



AGENDA MEMO - PLANNING

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: NOVEMBER 20, 2013
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING
ITEM DESCRIPTION: APPLICANT/OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS

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

<i>CASE NUMBER</i>	<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>REQUIRED FOR APPROVAL</i>
GPA-50785	Staff recommends APPROVAL.	

Staff Report Page One
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The request is for the adoption of an updated Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan Parks and Recreation Element. The purpose of this element is to determine existing and future recreational needs as well as establish priorities for the location, development and maintenance of parks and recreational facilities.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc</i>	
04/01/1992	The City Council adopted the city of Las Vegas General Plan
03/15/2000	The City Council adopted the Parks and Recreation Element of the 1992 General Plan
09/06/2000	The City Council adopted the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan (Ordinance #2000-62)
04/02/2008	The City Council adopted the Parks and Recreation Element of the 2020 Master Plan (Ordinance #5978)
01/23/2013	The City Council adopted an updated Trails Element of the 2020 Master Plan (GPA-46565).
10/08/13	The Planning Commission voted (7-0) to APPROVE GPA-50785. (PC Agenda Item 22/fs)

On September 6, 2000, the City Council adopted the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan capstone document as the new long-range land use policy plan for the city of Las Vegas. The Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan capstone document contains policy direction covering a broad spectrum of land use and development issues. Following the development of the capstone document, tailored elements were created to address specific elements required by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.160. These elements were created to provide in-depth analyses and to recommend action plans stemming from the broader objectives, policies and goals of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan. Departmental Policy dictates that master plan elements be updated every five years.

The Parks and Recreation Element was adopted by the City Council on March 15, 2000 as part of the 1992 General Plan and subsequently updated on April 2, 2008. This element, in conjunction with the recently adopted Trails Element, satisfies NRS requirements for a Recreation and Open Space Element.

<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>	
09/18/2012	Discussion was had regarding strategies to incorporate additional park space within underserved areas of the city of Las Vegas.

Staff Report Page Two
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

ANALYSIS

The purpose of the Parks and Recreation Element is twofold. First, this document is intended to fulfill the requirements of state law, as set forth in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.150 through 278.160, and second, to recommend strategies and actions to facilitate the implementation of the goals, objectives, and policies contained in the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan related to parks and recreation.

Relationship to the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS)

A Recreation and Open Space Element is one of eight elements required to be included in the Master Plan in counties of over 700,000 people. Per NRS 278.160, the Recreation and Open Space Element “may include a recreation plan showing a comprehensive system of recreation areas, including, without limitation, natural reservations, parks, parkways, trails, reserved riverbank strips, beaches, playgrounds, and other recreation areas, including, when practicable, the locations and proposed development thereof.”

The preparation and adoption of this Parks and Recreation Element in conjunction with the recently adopted Trails Element fulfills the City’s statutory obligation to include a Recreation and Open Space Element in its Master Plan.

Relationship to Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan

The Master Plan contains numerous goals, objectives and policies pertaining directly and indirectly to recreation and open space. As a component of the Master Plan, the Parks and Recreation Element is intended to not only satisfy NRS requirements, but also to provide guidance to assist in the location, development and maintenance of parks and recreational facilities within the city of Las Vegas.

Updates to the Parks and Recreation Element

The element and its analysis have been updated to reflect current conditions and future projections based on the most recent population estimates through 2035. The major updates associated with this document are as follows:

1. All existing parks and facilities were updated to reflect 2012 inventories.
2. All proposed facilities were updated to reflect the 2012-2017 Capital Improvement Plan.
3. The “Priority Areas” used for analysis in the 2008 document were replaced with areas defined by zip code. Where zip code boundaries intersected sector or city limit lines, the analysis was adjusted to compensate for population or area variations within each zip code.

Staff Report Page Three
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

4. The Service Level analysis was updated to reflect current and projected population projections through 2035. These population estimates had changed significantly between 2008 and 2012. In general, the population estimates decreased for the Southeast and Southwest sectors, while they increased for the Centennial Hills sector.
5. The spatial analysis was updated to reflect the population, underserved population, and percentage of underserved population that were outside of the recommended ½ mile park service area for each zip code. In addition, the spatial analysis includes average housing age, total park acreage, and park acreage ratios per 1000 residents for each zip code. The previous document depicted only underserved population, housing stock age and accessibility issues for each priority area.
6. The current and projected recreational facility needs were updated to reflect current population projections through 2035.
7. The functional analysis was updated to reflect current population projections through 2035. Due to the revised population projections, future facility needs slightly increased or decreased in relation to the revised 2012 and 2035 population estimates when compared to the 2008 document.
8. The implementation section format was changed while still providing clear direction for the city. Several new implementation strategies were added and/or updated to correspond with the new document.
9. The 2008 appendix was removed and the “Funding Sources” section was inserted into the main body of the 2013 document. The “Maintenance Costs” section was revised and written in general terms so that specific costs of parks and amenities, which can fluctuate significantly, were not included. This section was also included in the main body of the document.
10. All applicable maps were updated to reflect the current analysis.

