powered by HENDERSONSTRONG
our community, our future

City of Henderson Development Code Update

Code User Interview Summary

March 2019

Prepared for:

City of Henderson
240 South Water Street
Henderson, NV 89015

Prepared by:

Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. (LWC)
983 Osos Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Contents

Introduction 1

Background 1

Purpose 1

Common Themes 1

Code User Comments 2

Code Usability, Organization, and Clarity 2

- Overall 2
- Definitions and Interpretations 3

Use Regulations 4

Development Standards, Design, and Physical Form 4

- Residential Development and Design 6
- Industrial Development and Design 6
- Adaptive Reuse and Infill Development 7
- Landscaping and Open Space Standards 7
- Parking and Loading 8
- Signs 9

City Administration Process 10

- Overall 10
- Inter-Departmental Review 11
- Review Authorities 12

Boulder Highway 12

Hillside Overlay 13

Other Topics 13

Introduction

Background

The City of Henderson is currently engaging in an update of its Development Code, Title 19 of the Municipal Code. The purpose of the Development Code update is to comprehensively revise the citywide development regulations in order to appropriately shape future growth and implement the Comprehensive Plan, Henderson Strong. The overall objective of the project is to produce a state of the art, flexible, user-friendly Development Code that achieves the community's vision for the future.

Purpose

To learn about the issues associated with the City's current Development Code, Lisa Wise Consulting, Inc. (LWC) conducted interviews with a range of "code users". Code users are individuals who have used the Development Code or have a specific interest in development regulations. The code users included City staff, designers, developers, architects, and other interested professionals.

LWC conducted interview sessions on February 26th and 27th, 2019. Approximately 45 code users were interviewed in small groups of one to four people. The confidential interviews were conducted by staff members from LWC: Martha Miller and Spencer Johnson. The code users were asked a series of questions regarding their experience with the Code, as well as overarching concerns and specific topics related to the Code. Participants were also given the opportunity to discuss issues of significance to them that were not otherwise addressed by the facilitated questions.

Common Themes

Code users strongly agreed about many of the major themes and challenges with the Development Code and the City's development review processes. While code users may ultimately differ on the precise edits that should be made, there was a general consensus that the Development Code needed revisions to be more understandable and to achieve implementation of Henderson Strong. The following is a list of the common themes discussed by code user interviewees. A list of comments received, organized by topic, is attached.

- Revise the Code to be clearer, better organized, and more user-friendly.
- Modernize use regulations and improve overall organization.
- Tailor use regulations and development standards to support adaptive reuse.
- Develop physical form standards that effectively produce the desired built environment, especially for multi-family projects.
- Streamline inter-departmental review processes.
- Revise and modernize mixed use districts to appropriately enable varied uses and a stronger development pattern, especially along the Boulder Highway corridor.
- Review the Hillside Overlay for appropriateness related to projects of varying scales.

Code User Comments

Code Usability, Organization, and Clarity

Code users generally expressed that the organization of the Development Code needed improvement, and that similar or thematic topics were often spread throughout the document in separate locations. The sheer amount of standards also made it difficult for code users to find the right information without relying on a search function. Some users desired more visual richness and graphics to help illustrate zoning concepts.

Overall

- Organization could be improved. Consider locating administration section at the beginning.
- The Code is complex and confusing. You have to go back and forth between multiple sections to figure out what applies.
- The Code is too technical with too many ideas and amendments.
- The amount of cross-referencing makes the Code difficult to interpret.
- Regulatory framework is a maze – the City needs more consistency.
- The biggest problem is that you can't find anything in the current Code. The only way to find anything is to do a word search.
- You can't find anything in the Code, you just need to know what the rules are and how to get there.
- Different regulations related to the same issue are located one hundred pages apart. It's very easy to miss different chunks of standards – the Code needs appropriate cross-referencing.
- Consider strategies for a more web-based, search-friendly Code.
- One priority should be a Code that is easily-searchable electronically.
- Finding the Code on the City's website is confusing.
- There is a lot of duplication in Code - it mentions the same thing over and over.
- There are too many topics within one chapter. They don't all apply so you start skimming through page after page. Inevitably some things get missed.
- Standards that should be grouped together are located in different areas. Parking standards are one example. They are spread out throughout the Code. They should all be in the same place.
- There are a lot of standards. There is just too much stuff in the Code. The search function is not that useful.
- It would be great to make it easier to understand what you need. Maybe have a checklist. There may also be too many standards.
- The existing Code is internally inconsistent. This opens the door for an applicant to argue for concessions where the Code is inconsistent.

