



BP/RD 3/10/16 (4/5/16)

Enterprise Town Advisory Board MINUTES

Date & Time: February 24, 2016, 6:00 p.m.
 Location: Windmill Library, 7060 W. Windmill Ln., Las Vegas, NV.

Board Members: Frank J. Kapriva - Chair Cheryl Wilson - Vice-Chair
 David Chestnut Laura Ring (absent - excused) Rocky Brandonisio

Secretary: Edie Krieger

County Officials:
 County Liaison: Tiffany Hesser
 Current Planning Staff: Sami Real

.....
 All items listed on the agenda are for action by the Enterprise Town Advisory Board unless otherwise noted. Action may consist of any of the following: recommend approval, recommend denial, and recommend conditions of approval hold or table.

The Enterprise Library is accessible to individuals with disabilities. With forty-eight (48) hour advance request, a sign language interpreter may be made available by calling 455-3530 or TDD 385-7486 or Relay Nevada toll free 800-326-6868, TD/TDD.

.....

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by the Chair
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the Chair

ROLL CALL: By Chair:

INTRODUCTION OF COUNTY STAFF: Noted above

PROCEDURES & CONDUCT:

1. This meeting has been duly notified and is conducted in conformance with open meeting law.
2. Please turn off or mute all cell phones, pagers & other electronic devices.
3. Please take all private conversations outside the room
4. Request all attendees sign in
5. Observe the protocol for speaking before the Board. The protocol is posted in the meeting room. Also see Public Comments guidelines below.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

This is a period devoted to comments by the general public about items on **this** agenda only. No discussion, action, or vote may be taken on this agenda item. You will be afforded the opportunity to speak on individual Zoning Agenda Items at the time they are presented. If you wish to speak to the Board about items within its jurisdiction but not appearing on this agenda, you must wait until the "Public Comments" period listed at the end of this agenda. Comments will be limited to three minutes. Please step to the front of the room to address the Board, clearly state your name and address and please **spell** your last name for the record. If any member of the Board wishes to extend the length of a presentation this will be done by the Chair or the Board by majority vote.

NONE:

REGULAR BUSINESS:

1. Approve the Minutes for the meeting held on February 10, 2016. Requires a vote of the Board.
Motion by: Frank Kapriva
Approve as revised – changing Community Plan work Group to Community Plan Working Group
Motion passed: 4-0

RECEIVED
 MAR 10 2016
 COUNTY CLERK



Enterprise Town Advisory Board MINUTES

2. Approve the Agenda with any corrections, deletions or changes. Requires a vote of the Board.
 1. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
 2. The Town Advisory Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration.
 3. The Town Advisory Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.

Motion by: Frank Kapriva
Approve as published
Motion passed: 4-0

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Neighborhood Meeting

Re: To discuss a proposed single family development by DR Horton located near Bermuda Road and Chartan Avenue. Wednesday, March 2, 2016, 6:00 p.m. at the Enterprise Library, 25 E. Shelbourne Avenue, Lass Vegas.

Voters Can Help Save \$1.5 Million by Choosing to Get Sample Ballot by Email

Clark County voters have the opportunity to help save taxpayers more than \$1.5 million by going to the Election Department website at www.ClarkCountyNV.gov/vote and choosing to receive their sample ballot by email instead of through the regular mail.

Every election year, Clark County spends more than \$1.5 million and uses more than 50 tons of paper and other resources to print and mail sample ballots. But thanks to a recent change to state law, voters can now choose to receive their sample ballots by email and save County taxpayers' money and more than 1,000 trees. To choose to receive your sample ballot by email, go the Election Department website at www.ClarkCountyNV.gov/vote and enter your name and other information in the Registered Voter Services box in the middle of the page. After you log in, click on the drop down arrow under "Voter Services" and select "Request My Sample Ballot Electronically (Go Green)," enter your e-mail address, and then click "Save."

Neighborhood Meeting

To discuss the single family development by DR Horton located on the northeast corner of Hinson Street and Arby Avenue: Thursday, March 3, 2016 at 6:00pm at the Enterprise Library, 25 E. Shelbourne Avenue, Las Vegas.

ZONING AGENDA:

1. **UC-0011-13 (AR-0010-16) – EMERY FAMILY TRUST:**
USE PERMIT SECOND APPLICATION FOR REVIEW of a food cart (shaved ice) not located within an enclosed building.
DESIGN REVIEW for a food cart (shaved ice) in conjunction with an existing convenience store and gasoline station on 1.6 acres in a C-2 (General Commercial) Zone. Generally located on the northeast corner of Cactus Avenue and Decatur Boulevard within Enterprise. SB/jvm/ml (For possible action) **03/15/16 PC**

Motion by Cheryl Wilson
APPROVE per staff conditions



Enterprise Town Advisory Board

MINUTES

Motion passed 4-0

2. **DR-0052-16 – SUMMIT FORD, LLC:**

DESIGN REVIEW to increase the finished grade in conjunction with an approved single family subdivision on 2.6 acres in an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) Zone. Generally located on the north side of Ford Avenue, 330 feet east of Durango Drive within Enterprise. SB/jt/xx (For possible action) 03/16/16 BCC

Motion by Dave Chestnut
APPROVE per staff conditions
Motion passed 4-0

3. **UC-0031-16 – LEAKE, BONNIE G. TRUST:**

USE PERMIT to increase the number of household pets (dogs) in conjunction with an existing single family residence on 1.9 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) (RNP-1) Zone. Generally located on the northeast corner of Buffalo Drive and Raven Avenue within Enterprise. SB/mk/ml (For possible action) 03/16/16 BCC

Motion by Dave Chestnut
APPROVE per staff conditions and,
STRIKE Current Planning condition #4:
• ~~No replacement of dogs;~~
Motion passed 4-0

4. **UC-0070-16 – GAUGHAN SOUTH, LLC:**

USE PERMITS for the following: 1) expand an existing recreational facility (equestrian staging area); and 2) deviations from development standards for modifications to an existing resort hotel (South Point).
DEVIATIONS for the following: 1) permit an equestrian staging area outdoors where required to be within enclosed buildings; 2) waive buffer requirements adjacent to a freeway; 3) waive landscaping adjacent to a local street; and 4) permit all other deviations as shown per plans on file.
DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) expand an existing recreational facility (equestrian staging area); and 2) a proposed maintenance building in conjunction with an existing hotel/casino (South Point) on 14.7 acres in a H-1 (Limited Resort and Apartment) Zone in the MUD-1 Overlay District. Generally located on the east and west sides of Ensworth Street and the north and south sides of Pyle Avenue within Enterprise. SS/pb/ml (For possible action) 03/16/16 BCC

Motion by Frank Kapriva
APPROVE per staff conditions
Motion passed 4-0

5. **ZC-0043-16 – MERCER, RICHARD & CHRISTINE:**

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 2.5 acres from R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone to C-2 (General Commercial) Zone.
USE PERMIT to reduce the separation from a proposed on-premises consumption of alcohol establishment (supper club) to a residential use.
WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS to increase screen wall height.



Enterprise Town Advisory Board

MINUTES

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) on-premises consumption of alcohol (supper club) in conjunction with a restaurant; 2) convenience store with gasoline sales; and 3) vehicle car wash in conjunction with a partially constructed shopping center. Generally located on the west side of Buffalo Drive, 500 feet south of Blue Diamond Road within Enterprise (description on file). SB/rk/ml (For possible action) 03/16/16 BCC

Motion by Dave Chestnut

APPROVE per staff conditions and,

CHANGE Current Planning conditions #2 to read:

- Lighting to be low level with any light source to be shielded with "full cut-off" fixtures (light lens not visible), floodlights, spotlights, or other similar lighting shall not be permitted to illuminate buildings;

ADD Current Planning condition:

- Design Review as a Public Hearing for signage;

ADD Public Works – Development Review condition:

- Provide perpetual cross access ingress / egress and shared parking easement with the adjacent parcels to the west and north;

Motion passed 4-0

6. **ZC-0051-16 – 4129, LLC:**

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 7.3 acres from H-2 (General Highway Frontage) Zone to C-2 (General Commercial) Zone in the MUD-4 Overlay District.

DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed shopping center. Generally located on the south side of Blue Diamond Road, and the east and west sides of El Capitan Way (alignment) within Enterprise (description on file). SB/gc/ml (For possible action) 03/16/16 BCC

Motion by Dave Chestnut

APPROVE per staff conditions and,

CHANGE Current Planning condition #5 to read:

- Design Review as a Public Hearing for lighting and signage;

ADD Current Planning conditions

- Design Review as a Public Hearing for significant changes to plan;
- Rear doors of buildings adjacent to residential to be emergency exits only;
- Landscaping to be installed along southern boundary prior to building construction;

Motion passed 4-0

7. **ZC-0072-16 – NAPO1 LLC, ET AL:**

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 2.5 acres from R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone to M-D (Designed Manufacturing) Zone in the CMA Design Overlay District.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increased wall height; 2) reduced setbacks for a decorative fence; 3) allow alternative landscaping; 4) reduced setbacks for a gate; and 5) waive enhanced paving along pedestrian circulation routes.

DESIGN REVIEW for a data center on 3.8 acres in a M-D (Designed Manufacturing) Zone. Generally located on the north and south sides of Capovilla Avenue and the west side of Edmond Street (alignment) within Enterprise (description on file). SS/pb/xx (For possible action) 03/16/16 BCC

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

STEVE SISOLAK, Chair – LAWRENCE L. BROWN III, Vice-Chair

SUSAN BRAGER – CHRIS GIUNCHIGLIANI – MARILYN KIRKPATRICK – MARY BETH SCOW – LAWRENCE WEEKLY
DON BURNETTE, County Manager



Enterprise Town Advisory Board MINUTES

Motion by Dave Chestnut
APPROVE per staff conditions
Motion passed 4-0

8. **UC-0030-16 – CRAMER-STEPNIK, MARY A. REV TRUST:**

USE PERMIT for the proposed retail sale of landscape materials (rocks).

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) design standards for a temporary modular structure; 2) street landscaping requirements; 3) eliminate parking lot landscaping; 4) eliminate loading space; 5) eliminate trash enclosure; 6) on-site paving; and 7) full off-site improvements (excluding minimum paving).

DESIGN REVIEW for a landscape material (rocks and concrete pavers) retail/wholesale and storage facility including a modular building on 2.1 acres in an M-1 (Light Manufacturing) Zone in the MUD-3 Overlay District. Generally located on the northwest corner of Oleta Avenue and Mann Street, 300 feet south of Blue Diamond Road within Enterprise. SB/mk/ml (For possible action) 03/02/16 BCC

PREVIOUS ACTION

Enterprise TAB February 10, 2016: HELD to the February 24, 2016 TAB meeting per prior request of the applicant. (Not previously heard)

Motion by Dave Chestnut
APPROVE per staff recommendations and conditions
Motion passed 4-0

9. **ZC-0836-15 – VISION QUEST DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC; ET AL:**

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 3.5 acres from R-E (Rural Estates Residential) P-C (Planned Community Overlay District) Zone to C-1 (Local Business) P-C (Planned Community Overlay District) Zone.

USE PERMIT for a proposed mini-warehouse facility.

WAIVER OF CONDITIONS of a Concept Plan (MP-0420-02) requiring a 30 foot wide buffer along the north, east, south, and portions of the west boundaries of the northeast RNP area, the buffer will be designed in accordance with the exhibit submitted at the Planning Commission meeting, and shall be installed concurrently with the development of projects adjacent to the RNP area.

DESIGN REVIEW for a proposed mini-warehouse facility in the Mountain's Edge Master Planned Community. Generally located on the southwest corner of Rainbow Boulevard and Richmar Avenue within Enterprise (description on file). SB/rk/ml (For possible action) 03/01/16 PC

PREVIOUS ACTION

Enterprise TAB January 27, 2016: (The applicant did not appear nor did the TAB receive prior notice of the applicant's intentions.) The TAB motion: Request that the Planning Commission return this application to the February 24, 2016 TAB meeting. (Not previously heard)

NOTE #1: On the agenda for this TAB meeting this application is noted as scheduled for the March 1 Planning Commission meeting. However, at the February 16 PC meeting this application was held to the March 15 Planning Commission meeting and then to the April 20 Board of County Commission meeting.

NOTE #2: The TAB recorded in its previous action that the applicant did not appear at the January 27, 2016 TAB meeting as scheduled on that agenda. Note that the applicant was incorrectly informed by county staff as to the original date of the hearing of his application and that is the reason for his absence at that hearing.



Enterprise Town Advisory Board MINUTES

Motion by Dave Chestnut

APPROVE Zone Change with a Resolution of Intent to C-1 zone district to April 1, 2019 limited to mini warehouse facility use only;

APPROVE Use Permit;

DENY Waiver of Conditions;

DENY Design Review;

ADD Current Planning conditions:

- The "C" building west elevation to be similar to the "A" building east elevation;
- Design Review as a Public Hearing for significant changes to plans;

Per staff conditions

Motion passed 4-0

Motion by Frank Kapriva

Re-open hearing

Motion passed 4-0

Motion by Frank Kapriva

APPROVE Zone Change with a Resolution of Intent to C-1 zone district to April 1, 2019 limited to mini warehouse facility use only;

APPROVE Use Permit;

DENY Waiver of Conditions;

DENY Design Review;

ADD Current Planning conditions:

- The "C" building west elevation to be similar to the "A" building east elevation;
- Design Review as a Public Hearing for significant changes to plans;
- Hours of operation to be Clark County standard daylight hours: 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Per staff conditions

Motions passed 4-0

GENERAL BUSINESS:

TAB to approve draft letter to county expressing the TAB's views on the Community Plan Working Group plan including reference materials and proposals. (For possible action)

Discussion of the draft letter included the following:

- Correct the name to Community Plan Working Group
- Add a note that the Enterprise TAB is willing to meet with commissioners or staff to discuss the items
- Send copies to the county commissioners, county commission liaisons, Tiffany Hesser and Mike Shannon, and to Sami Real, Mario Bermudez, and Nancy Amundsen the Director of Comprehensive Planning
- Details are included in the attachments



Enterprise Town Advisory Board MINUTES

In addition to the recommendation from the TAB as a whole, Cheryl Wilson, who was a participant in the Community Plan Working Group process for several months, expressed her personal opinions on the matter:

- The end product does not represent her thoughts
- The working group meeting situation was not fair
- There were not representatives from every township
- There was a lack of leadership and the group was not well-guided or handled in a good manner
- The public should be part of the process, much like the Land Use Plan updates require (Open Houses, extensive hearings, etc.)

David Chestnut, who also participated in the Working Group noted:

- They were handed one alternative without an explanation of how or why it was developed
- Leadership veered off course
- The premise of the plan was flawed, prejudiced and outdated from the beginning

Motion by Dave Chestnut

Accept the revisions to draft letter as noted and distribute to noted recipients.

Motion passed 4-0

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No discussion, action, or vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on a future agenda. Comments will be limited to three minutes. Please step to the front of the room to address the Board, clearly state your name and address and please **spell** your last name for the record. If any member of the Board wishes to extend the length of a presentation this will be done by the Chair or the Board by majority vote.

