

January 16, 2020

Case: PZN-2018-00026 Black Mountain Rezoning and Development Standards

City of Henderson
 Scott Majewski
 Project Planner
 (702) 267-1512
 Scott.Majewski@cityofhenderson.com

Scott,

Below are our responses in **bold italic type** to the comments that you provided us on October 3, 2019 concerning the 1st submittals for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and Tentative Map applications for the Black Mountain development.

Staff Comments Dated 11/14/19

1. Provide detailed response to the CPR comments and how each comment was addressed with these applications (CD)
Response: Noted. Responses provided within this document.
2. Staff has concerns with any residential lot size less than 10,000 square feet on the Founders Parcels. Provide a map to reflect lots with minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet on Founders Parcels. (CD)
Response: The residential lot sizes in the current plan are consistent with adjacent properties. They provide a myriad of housing alternatives. Ongoing discussions with stakeholders may well result in increased lot sizes however those discussions have not concluded. These discussions also may well result in a reduced unit count
3. Who is the developer? (CD)
Response: Black Mountain Golf Course, LLC is the developer.
4. Staff suggest revising Parent Tentative Map to match parcels as shown on Exhibit 2.A of Development Standards. (CD)
Response: The Parent Tentative Map has been revised to show Overall Parent Parcels as they will be recorded with the Parent Final Map. All product boundaries/parcel lines will be established after the Parent Final Map records, and in conjunction with Individual Tentative Map Approvals for each Parent Parcel.
5. Work with staff to set up regular meetings to discuss the design standards. Staff continues to review the development standards documents and will provide a separate list of comments/revisions to the standards prior to the first regular meeting with staff. The design standards will need to be completed prior to the proposal moving forward. (CD)
Response: Noted.
6. Additional neighborhood meeting(s) may be required by the City. (CD)
Response: Noted.
7. Have any environmental studies been conducted to date? If so, please provide copy of studies. (CD)
Response: Yes, these studies have now been submitted.

8. Staff has concerns with the proposed main access aligning with Middleton. Suggest moving main access further north between proposed Parcel 2 & 3 on BLM parcel. Provide additional details on function of the proposed roundabout and how prevents traffic from entering existing neighborhood. (CD)
Response: The applicant has developed three different options for this comment
a. Development of a pork chop concept that restricts turning movement from Greenway not permitting a right turn;
b. Removal of access from Greenway onto Middleton by adding a knuckle condition;
c. Addition of stop signs at intersections within the areas bound by Horizon, Pacific and Greenway
9. Lots within Parcels 1, 2, and 8 should include larger lots along the perimeter adjacent to both Greenway and Mona. (CD)
Response: Large setbacks, extensive landscaping, and decorative property walls have been provided along Greenway and Mona to provide a compatible transition between existing and proposed homes.
10. Provide additional tentative map for the Founders parcels to show how proposed lots interface with existing homes. (CD)
Response: At this time a T-Map will not be provided for the Founders parcels or the BLM property. An exhibit has been provided for reference showing the proposed lotting and setback conditions within the Black Mountain development.
11. Provide cross-sections between existing homes and proposed Founders parcels. (CD)
Response: Cross-sections between existing homes and proposed are provided with this submittal.
12. Revise design guidelines to require a minimum number of street treatments along Greenway, Horizon Ridge and Mona Lane (i.e. similar to Inspirada Theme Street requirements). (CD)
Response: Theme Streets are not proposed within Black Mountain. Scale of project does not allow for proper integration of the Theme Street concept. Rather, a local, unloaded roadway with detached walkways is utilized to establish a similar concept.
13. Revise design guidelines to reflect 85-foot internal collector as a “theme street” and require minimum street treatments. (CD)
Response: Theme Streets are not proposed within Black Mountain. Scale of project does not allow for proper integration of the Theme Street concept. Rather, a local, unloaded roadway with detached walkways is utilized to establish a similar concept.
14. Revise CPA justification letter to address all “approval criteria” of 19.6.4.A.10. (CD)
Response: CPA justification revised to address all approval criteria.
15. Meet with staff to discuss open space and parks requirements as they relate to zoning approval criteria, specifically 19.6.4.C.7(c). (CD)
Response: Noted. Applicant has met on several occasions with staff to discuss requirements. This revised submittal includes proposed improvements based on those discussions.
16. Revise development standards to include photos of attached products with character images. (CD)
Response: Photos of character images have been added to the document as suggested.
17. Please provide information on how this project will address any impacts to school student counts. (CD)
Response: Applicant is diligently working with School District to satisfy requirements.
18. Show existing reclaim ponds and all easements on property. (US)
Response: Reclaimed ponds have been added to engineering plans.