- The City should focus on legal consistency within the Code.
- [I have] worked in all agencies in the Valley. Henderson's Code is one of the better ones in terms of organization and content.
- The City's zoning districts are intuitive. The standards work, tables are helpful, and the visuals are great.
- Design standards in the tables are easy to read.
- When Las Vegas overhauled their Code, they added a lot of visuals. That is helpful. Henderson's Code could add more visuals.
- A key priority should be graphics that make sense.
- There are little things to fix everywhere. The City has been doing a lot of Code "clean ups" for the last 8 years.
- With the last update, a paragraph was changed to a bulleted list. That changed the meaning of the standard. Be careful of doing things like that with this update.
- The Code is incredibly arbitrary.
- The content of the Code is good. The Code goes into detail on things that other codes don't, that's good.
- Add purpose statements to the beginning of sets of regulations so everyone understands the intent.
- It is confusing where and how overlay districts apply.
- Interactive, online maps have helped with understanding the Code.
- Bring the Code into alignment with Henderson Strong.
- Henderson Strong conflicts with many current development processes.
- For projects other than a comprehensive plan change or zone change, the Code does not require you to tie back to the Comprehensive Plan. You can do a tentative map for large subdivision and there is nothing that requires consideration of the Comprehensive Plan. That's where the implementation of Henderson Strong happens so it would be nice to have some of that language in the Code.

Definitions and Interpretations

- The Code needs a comprehensive definitions section.
- Consistent terminology is helpful. Even using consistent terminology with neighboring jurisdictions. That would be helpful.
- It's hard to define what a 'cooking facility' is. Can we structure the regulations so this isn't a big issue?
- Definitions need to be cleaned up and clarified. It is easy to come by different interpretations. Staff needs more things to point to in order to justify rationale.
- A clear and comprehensive definitions section should be a key priority.
- The Code should have staff's back. Limit ambiguity and simplify.

Use Regulations

Code users expressed that the uses established by the Development Code should be revised to provide a more effective organization. Some users mentioned obsolete and out-of-date uses that remained in the Development Code.

- The organization is not working well. Parking and definitions should not be located within the section for uses.
- There are too many use regulations and some contradict regulations in other parts of the Code.
- Uses should be revisited and revised. [Existing] uses do not account for all types of development.
- Right now, if a use is not mentioned in the Code, it's not allowed. There should be some mechanism to allow consideration of new uses. There are always new things coming up. It is always better if you can at least ask.
- Uses should be grouped under categories, but in a more effective organizational pattern.
- Use nomenclature is not intuitive.
- Uses need to be in one alphabetical list.
- The Code needs to address obsolete uses.
- Separation requirements for specific uses are challenging. Rather than serving their intended purpose to protect neighborhoods, these are instead protecting existing land owners from having competition. They need to be reviewed and revised. They are a barrier to mixed use.
- Mixed use development is a niche that you have to understand. You have to understand how different uses work together.
- The City's definition of mixed use is outdated. Mixed use can and should be horizontal as well as vertical.
- Consider incentives for mixed use development.

Development Standards, Design, and Physical Form

Code users generally agreed that the Development Code was overly-prescriptive and emphasized the need for flexibility in design and development standards. Multiple users remarked that the Code was not very adaptable, and that it still contained standards that enabled outdated development trends or styles.