1. An attendee expressed his thought that the TAB did an excellent job on the letter and associated materials, and that the TAB findings are correct in that the group did not accomplish its purpose.
2. Another attendee expressed similar sentiments and thanks to the TAB.
3. An attendee expressed support for the TAB letter and wondered whether mini storages had or are required to have trash provisions and dumpsters that are adequate for customers who are cleaning storage facilities.

NEXT MEETING DATE: March 9, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Cheryl Wilson

Adjourn: 8:13 p.m.

Motion passed 4-0



Enterprise Town Advisory Board

February 24, 2016

To: Commissioner Steve Sisolak
To: Commissioner Susan Brager
To: Commissioner Larry Brown
To: Commissioner Marilyn Kirkpatrick
To: Commissioner Lawrence Weekly
To: Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani
To: Commissioner Mary Beth Scow

Subject: Land Use Planning Redesign

The Enterprise Town Advisory Board, (TAB), has reviewed the input from our representatives to the Community Plan Working Group and we have been briefed by County Staff and held public meetings regarding the redesign effort. The Town Board's conclusions are that the proposed revised Consolidated Land Use Categories and Plan Design would not improve the existing planning and zoning process.

The County tried a process, in the 1990's, which was substantially similar to the current proposal. It was discontinued because it was considered too vague to be workable. It was referred to as the "Bubble System" and it lacked the level of detail needed to make legally supportable decisions. This resulted in contention and confusion because developers usually requested the most intense zoning regardless of location. The abandonment of that system, in 1998, led to the development of the current system. The existing system gives more control to the County Commissions through more detailed categories.

The TAB feels that the Proposed Land Use Categories are going in the wrong direction. The proposed land use categories are too subjective and vague. The Plan should be more specific rather than broader. The effort did not follow the normally accepted process of developing Goals, Policies and Evaluation of Strategic Alternatives. Based on our discussions and statements made by the Staff it appears that this effort would turn the Land Use Planning process into the development of a Master Plan Concept. We are not in a position to develop a Master Plan Concept. Too much has already been developed or planned for development. What we need now is a detailed plan for providing infrastructure services and opportunities for job creation, not general concepts.

Therefore, it is our Board's recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners reject the Consolidated Land Use Categories and the proposed planning process and direct the Staff to reconvene the Community Planning Working Group to define the problems with the existing process and develop strategic alternatives.



Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Members of the Enterprise TAB developed more detailed documents which we used to develop our recommendations and a complete summary of our findings which are attached.

Enterprise TAB members are ready to meet with or answer questions that the Commissioners or staff may have.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Attachments:

1. Proposed Land Use Categories Notes
2. Land Use Categories matrix – TAB comments
3. Rural Low Residential Recommendations
4. Arterial Edge Concept
5. Bubble Land Use System Notes
6. Analysis of Enterprise and Spring Valley NZCs revised
7. Response to Director of Comprehensive Planning
8. Enterprise NZC from 2012 to Nov 2015
9. Spring Valley NZC from 2012 to Nov 2015

CC: Nancy Amundsen, Director Comprehensive Planning
CC: Sami Real, Planning manager, Current Planning
CC: Mario Bermudez, Planning Manager, Advance Planning
CC: Tiffney Hesser, Liaison
CC: Michael Shannon, Liaison

Analysis of Enterprise and Spring Valley Non-conforming zone changes, 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 6 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

The Community Plan Workgroup was created to review the land uses within the Clark County urban towns. The current workgroup reviewed the proposed land use categories presented by the Advance Planning Staff. The reduction in non-conforming zone changes (NZC) was given as a reason to change the current land use categories. This analysis was created to see if the proposed land use categories would significantly reduce non-conforming zone change requests.

NOTE: The proposed land use categories can be found at:

http://www.clarkcountynv.gov/depts/comprehensive_planning/land_use/Pages/default.aspx

Scroll to the bottom of the page.

Questions:

- Would the proposed land use categories reduce the number of non-conforming zone changes?
- Were there unique factors influencing the NZCs?
- What were the effects of McCarran airport deed restricted changes and reduction in airport environ zones?

Conclusions:

- The NZC reduction is insignificant if the proposed land use categories are put into place.
 - 87.9 % of the NZCs would still be required, since 2012, using the proposed land use categories.
 - Insignificant number of NZCs eliminated does not justify changing the land use categories.
 - The proposed land use categories are fewer in number while considerably more complicated and subjective.
- Yes. 2013 was a unique year for non-conforming zone changes driven by three factors.
 - Residential builders feared that they could not acquire sufficient lands for the next several years.
 - McCarran deed restricted land became available for some types of residential.
 - 2008 reduction in the McCarran airport environ zones.
 - 2013 change in County policy on deed restricted allowed uses.
 - Land use moratorium being imposed prior to the major land use updates in Enterprise and Spring valley.
- The major drivers of 2013 non-conforming zone changes were a response to unique market forces and the demand for buildable land resulting from economic recovery and availability of previously restricted land.
- 62.6% non-conforming change requests were for R-1 or R-2 zone districts.
- Had the McCarran airport deed restriction not been in place, it's estimated that 3.5% (4 parcels) fewer NZCs would have been required.
- The County changed the McCarran airport deed restrictions for conversion to residential.
 - 100% of McCarran deed restricted lands were converted to residential uses
 - Deed restricted land distorts land use planning and use which skews market forces.
 - As jet engines become quieter and the AE lines shrink the deed restriction will create additional to the NZCs.
- Commercial uses on deed restricted land mandated by County policy, outside the AE-65 zone, are not compatible with established neighborhoods and planned land uses in Enterprise and Spring Valley.

Table 1 ENTERPRISE AND SPRING VALLEY NZC SENT TO THE BCC

YEAR	Non-Conforming Zone Changes	McCarran Deed Restricted NZC
2012	10	0
2013	94	20
2014	5	5
2015	6	0

Analysis of Enterprise and Spring Valley Non-conforming zone changes, 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 6 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZN Analysis in Enterprise and Spring Valley from 2012 to November 2015

	Total NZC	NZC not need with proposed land use categories	% Not needed	Deed restricted parcels	% deed restricted parcel vs all NZC	NZC not needed if deed restriction were not in place	% of total NZC not required if new land use categories and deed restricted parcels are considered
Enterprise	60	11	18.3%	5	4.3%	1	20.0%
Spring Valley	55	3	5.4%	20	36.3%	3	15.0%
Total	115	14	12.1%	25	21.7%	4	15.6%

Factors considered:

- The Las Vegas housing market started to collapse in 2006, the residential developers began to sell their land holdings to provide survival cash.
- June 2008, McCarran Airport Environs Overlay District was reduced based on new noise studies.
- The 2009, Enterprise and Spring Valley Land Use Plans had a distinct shift to commercial land uses.
 - A number of applicants desired to increase the land value through commercial land uses.
 - The applicant emphasis was on individual properties, not neighborhood development.
- As the housing market started to revive in 2011, previously sub-divided land was purchased to replace previously-disposed-of inventory and built on by the residential developers.
- In 2012, the housing market continued to revive and market forces drove a demand for new sources of single family residential land.
- In 2013, some McCarran Airport deed restricted land became available for residential uses.
 - Residential uses were allowed by County ordinance changes.
 - Residential land uses outside the AE-65 line are determined by the local jurisdiction not the FAA.
 - 100% were converted to residential uses demonstrating how deed restrictions had previously skewed uses, values and development.
- As the 2014 land use major updates approached, the residential developers became concerned with the buildable land supply.
 - The County staff indicated to the developers that a moratorium on non-conforming zone changes would be put in place prior to the major land use updates in Enterprise and Spring Valley.
 - The work on the new Community Development Plan delayed the Enterprise and Spring Valley Land Use Plans schedule.
- The developers had three concerns.
 - The supply of single family residential buildable land is not sufficient to meet demand.
 - They would be unable to secure enough land through the land use process.
 - Non-conforming zone changes may not be available for up to three years.
- The 2014 Enterprise and Spring Valley Land Use Plans had a distinct shift to single family residential land uses.