19. Traffic Study must be approved prior to Planning Commission hearing. (PW-TR)
Response: Noted. The traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff.
20. Provide trail or pedestrian connection from site to Newton Elementary. (PW-TR)
Response: An access point near the newly proposed pickleball courts has been provided. All other areas are inaccessible due to grading constraints.
21. Applicant shall submit a drainage study for Public Works approval. (PW-FLD)
Response: Noted. A drainage study has now been submitted to the City. The Conceptual Drainage Study for this entire site was approved by COH on 9-30-19. Clark County Regional Flood Control approval of the same was obtained on 10-24-19.
22. Applicant shall submit Civil Improvement Plans per Public Works requirements. (PW-ND)
Response: Noted, these plans will be provided after the zoning has been approved.
23. Meet with staff to discuss traffic impacts. (CD/PW-TR)
Response: Noted. Applicant has met with staff to discuss traffic and a revised traffic study has been submitted to the City for review and approval.
24. An approved traffic impact study is required prior to Planning Commission Meeting. (PW-TR)
Response: Noted. The revised traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff.
25. Preliminary traffic study shows the projected ADT on Horizon exceeds the capacity of Horizon (currently a 4-lane roadway). Additional right-of-way may be required. Applicant must provide mitigation measures acceptable to the City. (PW-TR)
Response: The applicant developed a revised traffic study that addresses City criteria. The traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff.
26. Preliminary traffic study does not have ADT information on Greenway. If projected ADT on Greenway exceeds the capacity, additional right-of-way may be required. Applicant must provide mitigation measures acceptable to the City. (PW-TR)
Response: The applicant developed a revised traffic study that addresses City criteria. The traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff.
27. Preliminary traffic study does not show Hidden Valley/Driveway. No information on the left turn volume and the existing left turn lane storage capacity at this driveway. Applicant may need to re-construct/lengthen the eastbound to northbound left turn lane at Hidden Valley/site driveway. (PW-TR)
Response: The applicant developed a revised traffic study that addresses City criteria. The traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff.
28. Preliminary traffic study also shows the eastbound to northbound left turn volume on Greenway at Horizon exceeds the storage length. Applicant may need to construct dual left turn lanes on the west leg of this intersection. (PW-TR)
Response: The applicant developed a revised traffic study that addresses City criteria. The traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff.
29. Revise Greenway to reflect buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street. 16' wide lane is too wide. (PW-TR)
Response: Greenway Road currently utilizes an existing 8' bike lane on both sides of the street adjacent to the BMGC parcel, and reduces to standard 5' wide near E. Fairway Road where roadway width limitations occur as it approaches UPRR. The developer will provide reconstruction of the bike lane as needed to match existing condition widths where proposed construction occurs.

30. Preliminary traffic study does not have ADT information on Fairway. Fairway must remain as a residential street with one-lane each direction with on-street parking. If the traffic volume exceeds the capacity of Fairway, applicant must provide mitigation measures acceptable to the City. (PW-TR)
Response: The applicant developed a revised traffic study that addresses City criteria. The traffic study is currently being reviewed by staff
31. Applicant shall construct sidewalk on Fairway. (PW-TR)
Response: This comment was removed per the meeting on 10/22. Sidewalk on one side of the street is an existing condition and represents a very small portion of the development.
32. Revise Mona Street section to provide for on-street parking for the existing homes on the east side of Mona.
Response: Mona Street section was negotiated with the neighbors over a series of meetings. The neighbors do not want any improvements. An easement will be provided for future ROW dedication.
33. The face of power poles on Mona must be minimum 18 inches from face of curb. (PW)
Response: Mona Street section was negotiated with the neighbors over a series of meetings. The neighbors do not want any improvements. An easement will be provided for future ROW dedication.
34. Revise street sections to provide a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk. (PW-TR)
Response: Street sections have been revised to match the COH 47' standard ROW, which includes a 5' sidewalk within the BLM parcel. The Founders parcel has the same paving section as the 47' standard ROW with a sidewalk on one side only to match the existing condition.
35. Interior streets should provide on-street parking where houses front the street. (PW-TR)
Response: The standard 47' COH ROW is now provided within the BLM parcel. The Founders parcel has the same paving section as the 47' standard ROW with a sidewalk on one side only to match the existing condition.
36. The 85' collector street section should have buffered bike lanes, instead of the 16' wide travel lanes.
Response: Buffered bike lanes have now been added to the 85' Collector.
37. Please contact Survey/ROW to schedule meeting due to concerns with the proposed TM. (ROW)
Response: Noted. The Project Engineer had a meeting on 1-7-20 with COH (ROW) Staff. No outstanding concerns at this time.
38. Applicant will be required to dedicate the following streets; Mona Lane, Horizon Drive, Greenway Road, Country Club Drive, Cecil Road, Middleton Drive, Fairway Road, and any additional right-of-way shown as proposed. Along with the listed streets, additional right-of-way dedication will be required per Public Works and the project's necessities with the Parent Final Map. (ROW)
Response: Understood, the streets listed above will be dedicated to the City of Henderson.
39. Applicant will be required to dedicate the ½ street on Mona Lane along 179-20-302-001. (ROW)
Response: Noted. An easement for future ROW dedication will be provided.
40. Applicant will be required to grant all easements per Public Works requirements. (ROW)
Response: Noted. All necessary easements will be granted as required for this project.
41. Applicant will be required to convey the existing utility reservoir site to the City of Henderson (ROW)
Response: Noted. The existing utility reservoir will be conveyed to the City of Henderson.
42. Applicant will be required to convey the property within the railroad corridor to the City of Henderson (ROW)
Response: Noted. The railroad corridor will be conveyed to the City of Henderson.
43. The northerly portion of 179-20-401-001 is not part of this project (ROW)
Response: Noted and corrected on all plans.

Comments from Correspondence Dated 10/9/19 - Development Standards:

