

**AGENDA MEMO****PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 11, 2007****DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT****ITEM DESCRIPTION: SDR-23839 - APPLICANT/OWNER: CLARK COUNTY****SCHOOL DISTRICT**

---

**\*\* CONDITIONS \*\*****STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL.** If Approved, subject to:**Planning and Development**

1. Approval of and conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Rezoning (ZON-23834) shall be required.
2. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a building permit has been issued for the principal building on the site. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.
3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan, date stamped 09/28/07, and landscape plan and building elevations, date stamped 08/10/07, except as amended by conditions herein.
4. A revised site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning and Development Department, prior to the time application is made for a building permit, to reflect the changes herein. An additional four accessible spaces must be depicted on the revised site plan and all accessible spaces meet the City's dual access aisle requirement as illustrated by Title 19.10.010 (K) Figure 4.
5. A revised landscape plan that reflects the changes made to the most recently submitted site plan, date stamped 09/28/07, that includes the entire site shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department for staff's review prior to City Council action. The revised landscape plan shall include the quantities of all plant materials illustrated. Further, all perimeter buffer areas shall be fully dimensioned with the typical tree spacing indicated.
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 application is made for a building permit. A permanent underground sprinkler system is required, and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner; the landscape plan shall include irrigation specifications.

**SDR-23839 - Conditions Page Two**  
**October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

7. Pre-planting and post-planting landscape inspections are required to ensure the appropriate plant material, location, size of planters, and landscape plans are being utilized. The Planning and Development Department must be contacted to schedule an inspection prior to the start of the landscape installation and after the landscape installation is completed. A certificate of occupancy will not be issued or the final inspection will not be approved until the landscape inspections have been completed.
8. Reflective glazing at the pedestrian level is prohibited. Glazing above the pedestrian level shall be limited to a maximum reflectance rating of 22% (as defined by the National Institute of Standards and Technology).
9. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets.
10. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of LVMC Title 19.12.040.
11. Parking lot lighting standards shall be no more than 30 feet in height and shall utilize downward-directed lights with full cut-off luminaires. Lighting on the exterior of buildings shall be shielded and shall be downward-directed. Non-residential property lighting shall be directed away from residential property or screened, and shall not create fugitive lighting on adjacent properties.
12. 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.
13. A Comprehensive Construction Staging Plan shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of any building permits. The Construction Staging Plan shall include the following information: Design and location of construction trailer(s); design and location of construction fencing; all proposed temporary construction signage; location of materials staging area; and the location and design of parking for all construction workers.
14. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City Departments must be satisfied, except as modified herein.

**Public Works**

15. Remove all substandard public street improvements and unused driveway cuts adjacent to this site, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards concurrent with development of this site.

**SDR-23839 - Conditions Page Three**  
**October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

16. The driveway throat depth proposed for the two eastern most driveways on Vegas Drive is not adequate. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the redesign of these driveways prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first.
17. All private improvements and landscaping 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.
18. A 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 as are recommended by the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Drainage Studies and approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.
19. A 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 or the submittal of any construction drawings, 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 also include 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 rightsofway 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 onsite development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. If additional rightsofway are not required and Traffic Control devices are or may be proposed at this site outside of the public rightofway, all necessary easements for the location and/or access of such devices shall be granted prior to the issuance of permits for this site. 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.

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

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This is a request for a Site Development Plan Review for a proposed 122,287 square-foot expansion of a public school, secondary campus. The subject site, located on 34.83 acres at 2501 Vegas Drive, currently consists of an undeveloped area to the northwest and developed athletic fields and academic buildings on the remaining site area.

The applicant has indicated that this expansion will include five new buildings, new and renovated athletic facilities (including a new ropes course), and new and redesigned parking lots. While the applicant has resolved many of staffs concerns, the location of the ropes course is incompatible with the residential development to the north and west; therefore, denial of this request is recommended.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&amp;D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
04/08/93	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-0028-93) for a number of parcels along the south side of Vegas Drive, approximately 400 feet west of Robin Street including a portion of the subject site. The Planning Commission recommended approval.
04/09/98	Staff administratively approved a Site Development Plan Review [Z-0028-93(1)] for a proposed 119,569 square-foot gymnasium addition to an existing high school at 2501 Vegas Drive.
06/28/01	The Planning Commission approved a Site Development Plan Review [Z-0028-93(2)] for a proposed 48,850 square-foot addition to an existing high school at 2501 Vegas Drive.
09/20/01	The Planning Commission approved a Review of Condition [Z-0028-93(3)] to review Condition 1 of an approved Site Development Plan Review [Z-0028-93(2)] that required an eight-foot wide landscape planter along the western property line at 2501 Vegas Drive.
04/05/07	The City Council approved a Resolution (R-14-06) to adopt the West Las Vegas Plan. This plan was submitted to update the area plan to meet the 2020 Master Plan requirement of a plan to provide direction to this area of the city. The Planning Commission recommended approval.
09/27/07	A companion item a Rezoning (ZON-23834) will be heard concurrently with this item.
<i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i>	
There are no relevant building permits or business licenses associated with this project.	