Methodology:

- The non-conforming zone changes
 - The TAB agendas for Enterprise and Spring Valley were reviewed to develop the NZC list.
 - Application information was taken from public records available on the County web site.
 - The information extracted from staff agenda sheets included current land use category, requested zone districted and if deed restricted.
- Proposed land use category

Analysis of Enterprise and Spring Valley Non-conforming zone changes, 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 6 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

- Used the Potential Land Use Categories after review by DA and Comprehensive Planning Director.
- The proposed best fit for the proposed land use category was determined by reviewing the Staff Agenda Sheets and Commission Agenda Map for each NZC application.
- The proposed best fit land use category conforming zone districts were compared against the applicant's requested zone district to determine if it would be conforming or not.
- Deed restrictions
 - The area around each deed restricted NZC request was analyzed.
 - The analysis was used to estimate the most probable land use if no McCarran airport deed restrictions were in place.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Arterial Edge Concept Notes

Attachment # 4 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

The Arterial Edge Concept should not be used to create a land use category or be included in the description of any land use category. The concept is better applied as an overlay.

Intent:

- Add additional land uses to underdeveloped arterial strips adjacent to the proposed Rural Low Residential (RLR).
- Create incentive for developers to use the underdeveloped arterial strips by adding low density commercial uses or residential uses up to four units/acre.
- 10,000 sq. ft. minimum would still apply adjacent to established RNP-1 residences.
- Provide an appropriate transition and buffering for the established RNP-1 when the arterial edge concept is applied.

History:

- In 2004 the RNP-1 overlay (RNP) was created.
- The decision was made to provide a 330-foot buffer around each RNP area.
- The plan was to provide a transition area between the RNP homes and arterial roads.
- The theory was RNP homes should not be built adjacent to an arterial.
- Office Professional (OP) land use category was applied to the 330-foot buffer to many RNPs in Enterprise.
- In a square mile, this dedicates 25% of the land to office uses adjacent to a low density residential.
- In 2009 Enterprise Land Use Major Update, it was determined that there was an OP oversupply.
- In 2009, some of the OP was removed and replaced with Business Design and Research Park (BDRP).

Current Situation:

- Experience has demonstrated the 330 ft. buffer in Enterprise and Spring Valley RNPs was a poor decision.
- The OP strips adjacent to the RLRs are not being developed due to oversupply.
- Some BDRP uses adjacent to RLR are not appropriate.
 - Location is not suitable for BDRP development
 - Insufficient land for quality BDRP project.
 - Some uses are too dense to be use as transition zone.
- Currently, Low Residential and Medium Residential projects are being built to the arterials.
- The proposed Residential Low/Office category and Arterial Edge Potential Zoning extend the arterial edge concept well beyond the intended use.
 - It became a solution in search of a problem.
 - Proposed Arterial Edge Potential Zoning in the Low Residential and Medium Residential categories would be difficult to show on a land use map.
 - Very difficult for the average citizen to understand.
 - The allowed Arterial Edge Potential Zoning in the Proposed Medium Residential is too dense.
 - Could be used for an infill project placing C-2 use next to R-2 homes.

Potential Solutions:

- Extend the current RNP overlay or proposed Rural Low Residential to the arterial.
- Eliminate the Low Residential/Office potential land use category and Arterial Edge verbiage.
 - The arterial edge concept was developed into Low Residential/Office to fix a specific problem that could be shown on a land use map.
 - Never intended to be included in Low Residential and Medium Residential categories:
- Create an overlay based upon the Low Residential/Office category, applicable only adjacent to the RLR.
 - Only extends for 330 ft. from the arterial.
 - Allowed zone districts R-D, R-1, CRT and C-P.
 - Requires access from local streets for residential uses.

Arterial Edge Concept Notes

Attachment # 4 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

- If an arterial goes through the middle of an RLR area, the "Arterial Edge Potential Zoning" is NOT ALLOWED.
- Addition buffer conditions between residential and commercial use.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

BUBBLE LAND USE SYSTEM NOTES

Attachment # 5 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

GENERAL

- The Bubble Land Use system.
 - Land use categories were multi-zone district.
 - 15 land use categories were used in the 1998 Enterprise land use maps.
 - Residential was lumped into one land use category from 1 to 10 unit per acre.
 - All commercial was in one land use category.
- TAB member research has discovered the following:
 - It appears the Proposed Land Use Categories is very similar to the Bubble Land Use system used in the mid 90's.
 - The applicant usually requested the highest zone district allowed in the Bubble.
 - There were no criteria for selecting the appropriate zone district.
 - The Bubble system was abandoned because land use could not be effectively controlled given the applicant request behavior.
 - From 1998 to 2004 Enterprise land use evolved into the current system.
 - This provided a measure of controlled orderly development.
 - Given recent policy changes and the number of non-conforming zone changes, the compelling justification for non-conforming zone changes needs to be greatly strengthened.
 - Mixed Use Development (MUD) suffers from the same defect as the Bubble system.
 - MUD is considered a commercial category.
 - There is no effective Title 30 standard for the commercial uses required within a project.
 - The Enterprise TAB reported this defect to the BCC in 2007.
 - No changes were made due to the TAB report
 - Only residential density is controlled.
 - MUD is usually developed as high density residential with very little commercial.
 - Commercial land is converted to high density residential making planning and providing for government services difficult.

CONCLUSION:

The Proposed Land Use Categories will not be a significant improvement over the current system. It will require a significantly tighter zoning selection process to be inserted into Title 30 to be effective. The Proposed Land Use Categories will increase the work load on the Current Planning staff and Commissioners. First, the appropriate zone district must be determined, then is the project appropriate for the neighborhood. Applicants will have to be convinced that highest and best use is not always the densest use.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Enterprise NZC from 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 8 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZC	Current land category use	Current zone district	Airport Deed Restriction	NZC requested zone district	Probable current land use category without deed restriction	Best fit proposed land use category	NZC prevented if new land use category used
NZC-0316-12	CN	R-E	NO	R-1		Commercial	No
NZC-0311-12	CG	R-E, H-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0564-12	OP	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0771-12	CN	C-1	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0770-12	OP	C-P	NO	R-3		Commercial	No
NZC-0318-12	CN	CG, U-V	NO	R-4, C-1		Community Activity Center	Yes
NZC-0129-13	I	R-E, M-1	NO	R-2, notified as R-3		Employment Center	No
NZC-0131-13	CN, RL, RNP	RNP-1	NO	R-1		Rural Neighborhood Residential Commercial	No
NZC-0134-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	M-1		Employment Center	Yes
NZC-0138-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0344-13	RH	H-2	NO	C-1		Commercial	No
NZC-0339-13	CN	R-E	YES	R-2	Residential Suburban	Commercial	No
NZC-0348-13	CG	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0354-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0356-13	RL, CN, CG	R-E, C-1, H-2	NO	R-2		Medium Residential	Yes
NZC-0358-13	CT	H-1	NO	R-2		Resort	No
NZC-0359-13	CG	R-E, H-2	NO	R-1		Commercial	No
NZC-0340-13	RL, RS	R-E	NO	R-1, R-2		Medium Residential	Yes
NZC-0575-13	CG	R-E, R-U	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0576-13	CG	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0579-13	RL	R-D	NO	R-2		Medium Residential	Yes
NZC-0582-13	CN	C-1	NO	R-2		Commercial	Yes
NZC-0131-13	RL, CN, RNP	R-E, RNP-1	NO	R-1		Rural	Yes

PROBABLE LAND USE CATEGORY WITHOUT DEED RESTRICTION: Green = NZC not required; Red = NZC required.