1. Revise Exhibit 3.A description – Page 3 – to reflect minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet or add new section to address Founder’s Parcels
Response: The residential lot sizes in the current plan are consistent with adjacent properties. They provide a myriad of housing alternatives. Ongoing discussions with stakeholders may well result in increased lot sizes however those discussions have not concluded. These discussions also may well result in a reduced unit count
2. Exhibit 4.G and 4.H – Pages 4, 60-61 – explain why not use standard COH 47’ street cross-section
Response: The plans have now been updated to utilize the Standard 47’ street cross-section within the BLM parcel. A 42’ street section has been provided within the Founders parcel that replicates the 47’ section with the exception that a 5’ attached sidewalk is only provided on one side of the street, replicating the existing built condition currently in place within this area of the development.
3. Section 1.4 – Page 6 – 1st bullet – change “General Plan” to “Comprehensive Plan”
Response: Noted and revised to read Comprehensive Plan.
4. Section 1.7 – Page 7 – add definition for “Code” as reference in Section 1.6
Response: A definition for ‘Code’ has now been added to the Development Standards document.
5. Section 1.7B – Page 7 – Why are we including height in the definition of a Cluster Product and a height that exceeds current code? This should be in the lot standards section.
Response: The definition of ‘Cluster Product’ has now been revised within the document.
6. Section 1.7E – Page 7 – define Enhanced landscape condition or provide reference
Response: A reference to multiple exhibits has now been added to the definition for clarity.
7. Section 1.7G – Page 7 – remove things that are not proposed to be developed within the project (ie. parking structures, bridges, etc.)
Response: Definition revised to reflect only conditions that exist within the proposed development.
8. Section 1.7P – Page 8 – Add a bullet for Theme Street
Response: Theme Streets are not proposed within Black Mountain. Scale of project does not allow for proper integration of the Theme Street concept. Rather, a combination of local unloaded roadways, open and landscaped stub streets, and paseo connections are utilized to establish a similar concept.
9. Section 1.7P – Page 8 – remove stub streets bullet
Response: Stub streets have been removed from the list on page 8.
10. Section 2.1 – Page 12 – This will likely need revision given the number of units
Response: Tied to overall unit count.
11. Section 2.2 – Page 12 – Change the medium/high density statement to low/medium or just medium.
Response: Reference changed to medium density as requested.
12. Section 2.2.B – Page 14 – why not allow courtyard homes to be attached as well?
Response: Section revised to include attached product.
13. Section 2.3 – Page 14 – change medium/low to just low
Response: The noted reference has now been changed to low density as requested.
14. Exhibit 2.A – Conceptual Land Plan – Page 15 – Add columns for acreage for each parcel and density for each parcel. Clarify what the 1,800 unit is based upon.
Response: A column has been added to the table reflecting the acres of each parcel.

15. Exhibit 2.A – Page 15 – increase map size for legibility
Response: All graphics within the document are meant to be printed as z-folded 11x17 exhibits. Graphic sizes have been increased where possible.
16. Exhibit 2.A – Page 15 – Revise Parcels 9-11 to be minimum 10,000 sq. ft. lots, adjust unit count accordingly
Response: The residential lot sizes in the current plan are consistent with adjacent properties. They provide a myriad of housing alternatives. Ongoing discussions with stakeholders may well result in increased lot sizes however those discussions have not concluded. These discussions also may well result in a reduced unit count.
17. Exhibit 2.B – Land Use Plan – Page 16 – We will need to discuss how our comments affect this exhibit
Response: The Land Use Plan graphic has now been revised to depict plan updates.
18. Exhibit 2.B -Land Use Plan – Page 16 – Parcel adjacent to Mona should be lower land use category (LUC 1 or 2). Lots sizes directly adjacent to Mona should be no less than 6,000 square feet in size.
Response: Large setbacks have been provided along Mona to provide a compatible transition between existing and proposed homes, please refer to the cross-sections that have now been added to the document for further clarification.
19. Section 3.1 – Page 18 – remove “of” after include on 1st sentence.
Response: ‘of’ now removed on page 18.
20. Pictures on Page 19 – Label these with the appropriate style
Response: Pictures have now been labeled to depict applicable architectural style.
21. Section 3.3.B.i – Major Home Plan requirements – Page 22 – Let’s discuss last paragraph under “Eight distinctly different elevations” and if this is adequate. As well as the color and material changes in last sentence.
Response: Noted, text was left as-is per discussions with staff.
22. Section 3.3.B.ii – provide more minimum diversity of product within the two proposed lot thresholds. – Page 22
Response: Parcels within the BLM portion of the property and the Founder’s portion, were designed to be on the small side and provide for a single product type. Creating neighborhood clusters of distinct product types. Therefore, product diversity is proposed as a whole, within the Founders Course area and within the BLM project area, and is de-emphasized on a parcel level.
23. Section 3.3.B.iii – Edge Conditions – Page 22
 - a. Add “side” to this section.
Response: Side has now been added to edge conditions.
 - b. This should be any street, not just “major” roadways.
Response: Text revised to clarify that edge conditions shall apply along Horizon Drive, Greenway Road, and Mona Lane.
 - c. Add themes street edge conditions.
Response: Theme Streets are not proposed within Black Mountain. Scale of project does not allow for proper integration of the Theme Street concept. Rather, a combination of local unloaded roadways, open and landscaped stub streets, and paseo connections are utilized to establish a similar concept.
 - d. Change the language in the leading paragraph to require enhanced details visible from ALL roadways, not just major roadways.

Response: Text revised to clarify that enhanced details shall be visible from Horizon Drive, Greenway Road, and Mona Lane.

- e. 7th bullet point – who is going to ensure compliance with this requirement?

Response: These Development Standards provide guidelines for staff to enforce. A checklist will be provided with finalized standards to aid in staff reviews and applicant submittals.

24. Section 3.3.B.iv – Page 23 – Discussion... how do we plan check for mix of roof types? Remove “major” from first sentence before community.

Response: These Development Standards provide guidelines for staff to enforce. A checklist will be provided with finalized standards to aid in staff reviews and applicant submittals.

25. Section 3.3.B.v – second bullet on Page 23 – discuss, we may want some distinctly different elevations for townhome buildings. Also, who is enforcing this requirement. Seems like developer needs to set up a DRC and provide COH letters of compliance prior to application submittal.

Response: Architecture for townhome products look best when similar styles are provided across all structures, but different architectural features are applied for variety. A Design Review Committee is not proposed for Black Mountain and a checklist will be provided with finalized standards to aid in staff reviews and applicant submittals.

26. Section 3.3.B.vi – Front Elevations – Page 23 – increase the required options beyond just one

Response: Text has been revised to require two front elevation architectural options, instead of just one.

27. Section 3.3.B.vii – Corner Buildings – Page 23 – same comment as above...increase required options

- a. This needs to include when facing the small strip common element used to get to get around not being a “corner side” designation.

Response: Text revised as noted to include homes facing small strip common elements, when applying corner building design requirements. Requirements have not been revised, applicant feels that one requirement satisfies the intent of the requirement.

28. Section 3.3.B.viii – Pages 23 and 24 – this section “encourages” which means we won’t get any of these projections... we need something more

Response: This section now requires one or more items, where none were previously required.

