

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

CITY OF LAS VEGAS, A POLITICAL  
SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF  
NEVADA,

Appellant,

vs.

180 LAND CO., LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED-  
LIABILITY COMPANY; AND FORE STARS,  
LTD., A NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY,

Respondents.

180 LAND CO., LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED-  
LIABILITY COMPANY; AND FORE STARS,  
LTD., A NEVADA LIMITED-LIABILITY  
COMPANY,

Appellants/Cross-Respondents,

vs.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS, A POLITICAL  
SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF  
NEVADA,

Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

No. 84345

Electronically Filed  
Sep 30 2022 10:50 a.m.  
Elizabeth A. Brown  
Clerk of Supreme Court

No. 84640

**AMENDED  
JOINT APPENDIX  
VOLUME 128, PART 3**

LAW OFFICES OF KERMITT L. WATERS

Kermitt L. Waters, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 2571

[kermitt@kermittwaters.com](mailto:kermitt@kermittwaters.com)

James J. Leavitt, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 6032

[jim@kermittwaters.com](mailto:jim@kermittwaters.com)

Michael A. Schneider, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8887

[michael@kermittwaters.com](mailto:michael@kermittwaters.com)

Autumn L. Waters, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8917

[autumn@kermittwaters.com](mailto:autumn@kermittwaters.com)

704 South Ninth Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: (702) 733-8877

*Attorneys for 180 Land Co., LLC and  
Fore Stars, Ltd.*

LAS VEGAS CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Bryan K. Scott, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 4381

[bscott@lasvegasnevada.gov](mailto:bscott@lasvegasnevada.gov)

Philip R. Byrnes, Esq.

[pbyrnes@lasvegasnevada.gov](mailto:pbyrnes@lasvegasnevada.gov)

Nevada Bar No. 166

Rebecca Wolfson, Esq.

[rwolfson@lasvegasnevada.gov](mailto:rwolfson@lasvegasnevada.gov)

Nevada Bar No. 14132

495 S. Main Street, 6th Floor

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Telephone: (702) 229-6629

*Attorneys for City of Las Vegas*

CLAGGETT & SYKES LAW FIRM

Micah S. Echols, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 8437

[micah@claggettlaw.com](mailto:micah@claggettlaw.com)

4101 Meadows Lane, Suite 100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89107

(702) 655-2346 – Telephone

*Attorneys for 180 Land Co., LLC and  
Fore Stars, Ltd.*

McDONALD CARANO LLP

George F. Ogilvie III, Esq.

Nevada Bar No. 3552

[gogilvie@mcdonaldcarano.com](mailto:gogilvie@mcdonaldcarano.com)

Amanda C. Yen, Esq.

[ayen@mcdonaldcarano.com](mailto:ayen@mcdonaldcarano.com)

Nevada Bar No. 9726

Christopher Molina, Esq.

[cmolina@mcdonaldcarano.com](mailto:cmolina@mcdonaldcarano.com)

Nevada Bar No. 14092

2300 W. Sahara Ave., Ste. 1200

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

Telephone: (702) 873-4100

LEONARD LAW, PC

Debbie Leonard, Esq.

[debbie@leonardlawpc.com](mailto:debbie@leonardlawpc.com)

Nevada Bar No. 8260

955 S. Virginia Street Ste. 220

Reno, Nevada 89502

Telephone: (775) 964.4656

SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER, LLP

Andrew W. Schwartz, Esq.

[schwartz@smwlaw.com](mailto:schwartz@smwlaw.com)

California Bar No. 87699

(admitted pro hac vice)

Lauren M. Tarpey, Esq.

[ltarpey@smwlaw.com](mailto:ltarpey@smwlaw.com)

California Bar No. 321775

(admitted pro hac vice)

396 Hayes Street

San Francisco, California 94102

Telephone: (415) 552-7272

*Attorneys for City of Las Vegas*

**From:** Tom Perrigo  
**To:** Carman Burney  
**Subject:** FW: Badland's Development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:58:21 AM

---

**From:** Bob Beers  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 3:31 PM  
**To:** 'Steve Caria'  
**Cc:** John Bear; Vicky Skilbred  
**Subject:** RE: Badland's Development

Thanks for writing Mr. Caria.

Unfortunately, the land has been zoned residential from before you moved next to it. The only legal way to prevent development under the existing zoning would be for the city to purchase the land, at current market value, in a process called inverse condemnation, and that would not be fair to all the other taxpayers in the city.

Every one of the purchase agreements I have seen have disclosure statements, initialed by the purchaser, stating that the community has no interest in the golf course land, and that it can go away. Have you checked yours?

The existing zoning is roughly quarter- to half-acre lots up and down the existing 250 acres. The owner is suggesting that the alternative plan would provide more value to more people over the long-term compared to moving forward with the existing zoning, but they are ready to do that if the city says no to the alternative, and have already met with staff on it. The map from that meeting was requested by your HOA's representatives. Did they share it with you?

I am not planning to recuse myself, and nobody ever said "It's a done deal" except for Frank Shreck, near as anyone in the media has been able to research. Frank was called out on that live on KNPR a couple of months back.

Actually, there is something adjacent that has similar density. Although the tower has 24 units and acre, those are each much larger than 3,000 sq ft each and house multiple humans. If those units were half size, there would be twice as many of them, and the density would be higher than what is requested with units much less than half size of what's in the tower now.

Three separate engineering groups, two paid by taxpayers, have been through the traffic study and pronounced it sound. Usually there is only one check.