- Some graphics in the district sections are confusing. These could be clearer for applicants.
- Henderson is the most stringent community in the valley when it comes to design, which is fine. The result has been good development. Henderson has high quality development. In that regard, the Code is appropriate.
- Some master developers want to do something good. Others are just building what they are required to do and leaving the area. They aren't invested. Therefore, the Code needs to be strong to make sure we are getting good, usable spaces.

- Don't try to make Henderson something that it's not.
- Need to have quality standards that result in varied, interesting design, but it needs to have fluidity with market trends.
- The Code doesn't take into account changes in the market. For example, demands for retail. The Code doesn't acknowledge that the demand isn't there.
- There needs to be some mechanism to adapt to changing markets. The market changes so fast, but the Code doesn't.
- Development standards need to find the right balance between prescription and flexibility. Most of the design criteria make sense, but they may be overly-prescriptive.
- Modern construction doesn't have all the cornices and other architectural details that were popular in the 90s. The Code should allow more modern design.
- Maybe the City needs to see more examples of modern style and design. Maybe that will help so we aren't stuck building the same stuff over and over again.
- Commercial standards are subjective. They don't force people to be creative.
- Designers are looking for things that allow more design flexibility. Henderson can be somewhat restrictive.
- Commercial development standards could be revised to be more enforceable.
- All of the setback requirements could be reduced. Buffering can be better achieved through denser landscaping.
- Street connectivity standards are confusing. You need a graphic to explain the standards.
- Connectivity requirements are too site specific. There may be a better way of getting connectivity.
- Barriers to connectivity, walkability, and general mixing of uses should be reviewed.
- With the last Code update there was a lot of talk about green development. Not sure that was really captured.
- Having subdivision design improvements as part of the Code is good.
- Conflicting standards for small lot subdivisions need to be cleaned up.
- The Code is lacking small lot development regulations.
- Come up with a more concise way to figure out architectural criteria. Right now, it's hard to figure out what you need to do and what you don't.
- The current sight visibility restriction diagrams are not consistent with the current standards. They should be updated.
- The regulations for accessory structures are confusing and sometimes changing one thing (such as adding a stove) puts you into a whole different category and subject to different standards. This should be simplified.
- Don't be so restrictive on the size of accessory structures.
- Consider incentives related to inclusionary zoning.

Residential Development and Design

- More consistent setback standards in residential zones would be preferable.
- Residential adjacency requirements should not be universally applied. You should take into account the use, what is actually there, and other factors. It shouldn't be a straight black and white application. That doesn't make sense.
- Henderson takes pride on elevated, four-sided architecture. That's good. The standards are just hard to navigate.
- Some design requirements seem a bit ridiculous, but they're fine. For example, the garage façade treatments are a bit silly.
- Garage standards are unique and challenging, but workable.
- Building façade/bulk plane requirements are outdated and old fashioned. They encourage pop outs and foam applications that were popular in the 90s. The standards have good intent, but they are not having the appropriate result.
- Review the Code for providing diverse housing products. Identify the barriers and fix them.
- Standards for multi-family and single-family need to jive more effectively.
- For multi-family developments, keep refuse collection in mind. Staff needs to know about the space required for trash vehicles to back up.
- Henderson holds multi-family developers to commercial standards, which has ADA implications, which often require a $50,000 elevator.
- Residential districts have a "connectivity index" which is confusing to implement and calculate.
- A big challenge to connectivity is integrating right-of-way into subdivisions with high land prices. The Code needs a happy medium where an access point can be created on stub streets.
- You cannot build an amenity zone between the back of curb and a sidewalk within subdivision. That regulation should be revised.