29. Section 3.3.B.X – Page 24 – discuss how we plan check for these

- a. Master Developer will need to set up DRC to review for conformance to these standards before submitted to COH

Response: These Development Standards provide guidelines for staff to enforce. A checklist will be provided with finalized standards to aid in staff reviews.

30. Section 3.3.D – Materials – Pages 24 and 25

- a. Second bullet – change should to must? (discuss)

Response: Text has now been revised to read ‘must’ instead of ‘should’.

- b. Third bullet – change should to must

Response: Text has been added to the document to clarify conditions in which architectural elements get wrapped.

- c. Fourth bullet – change should to must

Response: The fourth bullet has been changed to must instead of should.

- d. Sixth bullet – we may need a graphic for this one

Response: A graphic has been added with the revised materials to help clarify this standard.

31. Section 3.3.E.i – Page 25 – Discuss...we may want more than one here

Response: The section has now been updated to require two items instead of just one.

32. Section 3.3.E.ii – Page 26 – discuss... do we want to be more specific for treatments for each product type?

Response: Text has been revised clarifying standards for lots greater than 40' and those less than 40' in width.

- a. Clarify that garages must be setback a minimum of 6 feet from front of house plane for lots greater than 40 feet in width.

Response: Text added to clarify that garages over 40' require a 6' setback, a graphic has been added to help clarify.

33. Section 3.3.E.iii – Page 26 – remove courtyard wall option

Response: Revised text to clarify that if the courtyard wall option is utilized, courtyards must be an integral component of the architecture.

34. Section 3.3.E.iv – remove note about use of appliances above 48"

Response: Revised to remove note about use of appliances above 48".

35. Section 3.4.K – Page 28 – Do we want the entire BLM parcel to be gated??

Response: The entire BLM parcel is no longer proposed to be gated, individual parcels may be gated within the development.

36. Exhibit 3.A – Page 29 – Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure.

Response: The document has been revised to add a new section on accessory structures requiring the same architectural features as the main residential structure, if utilized within a front setback.

37. Exhibit 3.B – Page 30 – Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure.

Response: The document has been revised to add a new section on accessory structures requiring the same architectural features as the main residential structure, if utilized within a front setback.

38. Exhibit 3.C – Page 31 – Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure.

Response: The document has been revised to add a new section on accessory structures requiring the same architectural features as the main residential structure, if utilized within a front setback.

39. Exhibit 3.C – Page 31 – why not allow for attached product within this lot type?

Response: The document has been revised to add attached product to the Development Standards for this lot size.

40. Exhibit 3.D – Page 32 – Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?

Response: The document has been revised to add a new section on accessory structures requiring the same architectural features as the main residential structure, if utilized within a front setback.

41. Exhibit 3.E – Page 33 – Let's discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?

Response: The document has been revised to add a new section on accessory structures requiring the same architectural features as the main residential structure, if utilized within a front setback.

42. Exhibit 3.F – Page 34 – Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?

Response: The document has been revised to add a new section on accessory structures requiring the same architectural features as the main residential structure, if utilized within a front setback.

43. Exhibit 3.G – Page 35 – Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?

Response: Accessory structures have been revised within the Standards and are no longer allowed on lots under 2,500sf, and only allowed on detached lots over 2,500sf.

44. Exhibit 3.G – Page 36 – Let’s discuss accessory structures within the front yard setback. If permitted, need to add some standards for architecture to be equal to primary structure. Will accessory structure fit on this lot size and within the front yard?

Response: Accessory structures have been revised within the Standards and are no longer allowed on lots under 2,500sf, and only allowed on detached lots over 2,500sf.

45. Exhibit 3.G – Page 36 – Provide articulation requirement along alley façade and require landscape to be provide in “green areas” between driveways as shown on exhibits.

Response: For clarity, please refer to Exhibits 6F and 6G for graphic representations of this condition.

46. Exhibit 3.I – Page 37 – clarify lot size; Provide articulation requirement along alley façade and require landscape to be provide in “green areas” between driveways as shown on exhibits.

Response: For clarity, please refer to Exhibits 6F and 6G for graphic representations of this condition.

47. Section 4.2.A – Page 48 – Discuss gating the entire BLM parcel

Response: The entire BLM parcel is no longer proposed to be gated, individual parcels may be gated within the development.

48. Section 4.2.A.iii – Page 49 – 3rd bullet, 300 feet is too long for a offset, especially with smaller lot sizes. This requirement should be less or maximum number of lots before offset.

Response: For clarity, this requirement is meant for Common Elements areas only, not back yards. There will be no instances where a common area view fence exceeds 300 feet without an offset.

49. Section 4.2.A.v – Page 50 – we may want to have shorter block lengths for narrow lots to break up the street scene. Discuss increasing the 1200-foot block length and have that only apply to 5500 SF lots

Response: The shape of the project necessitates longer block lengths for product 3,500 sf or larger. Elevation diversity requirements have been included to help mitigate any negative impact to the street scene.

50. Section 4.2.A.vi – Page 50 – this section makes it sounds like Mona Lane is the only fire access. May need to revise to state where required by Fire Department.

Response: This section has been revised for clarity and now states ‘where required by Fire Department’.

51. Section 4.2.A.vii – Landscape Buffer Page 50 – discuss whether these buffers are large enough especially on Greenway.

Response: Cross-sections have now been added to the document depicting landscape buffers along Greenway.

52. Section 4.2.A.viii – Sidewalks – Page 50 – Do not support sidewalk on one side of the street. Sidewalks shall be detached where required per COH Master Transportation Plan.

Response: The only roadways proposed with sidewalk on one side of the street is along a short section of the realigned Fairway Road, and on local streets within the Founders Course area of the site. This is design is an existing condition, the built neighborhood within this area currently only has sidewalk on one side of the road.

53. Section 4.3.B.iii – Page 51 – minimum sidewalk width should be 5 feet, and all should be detached

Response: The COH 47' Street Section is now utilized within the Urban Residential District, these sidewalks are 5' in width and attached, not detached. This same section, with the exception of sidewalks on one side of the street, are utilized within the Founders Course area of the project (sidewalks on one side of the street are an existing condition within the built neighborhood).