Enterprise NZC from 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 8 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZC	Current land category use	Current zone district	Airport Deed Restriction	NZC requested zone district	Probable current land use category without deed restriction	Best fit proposed land use category	NZC prevented if new land use category used
NZC-0542-13	OP	R-E	NO	R-2		Neighborhood Residential	No
NZC-0547-13	PF	R-E, H-2	NO	M-1		Office	No
NZC-0544-13	CN	C-2, RUD	NO	R-2		Public Facility Commercial & Multiple Family Residential	No
NZC-0568-13	RNP, CN, RS	R-E, H-2	NO	R-2		Rural	No
NZC-0541-13	OL	R-E	NO	R-2		Neighborhood Residential & Low Residential	No
NZC-0540-13	OL	R-E	NO	R-2		Open Land	No
NZC-0556-13	OL	R-E	NO	RUD		Open Land	No
NZC-0543-13	OP	R-E	NO	R-2		Open Land	No
NZC-0560-13	CG	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0539-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0564-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0563-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0568-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0571-13	BDRP	R-E	YES/NO	R-2	Residential Suburban	Employment Center	No
NZC-0578-13	OP	R-E	NO	R-2		Office	No
NZC-0577-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0590-13	CG	R-E, H-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0583-13	BDRP	R-E, H-2	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0553-13	CG,CN,RNP	C-1,RNP, CRT-ROI	NO	RD, R-2		Rural Neighborhood Residential	Yes
NZC-0567-13	CG	C-2, R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No

Enterprise NZC from 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 8 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZC	Current land category use	Current zone district	Airport Deed Restriction	NZC requested zone district	Probable current land use category without deed restriction	Best fit proposed land use category	NZC prevented if new land use category used
NZC-0586-13	CG	C-2	YES	R-2	Residential Suburban	Commercial	No
NZC-0572-13	PF	PF, R-E	NO	R-2		Public Facility	No
NZC-0584-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0538-13	OP	R-E	NO	C-1		Commercial	Yes
NZC-0833-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Medium Residential	No
NZC-0838-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0844-13	CG, BDRP	R-E, C-2, M-1	YES	R-2	BDRP	Employment Center	No
NZC-0832-13	RM	R-E	NO	R-3		Multiple Family Residential	No
NZC-0830-13	CG	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0819-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-1		Commercial	No
NZC-0822-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0823-13	CN, OP	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0842-13	OP, CN	C-P, C-1	YES	R-1	Part of RNP buffer, OFFICE	Commercial	Yes
NZC-0449-15	BDRP	H-2	NO	M-1		Employment Center	No
NZC-0530-15	CN	C-1	NO	R-3		Multiple Family Residential	No
NZC-0578-15	CN, RS	R-E	NO	R-2		Medium Residential	Yes
NZC-0601-15	RS	R-E	NO	M-D		Light Manufacturing	Yes

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Potential Land Use Categories – TAB Comments

Attachment # 2 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

Potential Categories	Description	Conforming Zone District Desired Zoning
<p>OPEN LAND</p>	<p>The Open Land category designates areas to provide for permanent open space in the community; to prevent irreversible environmental damage to sensitive areas; and to deter development in areas with highly limited availability of public services and facilities; or severe natural constraints (i.e. areas with 12% or greater slope). Lands are primarily in public ownership. For lands in private ownership, residential uses up to 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres are allowed. Grazing, open space, and recreational uses may occur. Local supporting public facility uses are also allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks.</p>	<p>O-S, <u>P-F</u></p>
<p>RURAL LOW RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>The Rural Low Residential category allows a maximum of 2 dwelling units per gross acre. This category is intended to protect areas within the Las Vegas Valley that are already developed or planned as estate or rural in character, from encroachment by more intense development. The predominant residential life-style is single family homes on large lots, some with livestock and agricultural uses. The Rural Neighborhood Preservation (RNP-1) Overlay is often found within these areas, where PUDs are not allowed. Local supporting public facility uses are allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks. Multiple family dwellings, cluster development, and compact lots are not appropriate.</p>	<p>R-U, R-A, R-E, R-E (RNP-1), <u>P-F</u></p>

Potential Land Use Categories – TAB Comments

Attachment # 2 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

<p>LOW RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>Low Residential allows a maximum of <u>5.3 (3.5 du/ac with a PUD)</u> dwelling units per gross acre. Public infrastructure and service availability affect the intensity and density within this category. The predominant housing type is single family detached development. Multiple family dwellings are not appropriate. Local supporting public facility uses are also allowed in the category with appropriate buffering and setbacks.</p> <p>Arterial Edge Potential Zoning can include R-2, CRT, C-P, C-1 uses. Applications for these uses require a greater level of justification on the part of the proponent. Arterial Edge Potential only applies when the Low Residential land use designation abuts an arterial on the exterior perimeter of an LR area – if an arterial goes through the middle of an LR area, the “Arterial Edge Potential Zoning” is NOT ALLOWED.</p>	<p>R-D, R-T, R-1, P-F</p>
<p>MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>The Medium Residential category allows a maximum of 8 dwelling units per gross acre (10 du/ac with a PUD). Public infrastructure and service availability affect the intensity and density within this category. The predominant housing type is single family residential detached development. Single family attached is also encouraged, where appropriate. Multiple family dwellings are not appropriate. Local supporting public facility uses are also allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks.</p> <p>Arterial Edge Potential Zoning can include CRT, C-P, C-1, C-2 uses. Applications for these uses require a greater level of justification on the part of the proponent. Arterial Edge Potential only applies when the Medium Residential land use designation abuts an arterial on the exterior perimeter of an MR area – if an arterial goes through the middle of an MR area, the “Arterial Edge Potential Zoning” is NOT ALLOWED.</p>	<p>R-1, R-T, R-2, P-F</p>

Potential Land Use Categories – TAB Comments

Attachment # 2 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

<p>MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL</p>	<p>The Multiple Family Residential category permits a range from 10 to 32 dwelling units per gross acre. This category allows a variety of housing types including single family, residential multiplexes, town houses, mansion houses-homes, lofts, and low density apartments. Density ranges within this category are dependent on development and design. Local supporting public facility uses are also allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks.</p>	<p>RUD, R-3, R-4, <u>P-F</u></p>
<p>LOW RESIDENTIAL / OFFICE</p>	<p><i>The Arterial Edge category is applied on arterial edges to provide a transition area that may allow compatible uses adjacent to specific Rural Low Residential uses. Applications of these uses require a greater level of justification on the part of the proponent. Arterial Edge Potential applies when the Rural Low Residential use is near an arterial on the exterior perimeter of an RLR area. If an arterial goes through the middle of an RLR area, the use of this category is NOT ALLOWED. If an RLR area goes to the edge of an arterial, the use of this category is NOT ALLOWED.</i></p>	<p>R-D, R-1, GRT, C-P</p>
<p>OFFICE</p>	<p>The Office category applies to areas where the primary uses are low intensity business and professional services and accessory service uses. Typical uses include offices where medical, legal, financial, and other business/professional services are performed. Accessory commercial uses are appropriate when associated with the principal use. Local supporting public facility uses are also allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks.</p>	<p>CRT, C-P, <u>P-F</u></p>
<p>COMMERCIAL</p>	<p>The Commercial category allows retail and service commercial uses. Examples include neighborhood shopping centers, restaurants, hardware stores, shopping malls, banks, restaurants (with alcoholic consumption), taverns, and other similar retail and service uses. Developments should be sized to fit and integrate with the surrounding neighborhood. This category also includes offices either singly or grouped as office centers with professional and business services. Local supporting public facility uses are also allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks. Commercial uses should be developed as nodes or centers.</p>	<p>C-P, C-1, C-2, R-V-P, <u>P-F</u></p>