Industrial Development and Design

- A key priority should be to revise the industrial zones to have more clarity in direction. Write it to be indicative of modern industrial uses.
- The Code does not establish a high enough level of design, particularly in the industrial areas.
- There are only two industrial zones in the existing Code, so that doesn't provide much direction for an applicant. The Code needs to clarify differences in areas and clearly define what can be in close proximity to industrial areas.
- For the most part, standards for industrial development do help get good design.
- Very large industrial buildings may warrant different architectural treatments. When you get into bigger boxes, it's difficult to break up something 1,000 feet long. Using patterns and reveals are the most effective in making very large buildings look good. They should have pattern, almost like a quilt, and then prominent entries.

- If a building is not visible and the public doesn't have access to, decrease the number of architectural features that are required. If the truck dock is screened, maybe require 3 architectural treatments. If a truck dock is facing street (which it shouldn't) more should be required.
- Design standards for exterior design are challenging for industrial buildings. The Code requires screening on all four sides of a building, which is difficult to meet.
- Chain link fencing is not allowed, yet there is chain link fencing on City property. The cost can be difficult to work around. Can the Code be more flexible in some areas – the rear of industrial buildings?
- Horizontal projections or vertical elements sticking out four feet don't work for industrial development.
- The best treatment for industrial design is color, reveals, varying parapet height, awnings or horizontal projection. Trellis with vines work better for retail.
- Line of sight should be kept in as a consideration for mechanical equipment screening. Require line of site at a certain distance around site (around 500 feet) and if near a freeway, from the freeway.

Adaptive Reuse and Infill Development

- Infill development and sprawl should be on a level playing field. Infill should be given specific incentives for development.
- The community often pushes back on infill projects. Limit barriers to mixed-use and infill development.
- The Code doesn't allow some uses that may be appropriate for adaptive reuse. Someone wanted to do an indoor swap meet in a vacant commercial building. The Code didn't allow it.
- The Code doesn't adequately address adaptive reuse. There are a lot of "big box" developments that are vacant. They are zoned fairly narrowly for retail. A lot of sites could be repurposed into other uses and still be compatible.
- Adaptive reuse allows for more flexibility. Flexibility to fill vacant buildings may have more public support than new construction.
- Adaptive reuse is of interest to a lot of markets.

Landscaping and Open Space Standards

- Think about the purpose of the landscaping requirements. Is it for beautification or screening? Different intent warrants different treatment.
- Landscape standards currently just set a standard for the amount of landscaping, there is nothing that addresses design.
- Landscape standards are quantity-based, meaning that providing a certain number of trees will check the box. A percentage of coverage may be more appropriate/effective, but this might require additional staff training.

- Landscaping is one of the first things people ask for waivers on. It's the first thing to go. Knowing that we are in a drought, knowing it's problematic, maybe look at the requirements. Look at other desert communities such as Santa Fe. What are they doing?
- Landscaping and setbacks should be looked at. [Applicants] always ask to reduce setbacks and increase the density of landscaping as a tradeoff.
- Usable open space isn't defined and can be difficult to implement. Define usable open space criteria such as access, amenities, and dimensions, Currently, the Code doesn't give any extra value for the quality of open space.
- The City should look at the types of trees that are allowed. Mesquite trees have a shallow root base and are the first to go down in the wind. Look at plants that can withstand wind. Palo Verdes are a better choice.
- Clarify open space requirements. It could be a more straightforward calculation. Focus on usable open space.
- The width and percentage requirements sometimes contradict one another. Need to consider adjustments for usable open space vs. buffers.
- A big problem is how open space is measured. Particularly for townhome projects, you don't get any credit for private open space. There should be credit for private open space.
- Open space requirements are high. If the City would like to keep the requirements high, figure out a way to give credit for private open space.