I am sorry if you have suffered a drop in the value of your home due to the closure of the golf course. Its development seems a certainty, though I continue to hope that your HOA or an individual homeowner has a legal argument. I would note that such a contractual right at Silverstone Ranch elsewhere in city limits has resulted in the property being dry and abandoned for over a year now.

---

Existing nearby residential entitlements loom very large on Planning's radar. All have been included in all studies.

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001011

23290

I do not think the owner got any special consideration from the city, although we did make more demands on this developer, such as having an unprecedented number of public meetings and hiring independent engineers go through the technical aspects, which I don't think we often do.

Bob Beers  
Las Vegas City Councilman Ward 2

---

**From:** Steve Caria [<mailto:stevecaria@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 11:06 AM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian  
**Subject:** Badland's Development

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

I request that this project is rejected by all members of the council and mayor. It is clear that Councilman Beers has made statements that show he is either unaware of the facts (despite the City Attorney's attempt to explain to him) regarding Inverse Condemnation or he is too closely aligned with the developer and should recuse himself from all decisions made regarding this development.

At the Planning Commission meeting, one statement by the PC stated: "this project should be conforming to the community, and it should not cause harm to the residents of the community". Yet the PC went ahead and approved R4 zoning, although this is not conforming with our community. In fact, there is nothing similar to this zoning within a four mile radius of our community. Also, there has already been substantial harm to the values of our properties as this development is causing buyers to stay away. Many property owner's have received nothing but low ball offers, and told that this development has devalued our properties. Hence, this development does neither, conforming to the existing community and "is" causing harm to the residents.

Both Mr. Lowie and Mr. Beers are on record telling residents that this development is "a done deal". This certainly appeared to be the case in our meeting with the PC, with Staff rubber stamping many issues ie; developer agreement (or inappropriate lack thereof), in addition to several other irregular items it looks like indeed it is a "done deal". This is not to mention the traffic study provided by the developer just doesn't represent the overcrowding of Rampart Blvd. and Charleston Blvd. during different periods of the day.

Already there are entitlements for residential growth basically next door with a high rise next to One Queensridge Place, Tivoli and likely to follow Renaissance properties/developments. These project would add hundreds of units, but doesn't seem to be on anyone's radar from the PC and probably the City Council.

---

The greater majority of the Queensridge community is adamantly opposed this development and there area signed petitions supporting opposition.

ROR001012

23291

On the surface, many of my neighbors question "how" this developer has received such favorable treatment from the PC Staff, Planning Commission and potentially the City Council and Mayor. Without question this development will cause harm to our local elementary school already over 140% occupied and yet no agreement prior to the PC approval. Also, this doesn't address a realistic traffic flow study (other than the skewed report provided by the "developer") on Rampart Blvd. and surrounding main arteries like Charleston Blvd. Nor does it address that there are no apartments within this community at the time, nor is there any R4 zoning other than this outlier.

The list goes on, and it will be curious to see if in fact, "this is a done deal". All indications are it is.....

Disgruntled and disappointed citizen,

Steve Caria

---

ROR001013

**23292**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badland's Development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:45:36 AM

---

**From:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 12:37 PM  
**To:** Brad Jerbic; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** FW: Badland's Development

[more](#)



**CAROLYN G. GOODMAN, MAYOR**

Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

*City Hall is closed on Fridays*

---

**From:** Steve Caria [<mailto:stevecaria@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 12, 2016 11:23 AM  
**To:** Bob Beers  
**Cc:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Ricki Y. Barlow; Stavros Anthony  
**Subject:** Re: Badland's Development

Councilman Beers,

There seems to be no end to your ever changing story. A few months back at a Sun Coast developer meeting you told Mr. Swimmer and myself that you preferred for the golf course to stay but the city would have to pay the developer \$100,000,000 inverse condemnation fee if not allowed to develop on this property. A few months later I see a leaflet stating a \$30,000,000 cost. Which is it? Where do you get these figures? From a CPA genie?

You also stated to Mr. Swimmer and myself that Mr. Lowie and his development group could build 7.49 units per acre, which also has proved to be completely incorrect. Now you are stating that the developer has the right to build 1/4 to 1/2 acre parcels throughout the 280 acre property. This is not what Mr. Brad Jerbic just stated clearly at a recent meeting at OQP for residents attended by the Brad Jerbic and Mr. Perrigo, head of Staff Planning. Mr. Jerbic said that the property needs to be conforming to RDP-7 by building on lots similar in size to the abutting properties. For example, one acre lots next to existing 1 acre lots and 1/4 acre lots next to 1/4 acre lots. Obviously, you see things different than Mr. Jerbic, the City Attorney. Maybe this is one reason why so many people are questioning your intentions.

---

ROR001014

23293

There are so many inconsistencies in this development, the process and your statements. This project was rubber stamped by staff without the normal protocol, developer requests for delays seem unprecedented, putting multiple project requests on the same agenda at the PC seems unreasonable (most people couldn't decipher between one request or the other causing confusion among everyone but the development group--is this something you support?). Approvals for R4, a change in zoning, were permitted without a developer agreement or agreement with the school district, among a number of other inconsistencies. Are you saying this is normal procedure? I might also mention that the Planning Commissioner that you appointed Mr. Trowbridge (excuse the spelling if incorrect) gave approval to absolutely every request made by the developer.....Wow, what representation!