Potential Land Use Categories – TAB Comments

Attachment # 2 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

<p>MANUFACTURING</p>	<p>The Manufacturing category applies to areas of industrial use and provides areas for new and existing industrial development in proximity to major transportation facilities. Light manufacturing uses in the category include research and development, incubator businesses, food sales and distribution, postal and data processing centers, distribution centers, general non-hazardous warehousing, and can have limited outside uses. Examples of more intense uses in the category include food processing, freight terminals, laboratories, printing facilities, creation of construction materials, vehicle assembly, outdoor storage, and recreational vehicle storage. These uses should be reviewed for safety and aesthetics reasons when they adjoin other uses and arterials. Public facility uses are also allowed in this category with appropriate buffering and setbacks. Residential uses are not allowed as a primary use.</p>	<p>M-D, M-1, P-F</p>
<p>GOVERNMENT PUBLIC FACILITIES</p>	<p>The Public Government Facilities category allows public uses such as parks and recreational areas including public and private golf courses; trails and easements; drainage ways and detention basins; storm water control facilities; and any other large areas of permanent open land. Public Facilities include governmental building sites and complexes, police and fire facilities, hospitals and rehabilitation sites, schools, libraries, clubs, and utility facilities. Residential uses are not allowed as a primary use.</p>	<p>P-F</p>
<p>EMPLOYMENT CENTER</p>	<p>The Employment Center category is designed to draw companies which need Class A office space, an environment that attracts potential employees, allows more intensive uses near to the office environment, and needs a large workforce. Examples include technology, health, education and defense industries. It is generally served by a higher level of public services and facilities. Residential uses are not allowed as a primary use.</p>	<p>C-P, M-D, M-1, P-F</p>

Potential Land Use Categories – TAB Comments

Attachment # 2 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

<p>RESORT</p>	<p>The Resort category designates areas for commercial establishments that primarily cater to tourists. The predominant land uses include casinos, resorts, hotels, motels (greater than three stories), recreational vehicle parks, time shared condominiums, amusement or theme parks. Planned hotel/resort gaming establishments are restricted to the Gaming Enterprise Overlay District as defined by Title 30 (Unified Development Code). Public facility uses are also allowed in this category. Detached single family uses are not appropriate.</p>	<p>C-2, R-5, H-1, U-V, R-V-P, CRT, <u>P-F</u></p>
<p>COMMUNITY VILLAGE</p>	<p>The Community Activity Center category encourages a concentration of medium and high intensity residential uses intermixed with commercial uses. It may be used as a place making nucleus and in areas that show signs of transitioning to other more intense uses or that are ripe for revitalization or redevelopment. It is serviced or will be serviced by transit and intended to be a pedestrian friendly environment. Detached single family uses are not appropriate.</p>	<p>RUD, U-V, R-3, R-4, CRT, C-P, C-1, C-2, <u>P-F</u></p>
<p>REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTER</p>	<p>The Regional Activity Center category encourages a highly dense, self-sufficient concentration of commercial uses intermixed with high intensity residential uses. It may be used as a place making nucleus and in areas that show signs of transitioning to other more intense uses or that are ripe for revitalization or redevelopment. It is serviced or will be serviced by transit and intended to be a pedestrian friendly environment. It may be adjacent to neighborhood casino areas. Detached single family uses are not appropriate.</p>	<p>C-2, U-V, R-4, R-5, <u>P-F</u></p>

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Proposed Land Use Categories Notes

Attachment # 1 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Proposed Goals should be denied. The Proposed Goals are not measurable and difficult to enforce.

The BCC approval of the Potential Land Use Categories should be held until the entire package can be reviewed and revised as necessary. This package includes Proposed Goals, Unified Land Use Policies, Proposed Land Use Categories and potential Title 30 changes. The entire package should be thoroughly vetted through public meetings, TAB, PC and BCC hearings before final approval.

The TAB recommended changes should be applied to the Potential Land Use Categories.

GENERAL

- The Proposed Land Use Categories do not meet the staff developed objectives.
- AG-0218-14, 04/2/14 staff proposed new land use format to the BCC with three specific goals.
 - Unified set of land use policies (BCC approved)
 - Improved effective guidance uses, updated planning theories
 - Reduce non-conforming zone changes
- Two of the three objectives have not been met.
- The Community Planning Working Group was give one format.
 - No alternative formats were presented or discussed.
 - The process did not follow the normal flow of goals, policies, strategic alternatives and implementing the selected alternative.

CURRENT RESULTS

- Policy unification is completed and in use.
 - With centralized policies, the TAB's have been effectively removed from the land use policy creation/review process.
 - Policies were previously reviewed by the TABs during the major land use update.
 - TABs have not normally been involved in changes to the Comprehensive Plan.
 - Method for suggested land use policy changes needs to be developed and include the TABs
- After a year in use, the policies need to reviewed by Current Planning and TABS for suggested changes.
- Unified set of goals has been produced and should be denied.
- It appears the Proposed Land Use Categories is very similar to the Bubble land use system used in the mid 90's that was replaced as being not workable.
See note on Bubble Land Use System

COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP

- Staff did not clearly relate the current planning theories alluded to in their AG-0218-14, 04/2/14 recommendation to the BCC.
- Staff did not clearly relate how the current system developed or why it needs to be changed.
- The Proposed Land Use Categories will not significantly decrease the number of non-conforming zone changes.
 - No staff study accomplished on the available data.
 - A TAB member produced and submitted a non-conforming zone change study.
 - The Proposed Land Use Categories would reduce the number of NZCs by 12.8%.
- The working group was terminated too early.
 - Additional group member comments were truncated.
 - The developed Proposed Land Use Categories were not examined as a whole product.
 - No Current Planning input.
 - Not analyzed with the approved Unified Land Use Policies.
 - Not analyzed with current or proposed Title 30 standards.
 - No discussion of how Title 30 will be effected.
 - No discussion on how the desired zone district distribution would be accomplished.

Proposed Land Use Categories Notes

Attachment # 1 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

CONCERNS

- The public reception of the Proposed Land Use Categories has been negative.
 - Difficult to understand.
 - Staff TAB briefing did little to inform the public and created addition confusion.
 - Commissioner open houses may help the public perception of the Proposed Land Use Categories.
- Proposed land use categories will require additional analysis and consideration by the Current Planning and the Commissioners.
 - First, the appropriate zone district must be determined.
 - Second, is the proposed project appropriate for the neighborhood.
 - The process is more complicated and requires greater subjective decision making.
 - Very difficult to establish coded standards.
- Proposed land use categories requires major changes to Title 30 to better serve the public.
 - The applicant tendency to request the maximum density will be harder to counter with the proposed multi-zone district land use categories.
 - Will require strict Title 30 standards to insure orderly land use development.
 - How will the mix of land uses be maintained in multi-use land use categories?
 - If the enforceable standards cannot be developed the Proposed Land Use Categories will be less effective than the current system.

TAB COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS ON POTENTIAL LAND USE CATEGORIES

TITLE BLOCK

- Desired Zoning is actually a conforming zone district and should be labeled as such.
- This would be consistent with current practice.

LOW RESIDENTIAL

- Current Title 30 standards:
 - R-D is included in 30.40.030, Rural Residential Districts.
 - R-1 and R-T are included in 30.40.080, Suburban & Compact Residential Districts.
 - If adopted, this is a major change to how current zone districts are considered.
 - Significant impact on RNP-1 areas.
- Change first sentence to read 3 (3.5 du/ac with PUD).
 - 5 units per acre is too dense abutting the RNP.
 - Considerable resident opposition to 5 units per acre.
 - Current Title 30 division between Rural Residential Zone Districts and Suburban & Compact Residential Zone Districts is an excellent standard.
- Remove R-1 from Desired Zoning, included in Medium Residential, too dense for abutting RNP and not consistent with Title 30.
- Remove R-T from Desired Zoning, included in Medium Residential, too dense for abutting RNP and not consistent with Title 30.
- Remove Arterial Edge Potential Zoning. See Arterial Edge Concept Notes

MEDIUM RESIDENTIAL

- Remove Arterial Edge Potential Zoning. See Arterial Edge Concept Notes

MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

- Replace houses with homes.
- Add the previous Mansion Home description in the Enterprise Land Use Plan to Title 30 definitions.