Parking and Loading

- The City recently fixed some parking requirements. That really helped, they have become more flexible.
- Consider codifying clear parking design specifications.
- Parking should be revised to clarify how to determine parking provisions.
- Loading requirements should be centralized and located in a single place. Clarify which uses need loading for their operations, and where loading should be located.
- Parking would be best in a consolidated/streamlined section.
- Parking rates generally seem too high. Office buildings in particular tend to have a sea of unused parking spaces. You can try to hide or screen parking, but it is challenging if a lot is required.
- Parking requirements for large multi-family developments are too high. Developers will figure out where they need to provide lots of parking as an amenity.
- It may make sense to lower the parking requirement for very large warehouse and distribution uses.
- The market is changing around Uber, Lyft, and other carsharing. The Code should adjust to these alternatives.
- Parking reductions have been recently done by the City, but more could be done to lower the multi-family parking requirement. Car sharing and charging stations are popularly provided by a developer for a parking reduction. Could incentives be provided if the developer provides open space/trails?

- More tenants and property owners want spaces for app-related pick-ups, drop-offs, and deliveries. The Code should consider designated short-term parking spaces.
- Reconsider the 22-foot garage dimension requirement; it takes away from livable square footage.
- Need more clarity on bike parking. Uses that require bike parking are not clearly defined.
- Requirements for bike racks are too high.

Signs

- The Sign Code is out of compliance with the Reed Supreme Court decision. That needs to be updated.
- The Sign Code is the most complicated and difficult to implement part of the Code.
- Regarding signs, the Code itself is fine but the Master Sign Plan is the problem. They are often written without knowing the end user. They are often old, outdated, and overly restrictive.
- There are too many Master Sign Plans. They are required for just about everything and that is excessive. Maybe only require if you want to modify standards and you have a certain number of tenants.
- The Code allows enough signage, it's the Master Sign Plans that are too restrictive. Consider an expiration date for Master Sign Plans.
- Master Sign Plans are archaic, required far too frequently, and in some ways supersede the Code.
- Henderson is slightly more restrictive on signs than in other communities. The Code should allow more signage if it's the design the City wants. Allow each tenant and future buildings to have a certain sign allowance.
- Sign regulations involve equations that are tough to understand and calculate. Regulations in other communities are simple, very black and white, cut and dry.
- Some things should not count against a total sign allowance (clearance bars, menu boards, non-illuminated post directional signs).
- Wall signs and freestanding signs should have over the counter review.
- Clark County has a 'vivid hues' limitation for signs. That is an example of a standard that is hard to enforce, do not incorporate standards like this.
- Consider opportunities for sign cohesion in specific parts of the City – specifically in West Henderson. The signage being completed under the Sign Code is not aesthetically pleasing.
- The current Code's limitations on electronic messaging doesn't account for orientation. Electronic messages only have a 70-degree viewable range. Auto dimmer is also important.
- Build flexibility into the Code to allow for changing sign technology. For example, regulate "illumination" instead of "LED lights" because light technology might change.
- Limiting wall sign area to 20% of the elevation area for general commercial is a little restrictive. 25% would be more appropriate to get good proportions of sign area to building.
- A height of 50 feet for freestanding signs is appropriate and should be allowed.

- Signs can cause visibility issues depending on size and placement.
- Give staff a little bit of discretionary wiggle room to evaluate conformance with sign plans.
- The City is not able to track signs that don't require a permit. Therefore, they should not be subject to time limits.
- Graphic illustrations are helpful for determining sizes and measurements. This would streamline interpretations and how staff does calculations.

City Administration Process

Code users agreed on the need to streamline the review process, emphasizing clarity of process and timeframes. Users were critical of the comment process coordinated between departments. Many users observed that projects were generally reviewed by the appropriate decision-maker, while others expressed that levels of review should be reconsidered.