The traffic study was presented by the developer, and is more than questionable. Anyone that lives in this community understands with the already existing entitlements in place that fulfillment of this project and other approved residential properties will create massive backlogs and imperil drivers on Rampart, near capacity now, Alta, Charleston and surrounding arteries. Also, if the R4 development already approved by zoning becomes reality it appears that the only access to the project will be a right turn in and right turn out onto Rampart all day, every day. These construction trucks alone will jam our roads and create onerous delays and imperil drivers on this extremely busy roadway.

The Queensridge Residents HOA has clearly stated that 80% of the homeowners in that community adamantly oppose this development, and at OQP the residents who oppose this development far surpass those residents that are in favor (we have signed petitions opposing). Clearly you are not listening to your constituents that are directly impacted. So what is your justification? Do you have a survey from others surrounding communities in your district that supports this project, or is everyone to rely on your flipfopping comments?

Although you have not represented the interests of the Queensridge community favorably to date, few of us expect that you will do the correct thing by recusing yourself from this matter. Hence, your haughty response to this request comes as no surprise.

In closing, I would add that Mr. Shreck is not the only person that reports they heard you state that "this is a done deal", so your characterization of Mr. Shreck being a lone wolf is incorrect! The inconsistencies by staff, planning commission, you, and others involved with this project just doesn't pass the smell taste!

---

ROR001015

23294

**From:** Tom Perrigo  
**To:** Carman Burney  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to Development of Badlands Golf Course  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:37:10 AM

---

**From:** jerry choate [mailto:jwchoate11@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:43 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Opposition to Development of Badlands Golf Course

**We are opposed to the proposal to build 2600 apartments, and 60-70 homes on the Badlands Golf Course!!**

#### **PROPERTY VALUES**

Since the applications have been filed, homes in Queensridge have been difficult to sell. While property values surrounding us continue to appreciate, our own home values have fallen since the applications were filed with the city.

Recently, a home owner received an offer from a buyer which stated as follows: **"We understand (our offer) is low, . . . we based our price on the golf course going away."** The golf course does not benefit only those who live on it, but improves the value of the entire community we call home. Experts have confirmed a minimum of **10-20% reduction in property values** in Queensridge, should the proposed development be approved.

#### **TRAFFIC**

According to a previous City of Las Vegas staff report on these items, **Rampart would be 97% of capacity with just 720 new condo/apartments on that corner.** More than **tripling** that number of units would certainly require significant improvements on Rampart, Alta and Charleston.

**The developer notes in their application that they are relying on the City to construct light rail from downtown Las Vegas to Downtown Summerlin along Charleston in order to mitigate traffic concerns. The Developer has total disregard for anyone else's concerns, but his own!**

#### **QUALITY OF LIFE (NOISE, SAFETY)**

---

Since the mid 1990's, the Badlands Golf Course has served as required flood control, drainage, and open space for the master planned community of Queensridge.

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001016

**23295**

The construction of flood control structures, roads, and the 2,675 housing units themselves, will severely disrupt the quiet enjoyment of residents on, and near the Badlands golf course for an extended and unacceptable period of time. There will be inordinate amounts of dust and dirt going into our backyards, and pools, making our backyards unusable, and clogging the filters of our pools.

Page 11 of the proposed new master plan states that, "... gated access being provided to Development Area 4." This means that **over 5,000 new residents will have open access to the interior of our existing master planned community.**

**The Queensridge HOA has made significant strides in reducing crime in our community this through newly added security measures. We need to keep it that way, and not have hundreds of people accessing our community on a daily basis for years to come.**

#### **QUALITY OF LIFE (NEIGHBORHOOD INFRASTRUCTURE)**

**Tripling the density of a completed Master Planned community is unprecedented** and there is not provision in the currently available development agreement for adding the necessary improvements to streets, roads, sewer, water, electricity, schools, flood control, police, fire and emergency medical services, and parks and open space required by the influx of what could be well over 7,000 new residents.

The elementary, middle and high schools in this area are already significantly overcrowded as stated by the **CCSD** representative at the last planning commission meeting. The development **could add over 700 children to the** already overloaded neighborhood schools with no provision for new schools or classrooms.

The addition of **2,600 apartments**, some of which are contained in **new high rise towers** places a great strain on **limited fire, police and emergency medical personnel.**

Based on the expert opinion of engineers, hired by some of our neighbors, new flood control measures that have been verbally proposed, **will cause storm run-off to move at such a rapid speed as to cause severe flooding and damage in Queensridge, and neighboring communities.**

#### **DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT**

Legal advisors have indicated that the developer does **not have a right to such density**, and it is only possible if the city makes an **unprecedented, and dangerous decision** to allow a density of **over 35 units per acre inside an existing master planned community.**

ROR001017

23296

Homeowners are afforded specific rights/protections under the **Nevada State Law NRS 278A**, addressing Planned Unit Developments. The statute protects the interests holders (homeowners) in common interest communities, and affords them specific rights.

FINAL NOTE

The HOA has **no liability** for costs associated with contesting these plans, nor is **any HOA assessment** planned. Concerned Citizens are using their own funds to fight this threat to our community. Also, the information in this letter is correct based on information publicly available as of this date.

