNITS FOR A TOTAL COUNT OF 1,480 UNITS</p>

<b><i>Most Recent Change of Ownership</i></b>	
04/2005	A deed was recorded for a change in ownership for APNs 138-31-212-002; 138-31-312-001; 138-31-312-002; 138-31-418-001 and 138-31-610-002.
06/2015	A deed was recorded for a change in ownership for APN 138-32-210-008.
11/2015	A deed was recorded for a change in ownership for APNs 138-31-702-002; 138-31-712-004; 138-31-801-002 and 138-32-301-004.

<b><i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i></b>
There are no related building permits or business licenses relevant to these requests.



Staff Report Page Seventeen  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

**Pre-Application Meeting**

The terms of the settlement approved by the City Council on December 18, 2024 and subsequent meetings with staff satisfied this requirement.

**Neighborhood Meeting**

01/09/25	<p>A Neighborhood Meeting was held at 5:30 p.m. located at the Veterans Memorial Community Center located at 101 Pavilion Center Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89144.</p> <p>Attendees: Representatives for the Applicant/Developer; Various City of Las Vegas Departmental staff including Public Works, Planning and the City Attorney's Office; and approximately 200 members of the public/neighbors.</p> <p>The applicant's representative gave an introduction of the development team and an overview of the proposed project including density, product type (homes, townhomes and condominiums), architectural style of development and open space. The meeting was then opened up to questions that included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the square-footage of the various homes, the size of the lots, and price points of the varying home styles?</li> <li>• What is the timeframe of the proposed development if approved? When will construction begin?</li> <li>• Is this proposed development going to be a part of Queensridge or separated by walls, fences?</li> <li>• Will this community have an HOA? Who is paying for the walls? Is Queensridge paying for any of this?</li> <li>• Will Queensridge residents have access to the proposed open space, amenities?</li> <li>• How is Queensridge going to be separated from the new development, will the two communities share roads, gates?</li> <li>• Has the Queensridge HOA agreed to anything, been approached yet for possible shared roads, gates, amenities?</li> <li>• How is this developer going to gain the necessary easements if Queensridge does not agree? Are there alternative plans?</li> <li>• Will this new development have an HOA, is it going to be gated? Will it be a manned gate with actual security guards to prevent tailgating and unwanted individuals into the community? Will they have roaming security like Queensridge?</li> <li>• Will these new residences be for sale? Existing residents do not want rentals, or short term rentals. Can you guarantee no rentals?</li> </ul>
----------	--

NE

Staff Report Page Eighteen  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

<b>Neighborhood Meeting (continued)</b>	
01/09/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing custom homes on larger lots currently have view fences open to the subject site (golf course). Will I now be looking at a wall or someone's back or front yard? Could we have first right of refusal to buy the lots adjacent to ours to maintain our view of open space?</li> <li>• Will the property be secured by a wall prior to construction commencing?</li> <li>• What are the setbacks of the proposed homes? Will the Queensridge height limitations be honored? Very concerned about the grade of the development and will I have someone viewing into my property? Will a two-story home tower over mine?</li> <li>• Residents do not feel the density is compatible adjacent to the existing half acre to one acre home sites. Concerns of having multiple track homes in front, behind or both of existing custom homes. This will depreciate our home values that are upwards of 6 million or more.</li> <li>• Existing residents do not like the modern style of the proposed homes, Queensridge is a very different style, the new homes should be designed to match the existing style adjacent development.</li> <li>• How was Lennar chosen? Was this property auctioned off?</li> <li>• Can we have development similar to what was previously proposed with large lot custom homes to the west of the site and the density to the east towards Rampart?</li> <li>• There seem to be a conflict of interest with the City approving a development on land it is being sued for.</li> <li>• The schools in the area are already overcrowded. No new homes should be approved due to school overcrowding.</li> <li>• What is the back-up plan for Lennar if FEMA does not approve the proposed plan?</li> <li>• Can view fences be incorporated so existing homes are not staring at solid block walls?</li> <li>• We would like to see what the amenities will comprise of? The only open space (park) is for the multi-family. What is the rest of the open space going to look like?</li> <li>• Is Lennar willing to lower the density adjacent to the existing large lot custom homes?</li> </ul> <p>The majority of the neighbors who spoke did not express a favorable opinion of the proposed development and the meeting concluded with an invitation for those who had further questions to stay and speak with the representatives one-on-one.</p>

<b>Field Check</b>	
12/23/24	Staff performed a routine field where nothing of concern was noted.