Overall

- Staff has worked well with people to get a good product. But sometimes the Code doesn't give them the tools to be flexible.
- The Code doesn't give staff the ability to make a practical decision. It gets down to nitty gritty on every single issue.
- The Code needs more clarity about processes. It's a thick document.
- There needs to be more clarity and more flexibility.
- The City sometimes pushes back on an applicant during the review process, but this can be difficult to do without having anything concrete to point to in the Code.
- The Development Agreement section needs to be cleaned up. "Negotiated" Development Agreements have one process, "form" Development Agreements have another. It's not clear.
- There could be some use for a process where public notice is required but the project doesn't necessarily have to have a hearing. Maybe some things can go on consent. That could be a middle ground for some things.
- Staff in Henderson is more responsive than any other jurisdiction in the valley.
- Regarding processes, Henderson is a lot better than the County and the City of Las Vegas.
- Generally, Henderson has a good reputation but more and more there are delays in processing and they are losing that reputation.
- Sometimes Planning Staff asks for too much detail before taking a project to Planning Commission. Should just needs schematics, don't have to show exactly how every standard is going to be met. If it's reasonable that the project will be able to meet the standard ordinance requirements, that should be enough.
- The application process is complex and cumbersome. You need separate applications, each with separate owner signatures.

- Henderson is one of the best communities to work with. Staff goes above and beyond to benefit the community. They find flexibility in the Code to get a good project. Give staff more tools to do that.
- There are some major inconsistencies with the approval process, including waiver of standards, Development Agreements, zoning amendments initiated by the public, and advisory committees.
- Review timelines could be better fleshed out in the Code.
- Tenant Improvements: permits are required for things above a certain dollar amount. Permitting takes weeks and delays construction. Either don't require permits if it's not structural or rely more on contractors' professional obligation more.
- Staff asks for things that are not really in the Code. Photo simulations, for example. One never knows when it's going to be asked for.
- One application should cover multiple types of approvals. You shouldn't need to fill out multiple application forms for one project that requires multiple approvals.
- When "impact" doesn't affect anything but the development itself, it should be looked at differently from impacts that have off-site impacts.
- Some of the things [staff] make[s] you submit are cumbersome. Such as sustainability checklist. That is a pain.
- If you ask for waiver, you need to provide compensating benefits, but there is no direction on what you need to provide. If there is no clear direction on what you need to provide, it's difficult.
- Waivers, etc. are fair and decisions on them are made at the appropriate level.
- Some waiver impacts are external and some waiver impacts are internal. If the impact from the waiver is internal, the City shouldn't care.
- A big part of the implementation of the Code depends on how staff uses it. Allow flexibility and empower staff to work with applicants.
- When the City asks for alternatives, there should be more clear direction.
- The Code can tie your hands. Allow waivers by the Director if [the project] meets the intent.
- The City should allow an option for expedited processing if people pay extra. If people pay extra, hire a consultant to process it faster.
- It's hard to figure out the standards and what you need waivers on.

Inter-Departmental Review

- The City needs a comprehensive team review process.
- There are some issues with internal review. Planning staff and Public Works staff touch the project at different points and sometimes Public Works comments are removed.
- There is inherent disconnect in the department – current planning is not necessarily aware of long range planning policy goals.

- The process is frustrating because brand new comments come up after the initial review. Sometimes it happens multiple times. That pushes you to next hearing or deadline for neighborhood meeting.
- Sometimes Community Development Department gets blamed but it's not really their fault. Sometimes late comments come in from other divisions (traffic, utilities, etc.) but because Planning staff coordinates it all, they get blamed. Other departments don't care because it's not their responsibility.
- During the staff review process, give one set of complete comments. It's getting harder and harder to stay on filing schedule because you can't address staff comments in the time they give you to address them. Almost always have at least one extension. Always have to cycle in another round of staff review.

Review Authorities

- Generally, approvals are made at the appropriate level.
- Henderson has the right people making the right level of decision.
- Decisions are made at the appropriate levels. Things that staff decides on are appropriate. Things at Planning Commission or City Council level are appropriate.
- Level of review authority is appropriate. Henderson is not far off the mark, if at all, on that.
- There are a lot of decisions regarding signs that require Planning Commission review that could be done at the staff level.
- When the Planning Commission or City Council see an accessory dwelling unit application, they wonder why it comes to them.
- Staff tries to make things work. They should be able to decide on waivers.