54. Exhibit 4A – Page 53 – revise to show interior collector as Theme Street and remove note about sidewalks on one-side of street.

Response: Theme Streets are not proposed within Black Mountain. Scale of project does not allow for proper integration of the Theme Street concept. Rather, a local, unloaded roadway with detached walkways is utilized to establish a similar concept.

55. Exhibit 4C – Page 55 – is there a retaining condition all along Greenway?

Response: Cross Sections have been provided with revised submittal materials detailing conditions along Greenway and throughout the development.

56. Exhibit 4D – Page 56 – Does this proposal include landscaping in the Horizon Drive median? I think it should and I think the HOA should maintain – discuss with PW

Response: Existing conditions preclude the addition of landscape within the Horizon Drive median.

57. Exhibit 4E – Page 57 – Who maintains the 30-foot area containing the 5-foot meandering trail?

Response: The Black Mountain HOA will maintain the 30' area containing the 5' meandering trail.

58. Table 4.A – Page 58 – provide width of Neighborhood Street type

Response: The street sections have been revised to exclusively use the standard 47' section within the Urban Residential District, these sidewalks are 5' in width and attached. This same section, with the exception of sidewalks on one side of the street, are utilized within the Founders Course area of the project (sidewalks on one side of the street are an existing condition within the built neighborhood).

59. Table 4.A – Page 58 – revise all sidewalks to be minimum 5-feet wide; clarify why not doing standard COH 47-foot street section? Why proposing a 46' & 48' section?

Response: The street sections have been revised to exclusively use the standard 47' section within the Urban Residential District, these sidewalks are 5' in width and attached. This same section, with the exception of sidewalks on one side of the street, are utilized within the Founders Course area of the project (sidewalks on one side of the street are an existing condition within the built neighborhood).

60. Exhibit 4H – Page 61 – what are the situations for the use of each of these cross-sections?

Response: The street sections have been revised to exclusively use the standard 47' section within the Urban Residential District, these sidewalks are 5' in width and attached. This same section, with the exception of sidewalks on one side of the street, are utilized within the Founders Course area of

the project (sidewalks on one side of the street are an existing condition within the built neighborhood). Exhibit 4.M – Page 66 – Staff does not support this proposed street design

Response: Exhibits revised to include applicable street designs only.

61. Exhibit 4.N – Page 67 – Staff does not support this proposed street design (cul-de-sac to cul-de sac)

Response: Exhibits revised to include applicable street designs only.

62. Section 5.2 – Page 70 – Section may need revision after meeting with staff to discuss parks and open space

Response: Noted. The applicant has met with the parks department to discuss open space requirements.

63. Table 5.A – Page 71 – Lots less than 6000 SF require 700 SF of open space per unit; however, this table does not seem to capture that requirement. Do these standards intend to waive the open space requirement for all parcels within the plan? Discuss

Response: Applicant has worked with parks staff to provide adequate park facilities for both the residents of the new development and residents from surrounding neighborhoods within a half mile walk. The Parks agreement further establishes the obligations and responsibilities that must be met by the applicant.

64. Section 5.2.A – 2.77 Acre park – Page 71 –

- a. 3rd bullet – May need to add a reference to the landscape standards that contain minimum turf dimensions

Response: The document has been revised to add a reference to minimum turf dimensions.

- b. 7th bullet – let's strengthen this and add as a requirement... not "should"

Response: The document has been left as-is. The should language provides needed flexibility to develop the property.

65. Section 5.2B – Pocket Parks – Pages 71 and 72 –

- a. what does "as necessary" mean? We will want a standard here

Response: The text has now been revised to require one pocket park within the BLM parcel, and one pocket park within the Founder's parcel.

- b. 1st bullet – maybe limit this to artificial turf

Response: The document has now been revised to add a reference to minimum turf requirements.

- c. 4th bullet – suggest only allowing decomposed granite and part of a natural trail only.

Response: In order to provide adequate dust and erosion control, decomposed granite or decorative granite rock is proposed. The versatility of decomposed granite makes it ideal for pathways, play areas, under trees and shrubs, and also makes a good ground cover for xeriscapes or low-water landscaping projects. For all its advantages, one of the main benefits of decomposed granite is its low long-term maintenance and repair expenses.

66. Section 5.3.A and table 5.B – Page 72 –

- a. change "General Plan" to "Comprehensive Plan."

Response: The document has now been revised without reference to the Comprehensive Plan.

- b. The total number of new residents shown in this section and in the table is 1300-ish residents less than shown on the previous page

Response: The document has now been revised with text that references the Trust for Public land data.

67. Section 5.3B – Existing Parks – Page 73 – this section may need revision based on meetings with staff related to Parks and Open Space

Response: Noted. The applicant has met with City staff and has revised the document as discussed within those meetings.

68. Exhibit 5A – Page 75

- a. Are there any improvements proposed in the existing Rail trail to the west of Greenway where open space credit should be given?

Response: Yes, the trail will be continued west of Greenway with equivalent amenities. Applicant and staff are working together to determine trail amenities and landscape requirements.

- b. Suggest discussing with parks the idea of requiring the connection to College.

Response: Noted. A connection to College already exists, residents currently enjoy this section of the trail. No additional amenities are planned for this section of trail.

- c. Table should be separated into Public Open Space and Private Open Space.

Response: Per discussions with Parks staff, the included Table may remain as-is.

69. Section 6.1.A – Primary Entries – Page 79

- a. Discuss again the reasoning for gating off the entire “Urban District”

Response: The entire BLM parcel is no longer proposed to be gated, individual parcels may be gated within the development.

- b. Add minimum standards for tree and shrub requirements for primary entries

Response: Minimum tree and shrub standards have been added to the revised materials.

70. Section 6.1.B – Page 79 – Help staff to understand or provide an exhibit that better explains where primary trees are not required. Is it intended that exhibits 6C through 6G provide this explanation?