Proposed Land Use Categories Notes

Attachment # 1 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

“Mansion Homes combine several residences within one large structure. They require special architectural concerns addressed through the following standards: While pitched roof forms are desirable to express the specific architectural style, flat roof areas at the center of the structure are allowed to reduce the overall building height and provide location for mechanical equipment. In addition to roof form, building articulation and entry expression are considered when designing a Mansion Home.”



LOW RESIDENTIAL/OFFICE

- Delete, not appropriate as a land use category. See Arterial Edge Concept Notes
- Should be applied as an overlay district.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Rename to Government Facilities.
 - Staff was adamant that a land use and zone district should not have the same name.
 - Staff rejected the suggestion that Rural Neighborhood Preserve be used for the Rural Low Residential category name.
- P-F zone district should be listed as a conforming zone district in all proposed land use categories.
 - Many public projects are small and will not be designated on the land use maps.
 - This will create non-conforming zone changes for smaller public projects if P-F is not listed as a conforming zone district in each land use category.
- How are non-government facilities accounted for in this land use?
 - There needs to be a provision for quasi-public facilities.
 - All non-government facilities should be subject to all Title 30 standards.
- How are “and related private buildings, structures, and accessory uses” related to the proposed PF verbiage.
- Why are rehabilitation and clubs included in the proposed PF verbiage?

RESORT

- Will there be a minimum acreage requirement?
- What will be the buffering standards?
- How will a single land use be prevented from taking a majority of the land for this use?
 - Current tendency is to develop a single use in multi zone district land use categories.
 - Little if any conductivity between projects.

COMMUNITY VILLAGE

- Will there be a minimum acreage requirement?
- What will be the buffering standards?
- Not appropriate as an infill category.
- How will a single land use be prevented from taking a majority of the land for this use?
 - Current tendency is to develop a single use in multi zone district land use categories.
 - Little if any conductivity between projects.

Proposed Land Use Categories Notes

Attachment # 1 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTER

- Regional Center is a better description, otherwise, sounds like an "old folks home."
- Will there be a minimum acreage requirement?
- What will be the buffering standards?
- Not appropriate as an infill category.
- How will a single land use be prevented from taking a majority of the land for this use?
 - Current tendency is to develop a single use in multi zone district land use categories.
 - Little if any conductivity between projects.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Response to Director of Comprehensive Planning

Attachment # 7 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

The following was received from the Director of Comprehensive Planning in response to the non-conforming zone change study presented to the Community Planning Working Group. The study was reworked to take the Director's questions into account and use the final version of proposed land use categories for evaluation.

Thank you David. I have a couple of questions for you.... did you analyze the data with the understanding that 2013 was an anomaly?

Yes, I understand that 2013 was a unique year for non-conforming zone changes. It was driven by three events. Two of these events, reduction of airport environmental zones and pending major land use updates, are related to land use. The third was market forces driven by the home builders need for buildable land. It should be noted that significant areas of airport deed restricted land, outside the current AE 60 line, within Enterprise were placed in a residential category during the 2014 land use update.

Did you take into account that many of the requests were on previously deed restricted parcels?

The analysis was redone to take the deed restricted parcels into account. During the study period 25 of 115 (21.7%) NZC's were deed restricted parcels. It is estimated that 4 parcels would have been residential without the airport deed restrictions.

And did you evaluate what the land use categories for many of the requests would have been IF there were not deed restrictions on the properties?

Further analysis was made to estimate the most probable land use category without deed restriction. 4 of the 25 deed restricted parcels would most probably would have been residential and not required an NZC application.

I understand that we had close to 100 nonconforming zone change applications in 2013 and that most were for R1 and R2, however there is no certainty that in the evaluation during a previous land use update there would have been as much commercial/industrial land uses in those general areas if there was not a need for protection related to the airport environs (which subsequently changed and was reduced).

As a TAB we have followed the reduction in airport restricted zones. We expect the introduction of the geared turbine engine this year will further reduce the AE zones. The new engine is up to 75% quieter than the current jet engines. It will likely make a major noise difference as this type of engine is adopted by the airlines and cargo carriers. During the Enterprise 2014 Major Land Use Update significant areas of land previously under the AE 60 line were changed to provide additional residential land.

We (both staff and the TAB's) have to evaluate the land use plans based on current conditions and restrictions.

We agree fully.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

RURAL LOW RESIDENTIAL RECOMENDATIONS

Attachment # 3 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

The Rural Low Residential land use has evolved over the last decade in the Enterprise, Spring Valley and Lone Mountain land use plans. At first, it covered land in the RNP overlay where the rural character preservation is required. Then it was expanded to include large lot development outside the RNP where the rural character preservation is not required.

The Rural Low Residential goal, policies and code must be better defined to distinguish RNP uses from large lot uses outside the RNP overlay. The goals, policies and code developed must be consistent with the NRS and Title 30. Title 30 needs to better define the RNP-1.

NRS 278.0177

The NRS 278.0177 defines a "Rural Preservation Neighborhood" as:

"Rural preservation neighborhood" means a subdivided or developed area:

1. Which consists of 10 or more residential dwelling units;
2. Where the outer boundary of each lot that is used for residential purposes is not more than 330 feet from the outer boundary of any other lot that is used for residential purposes;
3. Which has no more than two residential dwelling units per acre; and
4. Which allows residents to raise or keep animals non-commercially.

TITLE 30.48 PART C

Title 30.48 Part C is used to implement the "Rural Preservation Neighborhood"

30.48.170

Purpose.

The Rural Neighborhood Preservation Overlay District, hereinafter referred to as RNP, is established to ensure that the character of rural and other residential development is preserved.

ANALYSIS

The key word in both the State and County code on the RNP is preservation. The preservation element must be included in the policies for Rural Low Residential. The County code introduces "rural character" as an element in Rural Low Residential and provides the distinguishing characteristic between the RNP and large lot developments. The two terms, "preserve" and "rural character", taken together mean RNP neighborhoods must be developed/protected.

A developed/protected neighborhood is a concept currently used by master planned communities and HOAs to maintain the neighborhood character and prevent parcel removal. The difference between large lot and RNPs is who drives the neighborhood development/protection. The County is required to developed/preserve the RNP while private developers or HOAs develop/preserve the master planned community and other neighborhoods.

RURAL CHARACTER

The verbiage below defines rural character that should be developed into a goals, policies and code. These were developed by examining how other government bodies in the valley approach the development/protection of Rural Low Residential uses.

RURAL LOW RESIDENTIAL RECOMENDATIONS

Attachment # 3 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

RNP neighborhood is defined by some or all of the characteristics below:

- Populated by residents with common interests in more open space lifestyles than experienced in suburban/urban neighborhoods. Homes front on local streets or 4 house cul-de-sacs.
- Custom built homes.
- No mandatory conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&Rs) or homeowners' associations
- Suitable for raising or keeping animals non-commercially and/or riding horses in a rural residential setting.
- Trail access to county trail system or internal trail systems.
- Residential net lot size large enough to park boats, horse trailers, and other recreational vehicles behind the front setback line and with enough rear yard area to construct accessory buildings.
- Residential densities low enough to provide greater setbacks between neighboring dwellings than typically found in suburban/urbanized areas.
- Modified pavement sections and few public streetlights and sidewalks.
- Less light pollution from fewer residential nighttime activities and reduced house lighting in general.