Boulder Highway

- Boulder Highway and the existing zoning there is potentially prohibitive to the Henderson Strong vision for that area.
- The development interest for Boulder Highway is for multi-family residential. Even though it is zoned a mixed-use corridor. There isn't the proper market for every parcel along Boulder Highway to be high-intensity development.
- Get rid of the Boulder Corridor Investment Strategy. It's not going to happen. The established development pattern precludes that. Vertically integrated mixed use just isn't going to happen. Allow single use development. Allow residential development. It's ok to require a minimum density, but at the same time allow for different housing types. Residential will drive commercial and you'll start to see the commercial fill up.
- There are mixed feelings for keeping the Boulder Highway lively with activity. Some think it's possible, others don't think it's the best option.
- The mixed use corridor is not working. All the interest along the corridor has been for multi-family residential or stand-alone nonresidential development, even drive throughs. The City should acknowledge this and adapt the Code somehow.

- It's not practical for the whole Boulder corridor to be mixed use. Stringent mixed use requirements may make sense in some focus areas. In other areas, it should be loosened up.
- The Code needs to reevaluate what things look like for the Boulder Highway. It has several overlays which require 25-50 dwelling units per acre.
- Residential development drives commercial development. On Boulder Highway, allow more residential. That will help support more commercial.
- Boulder Highway roadway will likely never expand or widen any further.
- Lots along Boulder Highway are only 100-150 feet deep, which may limit development opportunities. What types of urban form can be implemented well along wide roadways?
- Consider secondhand stores/swap meets along Boulder Highway. Some investment is better than nothing in vacant buildings.
- Consider prohibiting auto-oriented uses on Boulder Highway, or adding a separation requirement for uses such as gas stations.

Hillside Overlay

- For the most part, the Hillside Ordinance is working. A lot of detailed technical information is in there, and that is helpful. You don't have to justify what you're doing because it's already there; street widths, vertical curbs, slopes, and how it pertains to fire code, it's all there.
- The Hillside Ordinance works for large developments, as well as small ones.
- The ordinance seems to be drafted for a different type of development pattern than what is coming through – tailored to single-lot, not large-scale developments. The criteria could be revised to be more context-sensitive.
- Consider revisiting the Hillside Overlay and tweaking to reflect best practices. Applying the standards to a project can be a painful process.
- Henderson's Hillside Ordinance is the best in the valley, but it would still benefit from visuals and an overhaul.
- It is difficult to determine which properties the Hillside Overlay applies to.
- The technical information in the Hillside Ordinance is helpful. That needs to be there. If it doesn't stay in Development Code, make sure it's somewhere. It keeps you from having to go before Planning Commission and making the case to adjust the requirements.
- The Hillside Ordinance should be clarified for when it's ok to have a sidewalk only on one side of the street. Maybe state that a sidewalk only on one side would be considered on a case-by-case with approval of traffic.
- The Hillside Ordinance is illustrative, which is helpful.

Other Topics

Code users raised a number of individual issues that were unrelated to the major themes discussed above, or focused on other City policy documents. These issues are listed below.

- The part [of the Code] that talks about resource protection is just in jest and not really embraced and captured.
- Planned Unit Development standards are purposefully different than state law.
- Certain improvements should be tied to the business license, instead of the building permit. For example, changing rooms in bathrooms. They are only needed for public bathrooms but you don't know if the bathroom will be public until you know the tenant.
- Standards for car washes need to be updated. Standards are inconsistent – the Code needs to define attended vs. unattended.
- Standards for drive-throughs need to be revised. The proximity to residential may be problematic.
- Problems with short-term rentals, and the ordinance is currently stalled. Establishing requirements for owner occupancy might help.
- For telecommunications, the applicability of requirements is confusing and unclear.
- Golf Course Ordinance needs to be reviewed and revised.
- Religious facility uses need to be reviewed and revised.
- Accessory structures versus accessory dwelling units is complicated and confusing.
- Trail Master Plan is confusing to follow.
- West Henderson Master Plan identifies different zoning categories – should be cleaned up and reconciled with Code.