Response: Primary Trees are not required along external roadways or the internal collector. These areas will follow the standards outlined within Section 6.1.C Open Space and Pedestrian Connections.

71. Section 6.1.C – Open Space and Pedestrian Connections – Page 80

- a. 1st bullet – change 24” box to 36” box

Response: Per discussions with staff, this requirement has been revised to require 2” caliper trees.

- b. 2nd bullet – change 15 gallons to 24” box

Response: Per discussions with staff, this requirement has been revised to require ¾” caliper trees.

- c. Alternatively, explain why these plant size standards should be less than what is required by Code.

Response: As shown on exhibits 6C through 6G, landscape area is limited, but an expectation for a high-quality end-product is depicted within these exhibits to ensure that front yard landscape areas include plant materials that will ultimately enhance the entire development.

72. Section 6.1.D – Page 81 – revise table to provide minimum 36” box tree for “Up to 50’ and 51’-75” for primary tree

Response: As shown on exhibits 6C through 6G, landscape area is limited, but an expectation for a high-quality end-product is depicted within these exhibits to ensure that front yard landscape areas include plant materials that will ultimately enhance the entire development.

73. Section 6.1.D.i – Page 82 – 1st paragraph below shrub section – BIAS ALERT... do we want pines and junipers to be allowed at all? Discuss...
- Response: Pines and junipers are appropriate plant materials for the development as they currently exist within the region.**
74. Section 6.1.D.iii – Alley and Cluster... – Page 82
- a. 4th bullet – this is a significant departure from Code
- Response: As shown on exhibits 6C through 6G, landscape area is limited, but an expectation for a high-quality end-product is depicted within these exhibits to ensure that front yard landscape areas include plant materials that will ultimately enhance the entire development.**
75. Section 6.1.E – Front Yard Landscape Grading – Page 83
- a. Discuss requiring front yard contouring
- Response: Front yard contouring may not be able to be achieved on all lots, depending on lot size, utility easements, and other site constraints, which is why this design standard is encouraged and not required.**
76. Section 6.1.I.iii – Interior Walls – Page 84 – I don't believe we want to allow painted block under any circumstance
- Response: Text has been revised to require precision block with integral color.**
77. Section 6.2.E – Ground Cover – Page 86 – Consider removing DG as an allowed ground cover
- Response: In order to provide adequate dust and erosion control, decomposed granite or decorative granite rock is proposed. The versatility of decomposed granite makes it ideal for pathways, play areas, under trees and shrubs, and also makes a good ground cover for xeriscapes or low-water landscaping projects. For all its advantages, one of the main benefits of decomposed granite is its low long-term maintenance and repair expenses.**
78. Section 6.2.I – Prohibited Plant Materials List – Page 87 – add note “and other plants as listed on SNWA Regional Plant List”
- Response: A note allowing all other plants on the SNWA list has now been added to the document.**
79. Section 6.3.A – Dark Sky – Page 87 – Discuss with Developer and Public Works the idea of not requiring street lights on interior streets but only requiring them at decision points and requiring lanterns in front yards instead
- Response: Noted. Streetlights will only be implemented at decision points and lanterns will be used in front yards.**
80. Section 6.3.B – Identification Signage – Page 87 – remove this section or need to provide actual design criteria and size standards.
- Response: The Development Standards have now been revised to provide preliminary design concepts for all monumentation.**
81. Section 6.3.C – Paving and Hardscape – Page 87 – discuss idea of requiring paver driveways for all units instead of concrete.
- Response: Applicant will provide paver driveways.**
82. Exhibit 6H – Page 97 – Discuss under what circumstances we would want wall or fencing to extend above the lower retaining wall. Also, require a cap on both walls
- Response: The referenced wall detail has been revised to show view fencing and wall caps have been added.**

83. Exhibit 6J – Page 99 – same comment as Page 97

Response: The referenced wall detail has been revised to show view fencing and wall caps have been added.

Comments from Correspondence dated 10/31/19 - Parks Comments:

1. It doesn't appear they addressed the triangle park space in the design guidelines, what will become of this area?

Response: A park site design has been included with the revised submittal.

2. They indicate they have enough park space but every resident should be within a 10-minute (1/2 mile) walk of a park

Response: The surrounding park graphic has now been reworked to show a ½ mile radius

3. The design of the pickleball area needs to be further developed, not approvable in current condition

Response: The pickleball area has been revised as discussed and negotiated with park staff.

4. If they have 1000 units, 13.2 acres of park is required, if there will be 1800 units 23.76 acres is required, the private park will not count towards that calculation

Response: Applicant working with staff to determine adequate park acreage for the site. Final figures will be memorialized within the Parks Agreement.

5. They show 4' wide sidewalks, I don't believe that follows with Prowag, I think it needs to be a minimum of 5'

Response: Street sections have been revised to show COH 47' standard section within the BLM parcel and a 42' neighborhood street within the Founders parcel. All streets now accommodate 5' sidewalk widths.

6. The charts on pages 71-72 have inaccurate information

Response: Park calculations have been revised using population numbers gathered from the Trust for Public Lands.

7. Information in 5.3.A doesn't match data on previous page

Response: Section 5.3.A has now been revised to match information in the rest of the document.

8. Not sure how the 20.34 acres of additional park space is being calculated

Response: The parks table has been updated with revised figures.

9. The information on pages 73-74 needs to include how far each of the parks are from the project site (1/2 mile rule/10-min. walk)

Response: Graphic reworked to show a ½ mile radius around parks.

10. Restroom for the pickleball area needs to be larger than 1M/1W

Response: The pickleball restroom has now been revised to include to 2M/2W.

11. The radius that needs to be used on page 77 is ½ mile

Response: The surrounding parks graphic has now been reworked to show a ½ mile radius

12. Tree Plan – should eliminate all ashes, Arizona Ash could be used but not exclusively

Response: The Ash represents a hearty tree within the Las Vegas market. Any unhealthy trees would be required to be replaced by the HOA.