**THIS PROPOSAL CLEARLY PLACES A SIGNIFICANT RISK TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE OF QUEENSRIDGE AND THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY!! We urge the Planning Commission to NOT approve this proposal!...it will have far-reaching effects on other Planned Communities in the future!**

Thank You for your consideration,  
Sincerely, Jerry and Diane Choate  
701 Sir James Bridge Way  
Las Vegas, NV 89145

**We are opposed to the proposal to build 2600 apartments, and 60-70 homes on the Badlands Golf Course!!**

---

ROR001018

**23297**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge Development Plans  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:30:23 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Neil Colica [<mailto:neilcolica@sbcglobal.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:23 AM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Cc:** Sharon Colica  
**Subject:** Queensridge Development Plans

Hello all

As a resident of Queensridge and a homeowner for the past 8 years - I wanted to send you a note regarding the development plan that is being discussed and voted upon by the city council today. This is a very bad idea for the residents of this neighborhood (for a number of good reasons) and I'm certain that you have heard the issues in great detail. What is most challenging to us personally is that we purchased our home in this area with the understanding that the golf course and attached open space was zoned in a particular way that would restrict building homes in the area. We did our research and purchased our home with this as one of our decision points. Besides ruining the scenery and destroying the golf course - we are very concerned about the density issues and the sharp increase we will have in traffic, crime, and congestion should this development project be allowed.

Please don't get caught up in the hype of the proposed developer who is looking at this through a "profit only" lens. We enjoy living here and would recommend that this entire project, and all of it's phases, be rejected and that you vote to oppose the development project and leave the zoning and open land as is. We have to live with the outcome of your decision and should this happen it will create a tremendous amount of turmoil and dissatisfaction in a community that has grown to appreciate the master planned community and the current zoning restrictions.

Thank you  
Neil Colica  
9225 Whitekirk Place -  
Tudor Park.

Neil Colica RN, MBA, MSM, ACC  
Hospital and Healthcare Executive  
Chief Nursing/Chief Operating Officer  
Certified Executive Coach - ACC  
619-675-3694

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

---

**AGENDA ITEMS #101-107**  
**11.16.16 CC**

P

ROR001019

**23298**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Golf Course Development and its Effect on Queensridge Homeowners  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:59:20 AM  
**Importance:** High

---

**From:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 2:53 PM  
**To:** Brad Jerbic  
**Cc:** Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Golf Course Development and its Effect on Queensridge Homeowners  
**Importance:** High



**CAROLYN G. GOODMAN, MAYOR**

Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

*City Hall is closed on Fridays*

---

**From:** Lorie Curtis [<mailto:L.Curtis@healthgroupwest.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 2:37 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Badlands Golf Course Development and its Effect on Queensridge Homeowners  
**Importance:** High

Dear Mayor Goodman and council members,

I am a long time resident of Queensridge, having owned my home there for over seventeen years. I purchased a home in this neighborhood due to the beautiful golf course and quiet surroundings. I am strongly opposed to the proposed high density housing along Alta and Rampart. Since the announcement of the proposed development, the values of our homes have declined sharply!! There are currently a large number of homes for sale as a result of this, and none of them are selling, despite drastic price reductions. Further, there is already a tremendous amount of traffic congestion, including traffic fatalities, in the Rampart/Alta area. I do not see how this area could handle a project of this density. Please help us preserve the tradition that is Queensridge and reconsider you approval of this high density housing plan in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

---

Lorie Curtis  
And Kevin Curtis

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001020

**23299**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands golf course  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:47:57 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Carolyn G. Goodman  
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2016 11:54 AM  
To: Brad Jerbic; Tom Perrigo  
Subject: FW: Badlands golf course

Fyi

Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor  
Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

City Hall is closed on Fridays

-----Original Message-----

From: eleni [<mailto:elenieliades@hotmail.com>]  
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2016 10:53 AM  
To: Carolyn G. Goodman  
Subject: Badlands golf course

Dear Mayor Goodman,

With all do respect please take to heart the home owners pleas who are against redevelopment of the golf course. Queensridge is our home and we love living here. I am a native Las Vegas and I have grown with this city all of my 50 years. Queensridge is unique and like no other community in Las Vegas. We live in paradise. Queensridge is a master-planned community and we are privileged to live here. We have a right to the quiet enjoyment of the original open space. The developers applications don't include a development agreement that controls what he can build. Many changes make it confusing to understand what is being proposed and to respond to it. Property values have already taken a hit 30%. We can't afford to lose this equity we are not wealthy. Adding 6000 new residents to our existing community of 2000 is bad planing, too high a density will impact traffic, noise, air quality and schools. I wanted to attend the city council meeting but work during the day. Please help us the homeowners retain our rights a peaceful beautiful community, that we signed up for.

Thank you  
Sincerely  
Eleni Eliades

Sent from my iPhone

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001021

23300

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands golf course  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:48:51 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: eleni [<mailto:elenieliades@hotmail.com>]  
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2016 11:05 AM  
To: Tom Perrigo  
Subject: Badlands golf course

Dear Councilman Perrigo,

With all do respect please take to heart the home owners pleas who are against redevelopment of the golf course. Queensridge is our home and we love living here. I am a native Las Vegas and I have grown with this city all of my 50 years. Queensridge is unique and like no other community in Las Vegas. We live in paradise. Queensridge is a master-planned community and we are privileged to live here. We have a right to the quiet enjoyment of the original open space. The developers applications don't include a development agreement that controls what he can build. Many changes make it confusing to understand what is being proposed and to respond to it. Property values have already taken a hit 30%. We can't afford to lose this equity we are not wealthy. Adding 6000 new residents to our existing community of 2000 is bad planing, too high a density will impact traffic, noise, air quality and schools. I wanted to attend the city council meeting but work during the day. Please help us the homeowners retain our rights a peaceful beautiful community, that we signed up for.

