

December 12, 2005

Mr. Richard Truesdell, Chairman  
Las Vegas Planning Commission  
City of Las Vegas  
731 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

RECEIVED  
DEC 16 2005

RE: Justification Letter  
The Village at Queensridge  
The northeast corner of Rampart Blvd. and Alta Drive

Dear Mr. Truesdell,

On March 2, 2005, SDR-5657 received the approval of the City Council subject to Planning and Development conditions. Based on that approval and a genuine excitement in the marketplace about the project, as well as its significance to the City of Las Vegas, the design team proceeded with the design development process. As in the normal evolution of a project of this scale and complexity, the design, both in site plan and building elevation evolved as a result of market influences and architectural refinements. It is for this reason that we would like to submit an application for an updated Site Development Review, as well as an accompanying variance application. We have no intention of voiding the original approval and will maintain Planning and Development's original conditions of approval.

The design team has continued a very positive relationship with the adjacent homeowners. We have kept them apprised of the updates occurring to the project's overall design and they have been supportive and receptive. Todd Davis, President of the Angel Park Ranch Architectural Committee, has sent the City a letter of his support. A copy of this letter is attached.

We are submitting these applications for SDR and a variance as the project's refinements constitute a major amendment to the original SDR and a variance is required to allow 3,225 spaces instead of the required 3,540 spaces. I had met with Flinn and Mario Suarez on November 16, 2005, and reviewed the project updates with them. Their review was very positive and supportive of what we have done to enhance the project.

Thomas J. Schoeman, AIA  
President / CEO

Edward A. Vance, AIA  
Exec. Vice President

T: 702.254.8705  
F: 702.363.7746  
www.jmaarch.com

The following is an explanation and justification of the items addressed in the SDR and variance application.

RECEIVED  
DEC 16 2005

1. **Parking**
  - a. **Day and Night Parking Requirements.**

The City currently does not account for the variations in parking use and parking counts for day and night functions. In a mixed-use project such as ours, there is a distinct separation between some of the functions relative to parking, i.e., daytime/office and nighttime/ restaurant. We are submitting the attached project parking analysis which clearly reflects the utilization of daytime and nighttime uses and parking per code for your review.
  - b. **Valet Parking**

We are requesting the utilization of 20% of the required parking as valet parking per code.
  - c. **Parking Variance**

We are requesting a variance to the amount of required parking. Please see attached parking analysis.
  
2. **Architectural Details**
  - a. **Exterior Elevations**

Staff had requested that we revisit four exterior details on the building elevations. We have done so, and the new exterior details will alleviate any concerns they had over the architectural style issue.
  - b. **Frame Rampart Entrance**

We are requesting the addition of Building #18 at the northwest corner of the property. This would be a single-story building of approximately 2700 SF. This building would serve to architecturally reinforce and frame the entry to The Village from Rampart at the north.
  - c. **Balance Alta Entrance**

We are requesting the addition of Building #7 near of the southeast corner of the property. This would be a single-story building of approximately 4000 SF. This building would serve to architecturally frame and balance the entry to The Village from Alta. The building does encroach slightly on the easterly setback previously presented to the homeowners. However, this building would serve as an additional acoustic and visual buffer for the homeowners to the east. The homeowners are in support of this request.

3. **Revised Square Footages**

While staying at the approved 699,000 SF for the overall commercial area, our plan contains some usage adjustments as summarized on the attached SF summary and parking analysis.

a. **Residential Mixed-Use**

We are requesting the transfer of approximately 35 to 45 condominium units into the commercial component of the project. The office square footage will be reduced by similar amount to account for this addition of condo square footage. The condos would be in one four-story building, Building #17, which is located in the project's interior. The transfer of these residences in the retail and office environment would create a true mixed-use synergy and vitality in The Village and reinforce the architectural fabric of The Village experience. The balance of the residential units will remain in the three separate buildings to the north of the property.

b. **Increase Restaurant Square Footage**

We are requesting an increase in the restaurant square footage beyond what was indicated on the original approval. This increase was generated by the neighborhood demand for restaurants, as well as the design desire to utilize the restaurants as an activity center to help energize The Village. This increase in restaurant square footage is offset by a like reduction in office square footage. The traffic study will be updated with these adjustments and resubmitted for Planning and Development approval. A summary updated traffic report cover letter is being submitted at this time.

4. **Building Heights**

Some of the heights of the various buildings have been revised since the original approval to accommodate the design process. Although, all of the buildings are still within the original 1:3 slope setback restriction conditions.

The above items we are requesting in this Site Development Review Application as well as the Variance Application are consistent with the intent of the original approval. They are normal requests to be expected in the design development and evolution of a project of this scope, complexity, and significance.

We have kept the Planning staff abreast of the project's design in an effort to maintain Planning and Development compliance. We certainly appreciate their time and cooperation. We are looking forward to the Planning Commission's approval of the updated site development application and the variance application.

RECEIVED  
DEC 16 2005

We are scheduling a neighborhood meeting on January 12, 2006, to review these requests with the neighborhood. Planning commission hearing is scheduled for January 26, 2006.

We are extremely pleased to have broken ground this week. We are sure the City of Las Vegas shares in that excitement with us.

Please call me if you have any questions or require any further information.

Sincerely,



Neil Breen, AIA

RECEIVED  
DEC 16 2005

CC: Steve Wolfson, City of Las Vegas Councilman  
M. Margo Wheeler, Director of Planning and Development  
Larry Harala, City Council Liaison  
Flinn Fagg, Planning Manager  
Mario Suarez, Deputy Director of Planning and Development  
Todd Davis, President, Angel Park Ranch Architectural Committee  
Frank Pankratz, President, Great Wash Park, LLC  
Larry Miller, CEO, Peccole Nevada  
Bruce Bayne, Vice President, Peccole Nevada  
Tom Schoeman, AIA, JMA  
Greg Borgel, Moreno & Associates