13. The planters along the sidewalks that look to be considered open space should really be a minimum of 6' if we want the trees to have a higher survival rate

Response: Cross sections have now been included within the document to depict actual conditions within the site. The 5' condition shown on the exhibit are minimums only, actual conditions vary as shown on the cross sections.

14. Park agreement

Response: Noted, a Parks Agreement is currently being developed.

FYI Items

1. A development agreement is required. (CD)

Response: Noted. A Development agreement is currently being developed.

2. FYI: All homes shall have fire sprinklers. (FD)

Response: Noted. All homes shall have fire sprinklers.

3. FYI: Applicant shall add fire hydrant(s) and water line(s) as required. (FD)

Response: Noted. Fire hydrants and water lines will be provided as required.

4. A park agreement is required. (PR)

Response: Noted. A parks agreement is currently under development.

5. All interior streets must be privately maintained. (PW-TR)

Response: Noted. All interior streets will be privately maintained.

6. Ullis Newton ES and Foothills HS are over program for the 2019-20 school year. Newton is 115.74% and Foothills is 122.85% of program capacity. (CCSD)

Response: Applicant is working with School District to satisfy requirements.

Concept Review Comments:

1. Neighborhood Meeting required. Contact Planner on date/time/location and notice, prior to scheduling and sending out neighborhood meeting notice. (CD)

Response: A neighborhood meeting was held on 10/8/2019.

2. Letter mentions Master Plan Overlay and Planned Community (PC) zoning. If proposing PC with a negotiated development agreement then the MP overlay is not required. Regardless of approach, provide design standards as part of zone change application and meet with staff to discuss. (CD)

Response: A Planned Community with a negotiated Development Agreement is proposed.

3. Common open space required for zoning RS-8, RM-10 700 sf/unit (40% useable); RM-16 and higher 500 sf/unit (70% useable). Provide appropriate calculations with future submittal. (CD)

Response: A Planned Community with a negotiated Development Agreement is proposed, therefore the project will work to meet the City's overall 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents standard with negotiated park/common open space details included within the Development Standards document and within the Parks Agreement and Development Agreement.

4. For submittal of future applications, applicant will need to adequately address all criteria of "Project of Significant Impacts", also approval criteria for the following: Comprehensive Plan Section 19.6.4.A.10, Rezoning, 19.6.4.C.7, Master Plan Overlay Section 19.6.4.D.1 (if applicable). Also, please provide comment on the requirements of Planned Community zoning as required by 19.3.18.

Response: Noted. Responses to all approval criteria have been included with the formal submittal and resubmittal documents.

5. Clarify if any portion of project will be age-restricted (CD)

Response: Parcel 5 within the Urban Residential District has been planned for an age-restricted community.

6. Work with Parks and Recreation to determine appropriate public park requirement and park amenities based upon project's ultimate residential population and a Park Agreement (CD/PR)

Response: The applicant is working with the Parks department to ensure that adequate amenities are provided within the community based on the project's ultimate residential population.

7. Future Development Standards should incorporate provisions that lead to a walkable residential community, connecting new and existing infrastructure, including application of complete streets design with pedestrian and bicycle amenities and features (H3). (CD)

Response: The Black Mountain Development Standards have been written to require pedestrian access and amenities. Cross sections for each proposed street section have been included within the document for review and approval.

8. Development Standards must provide a variety of well-designed housing choices to meet the needs of a variety of income and demographic groups (H26.2). (CD)

Response: The Black Mountain Development Standards include requirements for a diversity of architectural elevations, products, side and rear articulation, roof styles and materials.

9. The technical and analytical studies requested by the October 2017 e-mail have recently been submitted but not evaluated as part of this review. There will be further comments on your future submittal that will be based on those studies and submittal of more detailed exhibits.

Response: Noted, we look forward to your comments.

10. Staff remains concerned with the proposed 1800 units and the impact on the City services and this neighborhood. More specifically, staff is concerned with the proposed 435 units identified on the "Founders" side which equates to a density of 7.2 units per acre and is higher than the existing density on the Founders side of the property.

Response: The residential lot sizes in the current plan are consistent with adjacent properties. They provide a myriad of housing alternatives. Ongoing discussions with stakeholders may well result in increased lot sizes however those discussions have not concluded. These discussions also may well result in a reduced unit count.

11. Applicant shall submit a drainage study for Public Works, Parks and Recreation's approval. (PW-FLD)

Response: A drainage study has been included with the formal submittal and resubmittal documents to the City. The Conceptual Drainage Study for this entire site was approved by COH on 9-30-19. Clark County Regional Flood Control approval of the same was obtained on 10-24-19.

12. Applicant must address the Las Vegas Valley Parking Lot Low Impact Development Criteria as set forth in Section 1500 of the Clark County Regional Flood Control District Design Manual. (PW-FLD)

Response: The Las Vegas Valley Parking Lot Low Impact Development Criteria have been reviewed and applied to the site as applicable.

13. Applicant shall submit Civil Improvement Plans per Public Works requirements (PW-ND)

Response: Noted. Civil Improvement Plans will be submitted following the entitlement process.

14. Applicant shall construct full off-sites per Public Works requirements and dedicate any necessary right-of-way (PW-ND)

Response: Noted, full off-sites and dedications are planned for this site.

15. Parcel is adjacent to a Clark County Regional Flood Control District (CCRFCD) facility; therefore, CCRFCD concurrence will be required. (PW-FLD)

Response: Noted. Applicant will ensure CCRFCD concurrence.

16. A traffic impact study will be required. (PW-TR)

Response: A traffic impact study is currently in process and will be submitted to the City for review and approval.