Thank you  
Sincerely  
Eleni Eliades

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

---

ROR001022

**23301**

**From:** Tom Perrigo  
**To:** Camran Burney  
**Subject:** FW: General Plan Amendment GPA-62387  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:30:59 AM

---

**From:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 10:36 AM  
**To:** David Horwitz  
**Cc:** Brad Jerbic; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** RE: General Plan Amendment GPA-62387

Dear David:

Thank you for your email and voiced opinions therein. We are working diligently and comprehensively to mediate the issues for a positive resolve for all.

Happy Thanksgiving!



**CAROLYN G. GOODMAN, MAYOR**

Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

*City Hall is closed on Fridays*

---

**From:** David Horwitz [<mailto:dlhorwitz@sbcglobal.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 10:28 AM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Subject:** General Plan Amendment GPA-62387

Dear Mayor Goodman,

I understand that the city council is scheduled to discuss this matter at its meeting today. Due to work I cannot attend the public input part of the meeting, but I do want to express my opposition.

A change from "Parks/Open Space" to "High Density" violates the master plan that home buyers have relied on as the city's commitment to maintain the neighborhood's character. Approving a change would indicate that the city does not honor its commitments, and clearly makes the City of Las Vegas a less desirable place to live or to buy a home in. Other communities, such as in Henderson or Summerlin, honor their master plans. I would hope that Las Vegas will do likewise.

I urge you to oppose any changes to the master plan.

---

Thank you for your consideration.

Submitted after final agenda.

Date: 11/16/16 Item: 101-107 p

ROR001023

23302

Sincerely,

David Horwitz  
9101 Alta Drive Unit 702  
Las Vegas

---

ROR001024

**23303**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Please Vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications (November 16, 2016)  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:44:31 AM

---

**From:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 12:40 PM  
**To:** Brad Jerbic; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** FW: Please Vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications (November 16, 2016)



**CAROLYN G. GOODMAN, MAYOR**

Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

*City Hall is closed on Fridays*

**From:** Ron Iverson [<mailto:ron@queensridgehoa.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 11, 2016 10:58 AM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Subject:** Please Vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications (November 16, 2016)

**Mayor Goodman:**

Please vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications next Wednesday, November 16, 2016. I purchased my retirement home in the Queensridge community in January 2015 for the prestige of the area and the enjoyment of its open space. After beginning an extensive home renovation, the Badlands Golf Course was purchased by EHB Companies and my concerns about open space, property values and difficult to understand Planning Commission concessions to this developer have dominated my life. Here is a summary of my concerns with the applications before you:

1. The General Plan Amendment. The City of Las Vegas (CLV) General Plan currently identifies the subject 17.49 acres as PARKS/OPEN SPACE (PROS). The General Plan Amendment request is for "H" which allows for a density of 25 dwelling units per acre or more. There is no upper end maximum to that density. The Developer's requested density on this project is 41 units per acre. By way of comparison, the Queensridge Towers immediate west of the proposed site are 19 units per acre. There is not a project of this requested density closer than 4 miles away at Lake Mead and Jones. Therefore, the requested density is not "harmonious and compatible" with my community.
2. Zone Change. Currently, the proposed building site is zoned RPD-7 (Residential Planned Development 7 units per acre). It was originally envisioned in my community's Master Plan (Queensridge) that the entire area would be zoned RPD-7. This included certain higher density areas off-set by open space recreational (PROS: Park Recreation Open Space) for an overall average density of 7.49 units per acre. The developer is asking that the site be rezoned

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001025

23304

to R-4 (High Density Residential). This R-4 zoning would set the development standards for the site at a maximum height of 55 feet. The Developer has requested a 48 foot height approval but that could be changed through the subsequent Site Review process that does not require public input. The allowance of R-4 zoning on this Phase One application/project would set a precedent allowing the Developer to request the same R-4 zoning for Phases 2 and 3 of this project which are sure to follow if this initial application is approved. R-4 zoning significantly inhibits the enjoyment of open space which is a major value of this community and the surrounding area.

3. Site Development Plan Review. The proposed Site Review process allows for changes to be made without a public hearing, i.e. public input of interested and impacted concerns in the area. Given all the confusion caused by and preferential treatment given to EHB Companies during the past 15 months (multiple competing applications; public meetings which never allowed for gathering of surrounding community concerns; very poorly defined Development Agreements to protect the right of the City and surrounding residents; allowance of last minute application changes causing confusion and curtailing public voice; confusing application descriptions that precluded some Planning Commissions from fully understanding upon what was being voted), the best interests of our City and community can be upheld by ensuring the public hearing right and allowing public voice to be heard.

4. Flood Plain Study. The technical drainage study is not yet complete and will not be completed for at least another 12-18 months. As such, there is no way to understand at this voting time what drainage improvements will be required upstream in the current natural drainage arroyos into the "funnel drain" underneath the intersection of Alta Drive and S. Rampart Boulevard to allow for the safe development of this 17.49 acre project.

5. Schools. Impacted schools in the area are already at 160% capacity without considering the effects of the proposed development. The developer and Planning Commission have known about this fact since receiving the impact statement from school officials in February 2016 but have denied receiving input until mid-October. No agreement has been reached with school officials about how to rectify the impact the proposed development would bring.