The characteristics are essential to describe RNPs within the Rural Low Residential land use category. The RNP characteristics must be included in the description for the Rural Low Residential land use category.

SUGGESTED GOAL, POLICIES and CODE:

Given the information above the following goal and policies are suggested:

Rural Low Residential Goal

- Rural Neighborhood Residential to provide for large lot residential uses with two distinct land uses, large lot homes and the Rural Neighborhood Preservation (RNP). **Current suggested goal.**

Additional Estate Residential Policies:

- Rural Neighborhood Residential uses should be developed to two units or less per acre.
- RNP should be developed to and maintain rural characteristics.
- Development within or abutting RNP overlay uses should preserve the RNP rural character and limit any impacts of non-residential development.
- Develop/preserve existing Rural Neighborhood Preservation Overlay Districts by discouraging reclassification of viable neighborhood areas for other uses.
- Provide the opportunity for RNP in areas to conform with the NRS and Clark County criteria for "Rural Preservation Neighborhood".

Code Changes and Additions

RURAL LOW RESIDENTIAL RECOMENDATIONS

Attachment # 3 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

- Establish the RNP as a zone district.
- Define the RNP characteristics

Change the following to Title 30.48.170 Purpose.

- The Rural Neighborhood Preservation Overlay District, hereinafter referred to as RNP, is established to ensure that the character of rural and ~~other residential~~ development is preserved.
- RNP neighborhood is defined by some or all of the characteristics below:
 - Populated by residents with common interests in more open space lifestyles than experienced in suburban/urban neighborhoods. Homes front on local streets or 4 house cul-de-sacs.
 - Custom built homes.
 - No mandatory conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&Rs) or homeowners' associations
 - Suitable for raising or keeping animals non-commercially and/or riding horses in a rural residential setting.
 - Trail access to county trail system or internal trail systems.
 - Residential net lot size large enough to park boats, horse trailers, and other recreational vehicles behind the front setback line and with enough rear yard area to construct accessory buildings.
 - Residential densities low enough to provide greater setbacks between neighboring dwellings than typically found in suburban/urbanized areas.
 - Modified pavement sections and few public streetlights and sidewalks.
 - Less light pollution from fewer residential nighttime activities and reduced house lighting in general.

Change the following to 30.48.190 STANDARDS

- b. Adequate buffer areas, screening, and an orderly and efficient transition of land uses, as determined by the Board, shall be provided between the RNP and a development with a higher density or intensity of use.
- c. New residential developments abutting existing RNP shall be transition at appropriate densities (lot sizes of 10,000 square feet or greater) and be of similar height. Significantly smaller lot sizes should be located beyond any appropriate transition areas.
- d. Local roads adjacent to the RNP-1 shall be developed to rural road standards.

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board

Spring Valley NZC from 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 9 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZC	Current land use	Current zone district	Airport Deed Restriction	NZC requested zone district	Probable current land use category without deed restriction	Best fit proposed land use category	NZC prevented if new land use category used
NZC-0331-12	CN, CG	R-E	NO	R-3, C-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0598-12	OP, CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0633-12	BDRP	R-E, C-2	NO	R-4		Employment Center	No
NZC-0761-12	CG, BDRP	C-2	NO	R-4		Employment Center	No
NZC-0006-13	RS	R-E	NO	R-2, R-3, C-2		Community Center	No
NZC-0177-13	CG	C-1	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0178-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0184-13	RS, CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0186-13	CG	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0375-13	BDRP	C-2, M-D	YES	R-2	BDRP	Employment Center	No
NZC-0384-13	CG	C-2	YES	R-4	Commercial General	Commercial	No
NZC-0390-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-4		Commercial	No
NZC-0393-13	CG	C-2	YES	RUD	Commercial General	Community Center	No
NZC-0398-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0403-13	BDRP	C-1	YES	R-2	BDRP	Employment Center	No
NZC-0411-13	CG	R-E, ROIR-4	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0414-13	CG	R-E	NO	R-2		Community Activity Center	No
NZC-0385-13	CG CG	C-2 C-P, C-2	YES	R-3 R-2	Commercial General	Commercial Commercial	No No
NZC-0608-13	CG	R-E	NO	M-D		Commercial	No
NZC-0612-13	CG, OP	R-E	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0619-13	CG	R-E, C-2	YES	R-3	Commercial General	Community Activity	Yes

Spring Valley NZC from 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 9 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZC	Current land use	Current zone district	Airport Deed Restriction	NZC requested zone district	Probable current land use category without deed restriction	Best fit proposed land use category	NZC prevented if new land use category used
NZC-0622-13	CG	C-1	NO	R-3		Center	No
NZC-0624-13	BDRP	R-E	YES	R-2	Residential High	Employment Center	No
NZC-0625-13	BDRP	R-E, C-P	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0626-13	CG, CT	R-E, R-2	YES	R-2	Commercial Tourist	Resort	No
NZC-0630-13	CG	R-E, ROI U-V	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0634-13	OP	CRT	NO	R-2		Office	No
NZC-0636-13	CN	C1	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0639-13	BDRP	R-E	YES	R-2	Residential Suburban	Employment Center	No
NZC-0640-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0642-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0645-13	BDRP	R-E	YES	R-2	Residential Suburban	Employment Center	No
NZC-0646-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0648-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0649-13	CG	C-2	YES	R-2	Commercial General	Community Activity Center	No
NZC-0650-13	BDRP	C-2, M-D	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0656-13	CN	C-1, ROI M-D	YES	R-3	Residential Medium	Commercial	No
NZC-0657-13	OP	C-P	YES	R-2	Commercial General	Commercial	No
NZC-0660-13	CN, OP	R-E, C-1	YES	R-2	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial	No
NZC-0664-13	CG, BDRP	C-2	NO	R-4		Employment Center	No

PROBABLE LAND USE CATEGORY WITHOUT DEED RESTRICTION: Green = NZC not required; Red = NZC required.

Spring Valley NZC from 2012 to November 2015

Attachment # 9 is a recommendation approved by Enterprise Town Advisory Board on February 24, 2016.

NZC	Current land use	Current zone district	Airport Deed Restriction	NZC requested zone district	Probable current land use category without deed restriction	Best fit proposed land use category	NZC prevented if new land use category used
NZC-0665-13	CG	C-2	YES	R-2	Commercial General	Community Activity Center	No
NZC-0391-13	OP	C-P	NO	R-2		Office	No
NZC-0864-13	CG	C-2	NO	R-2		Commercial	No
NZC-0857-13	CN	R-E	NO	R-3		Commercial	No
NZC-0008-14	RH, OP	R-E, ROI R-3	NO	R-4		Community Activity Center	No
NZC-0005-14	GC	R-E	YES	RUD	Commercial General	Commercial	No
NZC-0004-14	BDRP	R-E	YES	R-1	Residential Suburban	Employment Center	No
NZC-0001-14	OP	R-E	NO	RUD		Office	No
NZC-0003-14	BDRP	R-E, M-D	YES	R-2	Residential Suburban	Employment Center	No
NZC-0002-14	OP	R-E	YES	RUD	Residential Suburban	Office	No
NZC-0855-13	BDRP	M-D	YES	R-1	BDRP	Employment Center	No
NZC-0866-13	BDRP	R-E	NO	R-2		Employment Center	No
NZC-0850-13	CT	R-E	NO	R-2		Resort	No
NZC-0344-15	CG	R-4	NO	R-5		Regional Activity Center	Yes
NZC-0547-15	OP	R-E	NO	C-1		Commercial	Yes

Frank Kapriva
Chair, Enterprise Town Advisory Board