Service Levels

As a part of this document, park coverage service levels were analyzed for each master plan sector (Centennial Hills, Southwest and Southeast) based on current and projected park acreage and populations. The recommended standard is 2.5 acres of park space per 1,000 residents.

The current service level for the city as a whole is approximately 2.9 acres of park space per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the recommended standard of 2.5 acres per 1000 residents. When analyzed on a per sector basis, the Southeast sector is most deficient in terms of park space with a current service level of 1.36 acres per 1,000 residents. The Centennial Hills and Southwest sector have service levels of 6.63 and 2.82 acres per 1000 residents, respectively.

Projecting out to 2035, the service level for the entire city falls to 2.24 acres per 1,000 residents. The Southeast sector again has the lowest service level with 1.31 acres of park space per 1,000 residents. The Southwest sector also falls below the recommended service standard and is expected to be 2.07 acres per 1,000 residents. The Centennial Hills sector remains substantially above the threshold, with an expected 4.12 acres per 1,000 residents in 2035.

Staff Report Page Four
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

Citywide Current & Projected Service Levels

Citywide		
	2012	2035
Population	594,294	774,765
Park Acreage Built and Funded	1,736	1,737
Acreage Needed to meet the 2.5 acre standard	1,485	1,937
Difference Surplus(Deficit)	251	(200)
Level of Service	2.92	2.24

*Acres of park space per 1000 residents

Southeast Sector Current & Projected Service Levels

Southeast Sector		
	2012	2035
Population	210,110	217,453
Park Acreage Built and Funded	286	287
Acreage Needed to meet the 2.5 acre standard	525	544
Difference Surplus(Deficit)	(239)	(257)
Level of Service*	1.36	1.31

*Acres of park space per 1000 residents

Southwest Sector Current & Projected Service Levels

Southwest Sector		
	2012	2035
Population	200,476	273,125
Park Acreage Built and Funded (Summerlin Included)	565	565
Acreage Needed to meet the 2.5 acre standard	501	683
Difference (Surplus/Deficit)	64	(118)
Level of Service*	2.82	2.07

*Acres of park space per 1000 residents

Centennial Hills Current & Projected Service Levels

Centennial Hills Sector		
	2012	2035
Population	183,708	284,184
Park Acreage Built and Funded	1170	1170
Acreage Needed to meet the 2.5 acre standard	459	710
Difference Surplus (Deficit)	711	460
Level of Service*	6.63	4.12

*Acres of park space per 1000 residents

Staff Report Page Five
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

½ Mile Service Area

Neighborhood parks serve as the recreational and social focus of a neighborhood. Such parks can be up to ten acres in size and serve residents within a one-half mile radius. Populations outside of the ½ mile radius of a neighborhood park are considered to be underserved. Approximately 183,144 people (31% of the total population) live in underserved areas of the city. The Southeast sector has the greatest number of underserved residents with 83,318 or 40% of that sector's population living outside of the recommended ½ mile service area. The Southwest and Centennial Hills sectors have 56,876 (28%) and 42,950 (23%) residents living outside the recommended ½ mile service area, respectively. Zip codes with a high percentage of underserved residents should be given priority when considering the locations for the development of future parks.

Citywide Service Area Figures

Sector	Population	Population Outside of ½ Mile Service Area	Percent of Population Outside ½ Mile Service Area
Southeast	210,110	83,318	40%
Southwest*	200,476	56,876	28%
Centennial Hills	183,708	42,950	23%
City Wide Totals	594,294	183,144	31%

*Summerlin park acreage was included in this analysis due to the fact that while they are owned and maintained by Summerlin, they are generally accessible to the general public.

Southeast Sector Service Area Figures

Zip Code	Total Population	Population Outside of ½ Mile Service Area	Percentage of Zip that is Outside of ½ Mile Service Area
89101	41,772	17,140	41%
89102*	26,855	20,708	77%
89104*	17,320	5,293	31%
89106	25,711	10,631	41%
89107	39,988	11,751	29%
89108*	16,321	2,142	13%
89110*	42,143	15,653	37%
Sector Totals	210,110	83,318	40%

*Population adjusted to account for portions of the zip code outside the city limits/sector