6. NRS 278A. The Badlands Golf Course that EHB Companies purchased is tightly integrated with the Queensridge and Queensridge Towers communities. There is an approved Master Plan that has governed the land use of this property since 1992 including critical open space for flood drainage and highly valued community enjoyment. The City maintains that NRS 278A, which would provide substantial approval rights to existing community residents re. subsequent development of the Golf Course, does not apply because the City did not approve its use in Las Vegas. While I fully respect the difficult role and strong integrity of Mr. Jerbic and other governing city officials, it is hard to understand how the City of Las Vegas believes it has the authority to override the implementation and legal enforcement of a mandated state statute. Not enforcing this important protection granted by the State of Nevada significantly lessens the strong appeal of master communities in the state and encourages wealth grabs at the expense of existing residents who paid a premium for the protection of living in a master community.

Again, I strongly urge you to vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications before you on November 16th. Please vote to protect our Open Space, the appeal of the Badlands Golf Course area and the rights of my Master Community. I look forward to speaking before you on November 16th and hearing your disapproval of the three applications.

---

Very Respectfully,

ROR001026

23305

**Ronald J. Iversen**  
9324 Verlaine Court  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

ROR001027

**23306**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Vote NO on the Badlands Gold Course Redevelopment Applications (November 16, 2016)  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:53:51 AM

---

**From:** Bob Beers  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 12, 2016 2:19 PM  
**To:** 'roniversen'  
**Cc:** John Bear; Vicky Skilbred  
**Subject:** RE: Vote NO on the Badlands Gold Course Redevelopment Applications (November 16, 2016)

Thanks for writing Ron. Your bullet point numbers, commented...

1. If you change the metric from "units per acre" to "livable space" per acre, the proposal is less dense than the Tower. Because the unit size of the proposal will be less than half the unit size of the tower, the "net human impact" is equivalent between the two, which is one thing planners and traffic engineers consider. As well, the units will be built upon the parking, so there is no surface parking. The easiest way to cut the proposed density in half is the add 17 acres of surface parking, though that likely wouldn't create urban value.
2. Shauna is incorrect. Council action to change the density of RPD-7 land does not create a right for adjacent land to have equivalent density, at least under the Las Vegas codes. That adjacent land still has a density limit between the smaller of what's around it and 7.5 units per acre before the city has to worry about inverse condemnation. A subsequent council will have to grant a change of zoning for the adjacent land to exceed 7.5 units per acre, and would be under no obligation to do so. Your concern about changes in height without council approval is a good one, I think. And if the motion is for approval, I will condition it that any change in height be treated as a major rather than a minor change. That is the distinction between coming to council or not. Height in this case is critical to the people living in the Towers.
3. I disagree with your statement that the applicant has received any special favors during this process – quite the contrary. You are incorrect stating that there has been no opportunity for public input. It is well chronicled. The last of dozens of opportunities will be at 3pm Wednesday at City Hall. One of the ways the applicant has been beat up is by being required to hold so many public input meetings, compared with others. I disagree that the list of things you're citing as bias are any special accommodations, and some aren't true. Most of the confusion was feigned.
4. Owners don't fund a full flood mitigation design by engineers without first achieving project entitlements, as the design is a seven-digit exercise. This is standard practice in Nevada. The study will have to be completed, reviewed and approved before any construction can start, just as it was for Tivoli built over the same floodwater drainage.
5. I am still working with CCSD to determine what that impact on schools is. They are not sure. For example, it appears that the 71 QR kids at Bonner is quite a bit below the number of children who should be at Bonner given QR's metrics. They are in the process of running existing QR to see what it predicts, to see how close it is to the 71 at Bonner. It also appears that their formula does not distinguish between a 15,000 sf home with multiple generations

ROR001028

23307

and 1,200 ft units that are proposed. I would think that would impact the expected number of children. Another factor is that the school required to be built under the Master Plan you're claiming protection under was converted to a magnet school last year because enrollment had been falling for so long. Oddly, it is closer than Bonner for anyone who accesses through the Charleston gate.

6. The law is available [online](#). It is clearly not a mandate. It is an option. Cities may, not cities must at NRS 278A.080. It is so sad if all this has been based on that simple oversight.

Unfortunately, the land has been zoned residential from before you moved next to it. The only legal way to prevent development under the existing entitlement would be for the city to purchase the land, at current market value, in a process called inverse condemnation, and that would not be fair to all the other taxpayers in the city. I reconfirmed this with Brad after I saw you last week, and he reconfirmed with me that it is the only legal way to prevent development of Badlands available to the city government.

The existing zoning is roughly quarter- to half-acre lots up and down the existing 250 acres. Existing homeowners should expect a lot the same size as theirs and a house the same size as theirs will abut their property. The owner is suggesting that the alternative plan would provide more value to more people over the long-term compared to moving forward with the existing zoning, but they are ready to do that if the city says no to this alternative, and have already met with staff on it. You know this because you've seen the map the HOA requested from the city that was handed out at the meeting.

So the choice, even narrowed down to the last three agenda items only, is the existing entitlement or the plan. Which will create the most property value for the most people?

It is not a choice between the redevelopment applications and "protecting our Open Space, the Badlands Golf Course area and the rights of my Master Community."