**SDR-23839 - Staff Report Page Two**  
**October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>	
06/06/07	A pre-application meeting was held and elements of this application were discussed. Landscaping requirements and various Public Works concerns were talked about. Submittal requirements were discussed.

<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>	
09/05/07	<p>A neighborhood meeting was held at the Central Career and Technical Academy, 2501 Vegas Drive, at 6:00 p.m. Twelve members of the public attended. The applicant informed the members of the public of the revisions to the dates for the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings. The applicant presented a preliminary site, and also showed three other options. Comments from the public were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* There is a problem with students parking on Robin Street, even though there are currently an adequate number of parking spaces on the property.</li> <li>* There were concerns about the height of the new high school structure, and the fact that it will block views of the houses to the west of the school site (located on the cul-de-sac immediately west of the school property).</li> <li>* There were concerns about the distance of the new buildings from the residential properties to the west, and noise from the ropes course.</li> <li>* There is a problem with students meandering through the residential neighborhoods to the east.</li> <li>* Traffic at the intersection of Vegas and Robin will become more severe with the addition of the new school; the neighbors in attendance wanted to see a traffic light included as part of the school expansion plan.</li> <li>* One of the residents stated that they didn't want the new school at all.</li> </ul> <p>After reviewing the different options, the residents seemed to favor the option of moving the tennis and basketball courts to the interior of the property, and maintaining all of the parking spaces required by code. The residents also requested that the new buildings be moved as far away from the residential properties as possible.</p> <p>After the meeting, Planning and Development staff reviewed the residential adjacency issues with the applicant, and the impacts of locating the ropes course adjacent to the residences. The applicant indicated that they would look at options to bring the new structures into compliance with residential adjacency requirements.</p>

<i>Field Check</i>	
09/04/07	The Department of Planning and Development conducted a site visit that found that the site is in operation as a magnet high school. The east and north perimeters of the property are generally in compliance with Title 19 standards;

October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

	<p>however, it was observed that 5-10% of the landscape material has died or been removed over time and has not been replaced. Behind the landscape buffers, chain-link fencing was observed. The south and west perimeters of the site had virtually no landscape buffer between the site and the existing single family residential. It was also observed at these locations a chain-link fence approximately three feet from the backs of existing block walls.</p> <p>The former church building at the southeast corner of the site is still in place, however it appeared to be vacant, as the banner on the face of it advertised the Adult School which had once been housed in it had moved.</p>
--	---

**Details of Application Request**

**Site Area**

Net Acres	34.83
-----------	-------

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Undeveloped	PF (Public Facilities)	R-1 (Single Family Residential)
	Public School, Secondary	PF (Public Facilities)	C-2 (General Commercial)
North	Mini-Warehouse	SC (Service Commercial)	C-1 (Limited Commercial)
	Single Family, Detached	ML (Medium-Low Density Residential)	R-CL (Single Family Compact-Lot)
	Office, Other Than Listed	ML (Medium-Low Density Residential)	R-1 (Single Family Residential)
South	Single Family, Detached	ML (Medium-Low Density Residential)	R-PD8 (Residential Planned Development Eight Units per Acre)
East	Single Family, Detached	ML (Medium-Low Density Residential)	R-CL (Single Family Compact-Lot)
	Single Family, Detached	L (Low Density Residential)	R-1 (Single Family Residential)
West	Single Family, Detached	L (Low Density Residential)	R-1 (Single Family Residential)

<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
<b>Special Area Plan</b>			
West Las Vegas Plan	X		Y
<b>Special Districts/Zones</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Compliance</b>
<b>Special Purpose and Overlay Districts</b>			
A-O (Airport Overlay) District	X		Y

SDR-23839 - Staff Report Page Four  
 October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

Trails		X	n/a
Rural Preservation Overlay District		X	n/a
Development Impact Notification Assessment		X	n/a
Project of Regional Significance		X	n/a

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

Pursuant to Title 19.06.010, the development standards for a project in a Civic District shall be established by the C-V District approval and any corresponding Site Development Plan Review approval under Subchapter 19.18.050. The standards shall be designed to ensure compatibility of the development with existing and planned development in the surrounding area. The proposed landscaping, parking, setbacks, and maximum building heights for this project are defined below. Any future development will require review for determination of appropriate development standards.