NE

<b>Details of Application Request</b>	
<b>Site Area</b>	
Gross Acres	253.51

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use Per Title 19.12	Planned or Special Land Use Designation	Existing Zoning District
Subject Property	Undeveloped / Vacant Land	GTC (General Commercial Tourist)	PD (Planned Development)
		M (Medium Density Residential)	R-3 (Medium Density Residential)
		PR-OS (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space)	R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units Per Acre)
North	Hotel & Casino	GTC (General Tourist Commercial)	R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units Per Acre)
	Multi-Family [Condominiums]	ML (Medium Low Density Residential)	
	Single Family, Residential, Detached		
	Residential, Single Family, Zero Lot Line	SC (Service Commercial)	C-1 (Limited Commercial)
	Individual Care Center [Child Care] / School, Primary and Secondary		R-PD10 (Residential Planned Development – 10 Units Per Acre)
	Office, Other Than Listed	MLA (Medium Low Attached Density)	PD (Planned Development)
	Office, Medical or Dental		
South	Shopping Center	TOD-2 (Transit Oriented Development – 2)	C-1 (Limited Commercial)
	Multi-Family		R-3 (Medium Density Residential)
	Office, Medical or Dental	SC (Service Commercial)	R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development – 7 Units Per Acre)
		ML (Medium Low Density Residential)	
	Residential, Single Family, Detached	M (Medium Density Residential)	R-PD10 (Residential Planned Development – 10 Units Per Acre)

Staff Report Page Twenty  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

<b><i>Surrounding Property</i></b>	<b><i>Existing Land Use Per Title 19.12</i></b>	<b><i>Planned or Special Land Use Designation</i></b>	<b><i>Existing Zoning District</i></b>
East	Shopping Center	TOD-1 (Transit Oriented Development – 1)	PD (Planned Development)
	Office, Medical or Dental		C-1 (Limited Commercial)
	Office, Other Than Listed		
West	Park	SUM (Summerlin)	P-C (Planned Community)
	Residential, Single Family, Detached		

<b><i>Master and Neighborhood Plan Areas</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan Area: Angel Park	Y
Peccole Ranch	Y
<b><i>Special Area and Overlay Districts</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
R-PD (Residential Planned Development) District	Y
<b><i>Other Plans or Special Requirements</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
Trails	N/A
Las Vegas Redevelopment Plan Area	N/A
Interlocal Agreement	N/A
Project of Significant Impact (Development Impact Notification Assessment)	Y
Project of Regional Significance	Y

## DEVELOPMENT/DESIGN STANDARDS

Title 19.10.040 requires that PD-zoned planned developments be subject to a written set of standards for development in the district, including but not limited to standards for intensity and type of use; densities; building design, layout, configuration, height, coverage, spacing, bulk and setback requirements; provision for utilities; topography and drainage patterns; signage; open space and landscaping; on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation and parking; urban design elements and features; and site amenities. The following table briefly indicates how each requirement is addressed within the proposed Badlands Development Standards and Design Guidelines manual:

Applicability	The Badlands Development Standards and Design Guidelines apply to the 253.51-acres in this proposal, except that where the document is silent, Title 19 shall apply.
Amendments	The Declarant may amend the Master Development Plan and Design Guidelines from time to time. Pursuant to Title 19.10.040(G), the mechanism for amending the master development plan and/or the development standards for the PD District is a Modification.
Development Review	All development within the proposed Badlands boundaries require review and approval by Master Developer prior to submittal to the City of Las Vegas or other applicable agencies.
Maximum Units	1,480
Densities	L (Residential Low) Max 15 du/ac with an average of 5.49 du/ac
	ML (Residential Medium-Low) Max 15 du/ac with an average of 8.49 du/ac
	MLA (Residential Medium-Low Attached) Max 25 du/ac with an average of 17.99 du/ac
Height, Coverage, Spacing, Bulk and Setbacks	Provided through standards for Badlands R-1; Badlands R-SL; Badlands R-CL; Badlands R-TH; and Badlands R-3
Open Space	Approximately 4,303,558 square feet, or 98.80 acres
Building Design	Architectural design guidelines determining styles, materials, form, massing, layout, colors, outdoor spaces, walls and fences are defined within the manual.
Pedestrian Connections	A system of trails, sidewalks, walkways, and paseos allow for uninterrupted connectivity promoting connectivity for residents.
Uses/Intensity	Single family (detached and attached) and multi-family residential products, including condominium and townhome type units that include cluster and alley loaded product.
Circulation	Public streets provide entry into the Badlands development, while a private street network provides access throughout the proposed development itself.
Parking	Onsite within enclosed garages, and within designated parking areas and on-street in some districts.

Staff Report Page Twenty-Two  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

Landscaping	Perimeter entry areas, specific standards within residential neighborhood common lots (HOA maintained) and on individual lots (homeowner maintained).
Site Amenities	A comprehensive blend of both active and passive recreation opportunities through a combination of play areas, pocket parks, paseos, neighborhood parks, and community trails.
Utilities, Topography and Drainage	Where possible, traffic signal control boxes, light controller boxes, and other above ground utility structures shall be located out-of-site, away from any iconic structures, pedestrian pathways or plazas, and/or outside of the right-of-way. Utilities shall be consolidated at central locations, generally inconspicuous to pedestrian view and access.
Signage	Standards for the identification of streets, trails, residential neighborhoods, and recreation facilities.