Staff Report Page Six
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

Southwest Sector Service Area Figures

Zip Code	Total Population	Population Outside of ½ Mile Service Area	Percentage of Zip that is Outside of ½ Mile Service Area
89108	41,182	8,027	20%
89117*	36,034	28,606	79%
89128	36,616	8,295	23%
89124	0	0	0%
89134	24,463	3,305	14%
89135	0	0	0%
89138	12,630	439	3%
89144	18,462	1,326	7%
89145	25,773	6,555	25%
89146*	5,316	323	6%
Sector Totals	200,476	56,876	28%

*Population adjusted to account for portions of the zip code outside the city limits/sector

Centennial Hills Sector Service Area Figures

Zip Code	Total Population	Population Outside of ½ Mile Service Area	Percentage of Zip that is Outside of ½ Mile Service Area
89108*	14,073	8,535	60%
89129*	48,562	3,185	7%
89130*	30,921	16,064	52%
89131*	40,582	3,137	8%
89143*	13,260	5	0%
89149*	27,121	6,324	23%
89166	9,189	5,700	62%
Sector Totals	183,708	42,950	23%

*Population adjusted to account for portions of the zip code outside the city limits/sector

Leisure Service Facilities

The following table illustrates leisure service facility needs based on each planning sector's population. Based on current service standards, each sector is deficient in the number of all categories of leisure service facilities available to the citizens of Las Vegas. The different types of leisure facilities are defined below:

Staff Report Page Seven
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

Neighborhood Center: A Leisure Service Facility designed with multiple types of programming space that can be used for a variety of general recreational, social, performing and visual arts and educational activities. Neighborhood Centers are between 20,000 and 30,000 square feet and service approximately 10,000 residents.

Community Center: A Leisure Service facility designed to serve the citizens' recreational, social, performing and visual arts and educational needs beyond the immediate neighborhood and to a wider community audience. These centers are generally located adjacent to a community park, are about 30,000 to 55,000 square feet in size, and service approximately 25,000 residents.

Regional Center: A Leisure Service facility designed to offer a wider range of leisure services than the smaller Neighborhood and Community Centers. A regional center would typically serve several communities and be centrally located for regional use. Ideally, it should be located in conjunction with a larger park and/or swimming pool facility. These centers are at least 55,000 square feet in area and serve approximately 75,000 residents.

Southeast Sector				
Facility Type	Service Standard	Needs based on 2013 population of 210,110	Existing Facilities	Surplus (Deficiency)
Neighborhood Center	1: 10,000 residents	21	10	(11)
Community Center	1:25,000 residents	8	5	(3)
Regional Center	1:75,000 residents	3	1	(2)
Southwest Sector				
Facility Type	Service Standard	Needs based on 2013 population of 200,476	Existing Facilities	Surplus (Deficiency)
Neighborhood Center	1: 10,000 residents	20	1	(19)
Community Center	1:25,000 residents	8	1	(7)
Regional Center	1:75,000 residents	3	1	(2)

Staff Report Page Eight
November 20, 2013 - City Council Meeting

Centennial Hills Sector				
Facility Type	Service Standard	Needs based on 2013 population of 183,708	Existing Facilities	Surplus (Deficiency)
Neighborhood Center	1: 10,000 residents	18	1	(17)
Community Center	1:25,000 residents	7	1	(6)
Regional Center	1:75,000 residents	2	1	(1)

Achievements

While there have been many financial challenges since 2008, the City was able to accomplish several items recommended by the 2008 Parks and Recreation Element. The accomplishments achieved between 2008 and 2013 are as follows:

1. There have been 8 parks constructed since 2008:

Park Name	Year Built	Acreage	Type of Park
Buckskin/Cliff Shadows	2008	10.5	Neighborhood
Centennial Hills - Phase III	2008	30	Community
Thunderbird Park (2 phases)	2009/2012	18	Community
Angel Park Trailhead	2010	3	Neighborhood
Boulder Park Plaza	2010	0.23	Mini
Hualapai Canyon Trailhead	2010	22	Neighborhood
Douglas A. Selby Park	2011	7.41	Neighborhood
Stupak Park	2012	0.60	Mini

2. The number of city parks has increased from 40 to 77 between 2001 and 2013.
3. Overall, the City has increased its park service level from 1.1 acres per 1,000 residents in 2000 to 2.6 acres in 2006, to 2.92 in 2013.
4. The city has added three parks (Stupak, Selby and Boulder) to the underserved Southeast Sector as recommended in the 2008 Parks Element.
5. The city has added 8.24 acres of park area to the Southeast Sector, which was identified as underserved in the 2008 Parks Element.
6. Boulder and Stupak Park are small scale parks that have been added to the urban core as recommended by the 2008 Park Element.
7. As suggested by the 2008 Parks Element, park planning has been successfully linked to the capital improvement process and the Departments of Planning and Public Works routinely consult when designing or planning new park space.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED 33

NOTICES MAILED NEWSPAPER ONLY by the City Clerk

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0