Bob

**From:** roniversen [<mailto:rjiversen73@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Friday, November 11, 2016 11:00 AM

**To:** Bob Beers

**Subject:** Vote NO on the Badlands Gold Course Redevelopment Applications (November 16, 2016)

**Councilman Beers:**

Please vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications next Wednesday, November 16, 2016. I purchased my retirement home in the Queensridge community in January 2015 for the prestige of the area and the enjoyment of its open space. After beginning an extensive home renovation, the Badlands Golf Course was purchased by EHB Companies and my concerns about open space, property values and difficult to understand Planning Commission concessions to this developer have dominated my life. Here is a summary of my concerns with the applications before you:

---

1. The General Plan Amendment. The City of Las Vegas (CLV) General Plan currently identifies the subject 17.49 acres as PARKS/OPEN SPACE (PROS). The General Plan Amendment request is for "H" which allows for a density of 25 dwelling units per acre or more. There is no upper end maximum to that density. The Developer's requested density

ROR001029

23308

on this project is 41 units per acre. By way of comparison, the Queensridge Towers immediate west of the proposed site are 19 units per acre. There is not a project of this requested density closer than 4 miles away at Lake Mead and Jones. Therefore, the requested density is not "harmonious and compatible" with my community.

2. Zone Change. Currently, the proposed building site is zoned RPD-7 (Residential Planned Development 7 units per acre). It was originally envisioned in my community's Master Plan (Queensridge) that the entire area would be zoned RPD-7. This included certain higher density areas off-set by open space recreational (PROS: Park Recreation Open Space) for an overall average density of 7.49 units per acre. The developer is asking that the site be rezoned to R-4 (High Density Residential). This R-4 zoning would set the development standards for the site at a maximum height of 55 feet. The Developer has requested a 48 foot height approval but that could be changed through the subsequent Site Review process that does not require public input. The allowance of R-4 zoning on this Phase One application/project would set a precedent allowing the Developer to request the same R-4 zoning for Phases 2 and 3 of this project which are sure to follow if this initial application is approved. R-4 zoning significantly inhibits the enjoyment of open space which is a major value of this community and the surrounding area.

3. Site Development Plan Review. The proposed Site Review process allows for changes to be made without a public hearing, i.e. public input of interested and impacted concerns in the area. Given all the confusion caused by and preferential treatment given to EHB Companies during the past 15 months (multiple competing applications; public meetings which never allowed for gathering of surrounding community concerns; very poorly defined Development Agreements to protect the right of the City and surrounding residents; allowance of last minute application changes causing confusion and curtailing public voice; confusing application descriptions that precluded some Planning Commissions from fully understanding upon what was being voted), the best interests of our City and community can be upheld by ensuring the public hearing right and allowing public voice to be heard.

4. Flood Plain Study. The technical drainage study is not yet complete and will not be completed for at least another 12-18 months. As such, there is no way to understand at this voting time what drainage improvements will be required upstream in the current natural drainage arroyos into the "funnel drain" underneath the intersection of Alta Drive and S. Rampart Boulevard to allow for the safe development of this 17.49 acre project.

5. Schools. Impacted schools in the area are already at 160% capacity without considering the effects of the proposed development. The developer and Planning Commission have known about this fact since receiving the impact statement from school officials in February 2016 but have denied receiving input until mid-October. No agreement has been reached with school officials about how to rectify the impact the proposed development would bring.

6. NRS 278A. The Badlands Golf Course that EHB Companies purchased is tightly integrated with the Queensridge and Queensridge Towers communities. There is an approved Master Plan that has governed the land use of this property since 1992 including critical open space for flood drainage and highly valued community enjoyment. The City maintains that NRS 278A, which would provide substantial approval rights to existing community residents re. subsequent development of the Golf Course, does not apply because the City did not approve its use in Las Vegas. While I fully respect the difficult role and strong integrity of Mr. Jerbic and other governing city officials, it is hard to understand how the City of Las Vegas believes it has the authority to override the implementation and legal enforcement of a mandated state statute. Not enforcing this important protection granted by the State of Nevada significantly lessens the strong appeal of master communities in the state and encourages wealth grabs at the expense of existing residents who paid a premium for the protection of

ROR001030

23309

living in a master community.

Again, I strongly urge you to vote NO on the Badlands Golf Course Redevelopment Applications before you on November 16th. Please vote to protect our Open Space, the appeal of the Badlands Golf Course area and the rights of my Master Community. I look forward to speaking before you on November 16th and hearing your disapproval of the three applications.

**Very Respectfully,**

**Ronald J. Iversen**  
9324 Verlaine Court  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

---

ROR001031

**23310**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge Resident does not support rezoning of Badlands Golf Course  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:37:25 AM

---

**From:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:30 PM  
**To:** Brad Jerbic; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge Resident does not support rezoning of Badlands Golf Course

fyi



**CAROLYN G. GOODMAN, MAYOR**

Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

*City Hall is closed on Fridays*

---

**From:** Bob Beers  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:24 PM  
**To:** 'cjohnson1@aol.com'  
**Cc:** Carolyn G. Goodman; [lynn@queensridgehoa.com](mailto:lynn@queensridgehoa.com); [shughes@gcmaslaw.com](mailto:shughes@gcmaslaw.com); John Bear; Vicky Skilbred  
**Subject:** RE: Queensridge Resident does not support rezoning of Badlands Golf Course

Thanks for writing, Mr. Johnson.

Unfortunately, the land has been zoned residential from before you moved next to it. I am not sure where you heard it was zoned "PARKS/ OPEN SPACE". The only legal way for the city to prevent development under the existing entitlement would be for the city to purchase the land, at current market value, in a process called inverse condemnation, and that would not be fair to all the other taxpayers in the city.