*Pursuant to Title 19.06.010, the following development standards are proposed:*

<i>Standard</i>	<i>Provided</i>
Min. Setbacks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Front</li> <li>• Side</li> <li>• Corner</li> <li>• Rear</li> </ul>	> 50 Feet > 40 Feet > 40 Feet > 40 Feet
Min. Distance Between Buildings	> 20 Feet
Lot Coverage	12.6% (new building area)
Max. Building Height	42 Feet / 2 Stories
Trash Enclosure	Existing - Screened and Gated

*Pursuant to Title 19.08.060, the following residential adjacency standards apply:*

<i>Residential Adjacency Standards</i>	<i>Required/Allowed</i>	<i>Provided</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
3:1 proximity slope Public Services / Gymnasium	120 Feet	125 Feet	Y
3:1 proximity slope Business / Info Tech	111 Feet	126 Feet	Y
Adjacent development matching setback	15 Feet (R-1 Lots)	> 15 Feet	Y
Trash Enclosure	50 Feet	> 50 Feet	Y

*Pursuant to 19.06.010, the following landscaping standards are proposed:*

<i>Landscaping and Open Space Standards</i>	
<i>Standards</i>	<i>Provided</i>
Parking Area	> 40 Trees *

**SDR-23839 - Staff Report Page Five  
October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

Buffer: Min. Trees	≈107 Trees *
<b>TOTAL</b>	
Min. Zone Width	15 Feet
Wall Height	6 to 12 Feet (chain link for screening and perimeter)

\* An, if approved, condition has been added to this review that a revised landscape plan that reflects the changes made to the most recently submitted site plan, date stamped 09/28/07, be submitted to the Planning and Development Department prior to the City Council meeting for staff review. The revised landscape plan shall include the quantities of all plant materials illustrated and shall include the entire site with notations that indicate existing and proposed.

***Pursuant to Title 19.06.010, the following parking standards are proposed:***

<b><i>Parking Requirement</i></b>							
<b><i>Use</i></b>	<b><i>Gross Floor Area or Number of Units</i></b>	<b><i>Typically Required</i></b>			<b><i>Provided</i></b>		<b><i>Difference</i></b>
		<b><i>Parking Ratio</i></b>	<b><i>Parking</i></b>		<b><i>Parking</i></b>		
			Regular	Handi-capped	Regular	Handi-capped	
Public School, Secondary (Proposed)	35 Classrooms	9 Spaces / Classroom	308 Spaces	7 Spaces	318 Spaces	8 Space	Surplus of 11 Spaces
Public School, Secondary (Existing)	58 Classrooms	9 Spaces / Classroom	512 Spaces	10 Spaces	536 Spaces	6 Spaces	Surplus of 20 Spaces
<b>Sub-Total</b>	93 Classrooms	9 Spaces / Classroom	820 Spaces	17 Spaces	854 Spaces	14 Spaces	Surplus of 34 Regular Spaces / Deficit of 3 Accessible Spaces *
<b>TOTAL (including handicap)</b>			837 Spaces		868 Spaces		Surplus of 31 Spaces

\* The total parking provided is in excess of the typical parking requirement for this type of use; however, the number of accessible handicap spaces is deficient for the total number of spaces provided (two percent of the provided 868 spaces equals 18 accessible spaces required). An, if approved, condition has been added to this review that an additional four accessible spaces must be depicted on the requested revised site plan and that all accessible spaces meet the City's dual access aisle requirement as illustrated by Title 19.10.010 (K) Figure 4.

**SDR-23839 - Staff Report Page Six**  
**October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

## **ANALYSIS**

The subject site is located on the Southeast Sector Map of the General Plan and has a designation of PF (Public Facilities). This category allows for large governmental building sites and complexes, police and fire facilities, hospitals and rehabilitation sites, sewage treatment and storm water control facilities, and other uses considered public or semi-public such as libraries and public utility facilities. The project proposes to expand the existing public secondary school on the 34.83 acre site. The proposed expansion of the existing public school, secondary use is in compliance with the PF (Public Facilities) designation.

There is a Rezoning (ZON-23834) that proposes to change the sites zoning from C-2 (General Commercial) and R-1 (Single Family Residential) to C-V (Civic). The proposed C-V (Civic) zoning district is intended to provide for existing public and quasi-public uses and for the development of new schools, libraries, public parks, public flood control facilities, police, fire, electrical transmission facilities, Water District, Nevada Power and other public utility facilities. In addition, the C-V District may provide for any public or quasi-public use operated or controlled by any recognized religious, fraternal, veteran, civic or service organization. The existing and proposed uses established at this location are permissible in a C-V (Civic) zoning district which is compatible with the PF (Public Facilities) General Plan designation.

