



AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: APRIL 16, 2008
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
ITEM DESCRIPTION: ROC-27156 - REVIEW OF CONDITION - PUBLIC HEARING -
APPLICANT: LENNAR COMMUNITIES OF SOUTHERN NEVADA - OWNERS: US
HOME CORPORATION AND MS RIALTO SKY RIDGE NV, LLC

**** CONDITIONS ****

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL. If Approved, subject to:

Planning and Development

1. Condition number eight of Site Development Plan Review (SDR-3320) shall be removed.

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This application is a request for a Review of Condition to remove Condition Number Eight of an approved Site Development Plan Review (SDR-3320) which required that the setbacks shall be a maximum of five feet or 18 feet and greater to the front of the garage and house as measured from the back of sidewalk or back of curb for a 23.4-acre Residential Planned Development adjacent to the northeast corner of Grand Teton Drive and Tee Pee Lane.

The applicant is requesting to change the existing condition to reduce the 18-foot front yard setback to a minimum of nine feet for the Plan 2 model home.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
12/07/98	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-0076-98) to T-C (Town Center) of a 1,468-acre portion of the Northwest, including the subject site. Staff recommended approval. The Planning Commission recommended approval on 11/05/98.
8/21/02	The City Council approved an update of the Centennial Hills Town Center Land Use Map (GPA-0019-02) in the City of Las Vegas General Plan. On this map, the subject properties were designated for EC-TC (Employment Center Town Center) land uses with a maximum density of eight dwelling units per acre. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval on 07/25/02.
3/05/03	The City Council approved a General Plan Amendment (GPA-0039-02) to amend a portion of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan from EC-TC (Employment Center Town Center) to MLA-TC (Medium Low Attached Town Center) on this site. The Planning Commission recommended approval on 01/09/03. Staff recommended denial.
4/24/03	The Planning Commission accepted the applicants request to withdraw without prejudice a related Variance (VAR-2045) for a reduction of parking to allow one space per dwelling unit where two spaces per dwelling unit are required in this development. Staff recommended denial of the Variance request.
5/21/03	The City Council approved a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-2035) for a 250-lot single-family residential development and a Special Use Permit (SUP-2036) to allow a gated community with private streets within Town Center on this site. The Planning Commission and Staff recommended approval on 04/24/03.
6/12/03	The Planning Commission approved the Tentative Map (TMP-2303) for Rancho 25, a 250-lot Single-Family Residential Subdivision on this site. Staff recommended approval.

2/04/04	The City Council approved requests for a Site Development Plan Review (SDR -3320) for a 252-lot Single-Family Residential Development and a Variance (VAR-3322) to allow 3.16 acres of open space where 4.16 acres are required on the subject site. The Planning Commission and Staff recommended denial of both items on 01/08/04.
2/21/04	The Planning Commission approved the Tentative Map (TMP-3396) for Sky Ridge, a 252-lot Single-Family Residential Subdivision on this site. Staff recommended approval.
2/09/05	A Final Map (FMP-4353) for Sky Ridge Unit 1, a 151-lot Single-Family Residential Subdivision on 15.38 acres, north of Grand Teton between Tee Pee Lane and Rancho Drive.
2/09/05	A Final Map (FMP-4354) for Sky Ridge Unit 2, a 104-lot Single-Family Residential Subdivision on 8.93 acres, north of Grand Teton between Tee Pee Lane and Rancho Drive.

<i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i>	
Of the 255 lots recorded on the combined final maps, 81 homes have received building permits or have completed construction, leaving a remaining 174 lots that could be affected by this request.	
<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>	
A neighborhood meeting is not required for this type of request, nor was one held.	
<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>	
A neighborhood meeting is not required for this type of request, nor was one held.	

<i>Details of Application Request</i>	
<i>Site Area</i>	
Gross Acres	24.3 acres
Net Acres	23.4 acres

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Single Family Residential - Detached	TC (Town Center)	T-C (Town Center) [MLA-TC (Medium Low Attached Residential Town Center) Land Use Designation]
North	Undeveloped	SC (Service Commercial)	C-1 (General Commercial) and R-E (Residence Estates)
South	Undeveloped	TC (Town Center)	T-C (Town Center) [EC-TC (Employment Center Mixed Use Town Center) Land Use Designation]
East	Right-of-Way (Oso Blanca Road)	Right-of-Way	Right-of-Way (Frontage Road)

West	Multi-Family Residential/ Single Family Residential - Detached	PCD (Planned Community Development)	PD (Planned Development)
------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Area Plan			
T-C Town Center District	X		Y
<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Purpose and Overlay Districts			
T-C Town Center District	X		Y
Trails Multi-Use Transportation	X		Y
Rural Preservation Overlay District		X	NA
Development Impact Notification Assessment		X	NA
Project of Regional Significance		X	NA

Town Center This single-family residential subdivision is located with the Town Center Master Plan Area under the MLA (Medium-Low Attached Residential) Town Center land use designation which includes a variety of multi-family units, low density apartments and allows for single-family detached homes at a higher density level.

Trails Multi-use Transportation Trails have been installed along the east and north sides of Tee Pee Lane and along the west side of the Frontage Road in accordance with Exhibit 1 of the Transportation Trails Element of the Las Vegas 2020 General Plan.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

The following Setbacks were established with the approval of SDR-3320:

<i>Standard</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Requested</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Min. Setbacks			
• Front	Max. 5 Feet or Min. 18 Feet	Max. 5 Feet or Min. 9 Feet	N
• Side	5 Feet	5 Feet	Y
• Corner	5 Feet	5 Feet	Y
• Rear	5 Feet	5 Feet	Y

ANALYSIS

Condition Number Eight of Site Development Plan Review (SDR-3320) is written as follows:

8. The setbacks for this development shall be a maximum of 5 feet or 18 feet and greater to the front of the garage and house as measured from the back of sidewalk or back of curb if no sidewalk is provided, 5 feet on the side, 5 feet on the corner side, and 5 feet in the rear.

The applicant has requested a Review of Condition Number Eight of the approved Site Development Plan Review (SDR-3320) that required the setbacks of the front of the house and garage to be a maximum of five feet or 18 feet and greater as measured from the back of sidewalk or back of curb. The small amount of building setback stems from the maximum lot coverage on small lot sizes; however, the approved setback standards for the subject site were determined acceptable for the MLA (Medium Low Attached Density Residential) land use designation and the higher density single-family detached homes.

It was noted during the Site Development Plan Review (SDR-3320) that some of the optional floor plans are too large for the smaller corner lots and are incapable of meeting the required setbacks. Because of this issue, it was stated in the review that it is the applicants responsibility to select floor plans appropriate for individual lots. The Planning and Development Department must uphold setback requirements.

There is concern regarding the reduction of setbacks for the Plan 2 model home as the internal private streets do not include sidewalks. Pedestrian travel will be made difficult to achieve and a safety hazard will be created if cars park on the nine-foot driveway and overhang into the public right of way. The five-foot maximum setback is created to discourage parking on the shortened driveway, with the 18-foot minimum setback used to create a space adequate for off-street parking.

FINDINGS

Staff recommends denial of this request as the setbacks were specifically set for this particular development during the Site Development Plan Review. In order to avoid the possibility of vehicles overhanging from driveways into the private streets, the required front yard setback area will need to be at a five-foot maximum.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED N/A

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT N/A

SENATE DISTRICT N/A

NOTICES MAILED 1,252 by Planning Department

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0