17. Construct water storage at Reservoir Site R-01 equivalent to 1 Max Day demand (estimated to be approx. 1600 gpm or 2.3 MGD). Land is owned by City. This facility shall be designed and bonded prior to first final map approval and shall be constructed prior to issuance of 400th building permit or 2 years after approval of

design, whichever is sooner. NDEP Bureau of Safe Drinking Water approval of design is required prior to construction. Design shall follow process in HUGS (i.e. Design Concept Report, Predesign Report, 30%, 60%, etc.) (US)

Response: Per additional correspondence with cohCOH staff, an additional reservoir will be completed at the Rr-1 site, sized to the equivalent of 1 maximum day demand of storage capacity. Timing of the reservoir construction will be determined in cooperation with staff after the total unit count is finalized.

18. Applicant shall replace all affected park irrigation and avoid impact to existing tennis courts with new reservoir. (US)

Response: The existing tennis courts will be avoided during the construction process.

19. 18" 2240 Zone Pipeline through Founders area (built in 1960)-Replace/relocate into new road alignment within new layout and remove from areas between houses on Fairway and also on Country Club (align with easement on Cecil alignment). Approx. 3000 LF. (US)

Response: The applicant will address all project constraints during the construction process.

20. Mona Lane, north of Boris, concern about flooding near existing valves—need to coordinate improvements to ensure valves are accessible and protected. (US)

Response: Improvements will be coordinated to ensure existing valves are accessible and protected.

21. Mona Lane, north of Boris, concern about power poles in close proximity to waterlines—prefer to have poles relocated to aid in access to existing facilities. (US)

Response: The power poles will not be relocated along Mona Lane. Precautions have been taken to ensure that access to existing facilities is maintained.

22. Dual 2240 zone lines in Mona are dedicated transmission lines and should not be tapped for services. Connections to be made from existing 2240 pipeline in Greenway. Note that stub shown in City view southwest of Fairway/Greenway intersection is not believed to be existing-verify if planning to use for connection. (US)

Response: Noted. The Project Engineer will work with DUS Staff for acceptable points of connections for both upper and lower Pressure Zones within the project.

23. All existing water laterals within the project area that are not in use need to be abandoned.

Response: Noted. All existing water laterals within the project that are not in use will be abandoned.

24. If connecting to existing stubs within the project area, must replace pipe back to tee and replace valve. (US)

Response: Noted. If existing stubs are utilize, these pipes will be replaced back to the tee with a new valve.

25. Other waterlines may need to be constructed in order to meet minimum requirements in WNA and also for providing fire protection/meeting fire code (i.e. 2nd feed for 2240 zone from north of RR tracks). (US)

Response: Noted. The applicant will work with Utility Services to ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area.

26. Provide water efficiency plan to offset "water footprint" of project, minimize outdoor watering and maximize return flow credits. (US)

Response: Proposed project will meet all City Of Henderson and SNWA requirements for water efficiency. Turf areas will be limited to useable open space areas only

27. Proposed project would add approximately 2000 units and 1750 ERU to sewer system in 4 areas: Mona-919 ; Greenway/Fairway 291; 8" Major-175 (plus the 291); Pacific-356 (estimated total peak flow of 1.3 MGD). (US)

Response: Noted. The applicant will work with Utility Services to ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area based on total contribution.

28. Reroute 450 LF 8"/10" sewer and replace 770 LF 8" VCP with 10" PVC in Fairway/Pacific Area (see exhibit) (US)
Response: Noted. The applicant will work with Utility Services to replace any deficient lines and ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area based on ultimate project wastewater contributions.
29. Install 800 LF 8" sewer in Country Club/Greenway (see exhibit)
Response: This project does not contribute to the referenced sewer line, and therefore will not be installed as part of this project
30. Replace sag at Pacific (35 LF) (see exhibit) (US)
Response: This is an existing operational issue not caused by the project. The applicant will work with utility services to replace the sag at Pacific if it is determined the new development is the cause of capacity issues at that location. The project will ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area based on ultimate project wastewater contributions.
31. Replace 3500 LF of existing 12" VCP sewer in Boulder Highway with 15" sewer generally between Lake Mead and Warm Springs (NDOT ROW). (US)
Response: Noted. The applicant will work with Utility Services to replace any deficient lines that exceed capacity due to the new development, and ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area based on ultimate project wastewater contributions.
32. No new connections to existing VCP sewer—must replace with PVC between manholes if connection required. (US)
Response: Noted. The applicant will work with Utility Services to replace any deficient lines and ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area.
33. New crossings of UPRR (if required) must be permitted by developer and place manholes outside of the UPRR ROW. (US)
Response: Noted. No new UPRR crossings are proposed.
34. Capacity improvements in Major and Pacific between BMGC and Townsite-TBD per monitoring. (US)
Response: Noted. The applicant will work with Utility Services to ensure that adequate facilities are provided within the project area based on ultimate project waste water contributions and capacity flow analysis provided to DUS.
35. Cash-in-lieu for constructing new 1 MG reclaimed reservoir on BMGC property. Estimated cost per recent 1.5 MG tank project (bid in 2016) is \$2.70 per gallon. Therefore, estimated cost of \$2.7 M. (US)
Response: Noted. Thank you for the estimated cost.
36. FYI: All homes shall have fire sprinklers. (FD)
Response: Noted. All homes will be fire sprinkled.
37. Community Policing suggests lighting in open spaces meet Illuminating Engineering Societies (IES) Candle light standards in relation to high traffic areas, sidewalks, and cross walks should comply with IES standards. Each light fixture should direct light source in a manner that maximizes it capabilities (IES RP-20-14) (CP)
Response: Lighting will be provided to ensure safety but also with the intent of meeting the IES standards.
38. Any open space should be illuminated during hours of darkness to eliminate criminal element (CP)
Response: Lighting will be provided to ensure safety but also with the intent of meeting the IES standards.
39. Utilizing proper light fixtures and IES standards to illuminate the property is vital for first responders from all directions of travel. (CP)
Response: Lighting will be provided to ensure safety but also with the intent of meeting the IES standards.

Please feel free to contact us with any further questions or concerns you may have regarding the 1st submittal of the Black Mountain Comprehensive Plan, Rezoning, and Tentative Map applications.

Sincerely,

Andy Baron
President