Pursuant to Title 19.06.010, the development standards for a project in a C-V (Civic) District shall be established by the C-V (Civic) District approval and any corresponding Site Development Plan Review approval under Subchapter 19.18.050. The standards shall be designed to ensure compatibility of the development with existing and planned development in the surrounding area. The proposed landscaping, parking, setbacks, and maximum building heights for this project are defined as a part of this review. Any future development will require review for determination of appropriate development standards.

The site is within the North Las Vegas Airport Overlay Map portion of the A-O (Airport Overlay) District. This is a mostly developed site, with the highest proposed new structure at 42 feet, which is in compliance with Title 19.06.080 and the overlay height limitation of 105 feet.

This site development plan review has been submitted in conjunction with a Rezoning (ZON-23834) to convert the sites zoning from C-2 (General Commercial) and R-1 (Single Family Residential) to C-V (Civic).

- **Site Plan**

The site plan depicts five new buildings, which total 122,984 square-feet, added to an existing public school, secondary campus. In addition to the new academic and athletic buildings the project proposes to add new athletic fields, a ropes course, and parking areas. The new buildings have been moved back from the adjacent residential properties to the north and west, which has resolved any residential adjacency setback concerns.

**SDR-23839 - Staff Report Page Seven**  
**October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

The location of the ropes course, however, is still relatively close to the residential properties and the screening provided is a 12-foot chain link fence. The poles that are used for the ropes course get as high as 50 feet with various levels/platforms at different heights.

The proposed new site development has a typical parking requirement of 837 parking spaces. The development (existing and proposed) is providing 868 parking spaces; however, the number of accessible disability spaces are under the required two percent by four spaces. An, if approved, condition has been added to this review that an additional four accessible spaces must be depicted on the requested revised site plan and that all accessible spaces meet the City's dual access aisle requirement as illustrated by Title 19.10.010 (K) Figure 4.

- **Landscape Plan**

The landscape plan shows multiple tree types planted in fairly tight formation along the perimeter of the site where the new construction is proposed. As the site plan has changed since the most recent landscape plan was submitted, dated stamped 08/10/07, a revised landscape plan has been requested prior to City Council action on this review to allow staff time to review an updated version of the landscape plan for this development.

- **Elevations/Floor Plan**

The building elevations illustrate a façade that utilizes building materials and an exterior color scheme that are consistent with the existing buildings and other development of this nature. There are two, two-story buildings proposed. The remaining three buildings will be a single story design.

The floor plans illustrate classrooms and support rooms typical of academic and athletic buildings utilized by secondary education campuses. There are also administrative offices indicated. Each building includes restroom facilities that should be adequate for the proposed building occupancies.

This request is not compatible with the existing single family residential development in the area due to the location of the ropes course. While the applicant has made efforts to address staff and neighborhood concerns related to site access from Robin Street and residential adjacency setbacks related to the proposed two-story buildings; the proximity and screening of the ropes course relative to the residential neighborhoods to the north and west creates an incompatibility between the proposed development and the adjacent area. For this reason, staff is recommending denial of this Site Development Plan Review.

## **FINDINGS**

In order to approve a Site Development Plan application, per Title 19.18.050 the Planning Commission and/or City Council must affirm the following:

**SDR-23839 - Staff Report Page Eight**  
**October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting**

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

The proposed public school, secondary expansion is not compatible with adjacent residential development to the north and west project area. The location of the proposed ropes course is too close to and inadequately screened from the residences in this area.

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

The project is consistent with the PF (Public Facilities) designation of the General Plan and the zoning regulations of the proposed C-V (Civic) zoning district.

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

The main access to the site is from Vegas Drive, a 100-foot wide primary arterial street, which should be adequate to meet the needs of the proposed expansion and should not negatively impact the adjacent roadways.

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

The building and landscape materials 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 proposed buildings will not be unsightly, undesirable, or obnoxious in appearance; however, the proposed ropes course due to its proximity to the residential neighborhoods to the north and west will be unsightly and undesirable. The buildings as proposed are compatible with other development in the area from a building elevation, design characteristics and aesthetic features point of view due to its cotemporary design which is compatible with the existing school buildings.

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

The proposed plan will not impact public health, safety or welfare since the development will be subject to City inspections during construction of the building as well routine business license inspections for the commercial space.

October 11, 2007 - Planning Commission Meeting

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED 19

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 6

SENATE DISTRICT 4

NOTICES MAILED 957 (Mailed with ZON-23834)

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 1