<b>Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Permitted Density</b>	<b>Units Allowed</b>
PD (Planned Development) (4.50 acres)	8.00 du/ac	36 units
R-PD7 (Residential Planned Development - & Units per Acre) (231.52 acres)	7.00 du/ac	1,620 units
R-3 (Medium Density Residential) (17.49 acres)	13-50 du/ac	227 – 874 units
<b>Proposed Zoning</b>	<b>Permitted Density</b>	<b>Units Allowed</b>
PD (Planned Development)	8.00 du/ac	2,028 units
<b>Existing General Plan</b>	<b>Permitted Density</b>	<b>Units Allowed</b>
GTC (General Commercial Tourist) (2.38 acres)	-	-
M (Medium Density Residential) (17.49 acres)	<25.50 du/ac	445 units
PR-OS (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space) (233.64 acres)	-	-
<b>Proposed General Plan</b>	<b>Permitted Density</b>	<b>Units Allowed</b>
PCD (Planned Community Development)	8.00 du/ac	2,028 units

Staff Report Page Twenty-Three  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Functional Classification of Street(s)</b>	<b>Governing Document</b>	<b>Actual Street Width (Feet)</b>	<b>Compliance with Street Section</b>
Hualapai Way	Primary Arterial	Master Plan of Streets and Highways Map	98	Y
Alta Drive	Collector		75	Y
Rampart Boulevard	Primary Arterial		100	Y
Charleston Boulevard	Primary Arterial		137	Y

**Clark County School District student projections:**

Proposed 115 Single-Family Units:					
Student Yield		Elementary School	Middle School	High School	
Single-Family Units (855)		x 0.137 = 118	x 0.078 = 67	x 0.125 = 107	
Multi-Family Units (625)		x 0.120 = 75	x 0.060 = 38	x 0.078 = 49	
Total Additional Students		193	105	156	
Schools Serving the Area:					
Name	Address	Grade	Capacity	Enrollment	Site Date
Bonner Elementary School	765 Crestdale Lane	Kindergarten – 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	887 Students	828 Students	11/02/24
Rogich Junior High School	235 North Pavilion Center Drive	6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	1,646 Students	1,633 Students	11/02/24
Palo Verde High School	333 South Pavilion Center Drive	9 <sup>th</sup> - 12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	2,571 Students	2,929 Students*	11/02/24

\*Palo Verde High School is over capacity for the 2024 - 2025 school year, and is at 113.92 percent of program capacity.

Staff Report Page Twenty-Four  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

**Department of Public Works Preliminary Traffic Study**

**Proposed 1,480-Unit Residential Development - Badlands**

**First Proposed Use**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>#Unit</b>	<b>Rate/#Unit</b>	<b>Total</b>
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	SINGLE FAMILY	559	9.43	5,271
AM Peak Hour	DETACHED		0.70	391
PM Peak Hour	[DU]		0.94	525

**Second Proposed Use**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>#Unit</b>	<b>Rate/#Unit</b>	<b>Total</b>
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	SINGLE FAMILY	319	7.20	2,297
AM Peak Hour	ATTACHED		0.48	153
PM Peak Hour	[DU]		0.57	182

**Third Proposed Use**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>#Unit</b>	<b>Rate/#Unit</b>	<b>Total</b>
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	MULTIFAMILY HOUSING	602	6.74	4,058
AM Peak Hour	(LOW-RISE)		0.40	241
PM Peak Hour	[SU]		0.51	307

**Total Proposed Use**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>#Unit</b>	<b>Rate/#Unit</b>	<b>Total</b>
Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	TOTAL	1,480	-	11,626
AM Peak Hour				785
PM Peak Hour				1,014

**Existing Traffic on Nearby Streets**

**Alta Drive**

Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	10,100
PM Peak Hour ( <i>heaviest 60 Minutes</i> )	808

**Rampart Boulevard**

Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	34,000
PM Peak Hour ( <i>heaviest 60 minutes</i> )	2,720

**Charleston Boulevard**

Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	35,500
PM Peak Hour ( <i>heaviest 60 minutes</i> )	2,840

**Hualapai Way**

Average Daily Traffic (ADT)	17,500
PM Peak Hour ( <i>heaviest 60 minutes</i> )	1,400



Staff Report Page Twenty-Five  
February 19, 2025 - City Council Meeting

**Department of Public Works Traffic Study (continued)**

<b>Traffic Capacity of Adjacent Streets:</b>	
<b>Adjacent Street ADT Capacity</b>	
Alta Drive	35,490
Rampart Boulevard	62,895
Charleston Boulevard	62,895
Hualapai Way	62,895
<b>Summary</b>	
This project is expected to add an additional 11,626 trips per day on Alta Drive, Rampart Boulevard, Charleston Boulevard, and Hualapai Way. Currently, Alta Drive is at about 28 percent of capacity, Rampart Boulevard is at about 54 percent of capacity, Charleston Boulevard is at about 56 percent of capacity, and Hualapai Way is at about 28 percent of capacity. With this project, Alta Drive is expected to be at about 61 percent of capacity, Rampart Boulevard is expected to be at about 73 percent of capacity, Charleston Boulevard is expected to be at about 75 percent of capacity, and Hualapai Way is expected to be at about 46 percent of capacity.	
Based on Peak Hour use, this development will add into the area roughly 1,014 additional peak hour trips, or about seventeen every minute.	

*\*Note that this report assumes all traffic from this development uses all named streets.*