Every one of the purchase agreements I have seen have disclosure statements, initialed by the purchaser, stating that the community has no interest in the golf course land, and that it can go away. Have you checked yours? If the person you bought it from misrepresented the transaction, you may have recourse against them. I would recommend consulting an attorney.

The existing zoning is roughly quarter- to half-acre lots up and down the existing 250 acres. Existing homeowners should expect a lot the same size as theirs and a house the same size as theirs will be built behind them. The owner is suggesting that the alternative plan would provide more value to more people over the long-term compared to moving forward with the existing zoning, but they are ready to do that if the city says no to the alternative, and have already met with staff on it. The map from that meeting was requested by your HOA's representatives. Did they share it with you? The choice for the City Council is which of those two development plans will retain the most property value for the neighborhood.

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

ROR001032

23311

I am sorry for the loss of your view. Development of Badlands seems a certainty, though your HOA or an individual homeowner may yet present a legal argument to intercede. I would note that such a contractual right at Silverstone Ranch elsewhere in city limits has resulted in that golf course being dry and abandoned for over a year now. I would hate to see that happen here.

Bob Beers  
Las Vegas City Councilman Ward 2

**From:** [cjohnson1@aol.com](mailto:cjohnson1@aol.com) [mailto:[cjohnson1@aol.com](mailto:cjohnson1@aol.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 15, 2016 12:48 PM  
**To:** Bob Beers  
**Cc:** Carolyn G. Goodman; [lynn@queensridgehoa.com](mailto:lynn@queensridgehoa.com); [shughes@gcmastlaw.com](mailto:shughes@gcmastlaw.com)  
**Subject:** Queensridge Resident does not support rezoning of Badlands Golf Course

November 15, 2016

City Councilman Beers:

I am an owner of 9812 Winter Palace in Queenridge South. My house borders the Badlands Golf Course that was recently sold to a property developer. I am writing to you for 3 reasons:

- (1) I am 100% against re-development of the Badlands Golf Course and **do not support rezoning** of the Golf Course from "PARKS/ OPEN SPACE" to "RESIDENTIAL (regardless of density)."
- (2) I urge the city to **not approve rezoning at this time**, and
- (3) I have lost about \$240,000 in home value due to date due to the redevelopment actions taken by the property developer. More value will be lost if any or all of the requested rezoning is approved.

**Do not approve rezoning at this time.** There is little if any desire for rezoning and redevelopment of Badlands Golf Course by *any entity* other than the developer. Las Vegas has excess housing inventory and insufficient water. Moreover, the developer purchased the golf course with the existing zoning in place. It is not the responsibility of City Administration to enable a speculative developer to realize value at the expense of City residents. We lack answers to simple questions such as (a) Why does this rezoning need to be approved at this time? and (b) If rezoning is approved, who will compensate homeowners for their loss in home values?

At the October 6, 2016 Badlands Informational Meeting in City Hall[1][1], a Queensridge homeowner asked "Who will pay us for the lost value of our homes as a result of this redevelopment." The response from the developer was "I cannot comment on it." When pressed repeatedly by the homeowner, the developer responded, "We do not believe that (your homes will decrease in value)."

The Queensridge homeowner was verklempt. She asked "With all the clanging and banging during construction and changes from a golf course view to a view of multifamily residential units, who will compensate homeowners for their lost value?"

Again, the developer responded "We do not believe that will be the case."

**Loss of Value:** I along with other homeowners have lost home value as a result of the changes being sought by the developer. More value will be lost if rezoning is approved. I have been advised by multiple real estate appraisers that the *possible* redevelopment of the Golf Course has reduced the value of my home on Winter Palace by \$240,000 as of November 1, 2016. City approval of rezoning will cause the value of my home to decrease even more.

ROR001033

23312

I do not believe the developer's conclusions, views, or opinions during the Informational Meeting(s). I paraphrase my fellow homeowner, "***Does the developer think I am an idiot?***" Please do not approve rezoning. If the City does approve this rezoning I demand to be compensated by the developer for my loss of home value.

Sincerely,

Christian C. Johnson  
9812 Winter Palace Drive  
Las Vegas, NV 89145

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[1][1] This meeting can be viewed at  
<https://livestream.com/cityoflasvegas/events/6388973/videos/138057939>

---

ROR001034

**23313**

**From:** Tom Perrigo  
**To:** Carman Burney  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge Resident does not support rezoning of Badlands Golf Course  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:38:59 AM

---

**From:** cjohnson1@aol.com [mailto:cjohnson1@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 15, 2016 12:58 PM  
**To:** Tom Perrigo  
**Cc:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian  
**Subject:** Queensridge Resident does not support rezoning of Badlands Golf Course

November 15, 2016

Director Tom Perrigo:

I am an owner of 9812 Winter Palace in Queenridge South. My house borders the Badlands Golf Course that was recently sold to a property developer. I am writing to you for 3 reasons:

- (1) I am 100% against re-development of the Badlands Golf Course and do not support rezoning of the Golf Course from "PARKS/ OPEN SPACE" to "RESIDENTIAL (regardless of density)."
- (2) I urge the city to not approve rezoning at this time, and
- (3) I have lost about \$240,000 in home value due to date due to the redevelopment actions taken by the property developer. More value will be lost if any or all of the requested rezoning is approved.

Do not approve rezoning at this time. There is little if any desire for rezoning and redevelopment of Badlands Golf Course by any entity other than the developer. Las Vegas has excess housing inventory and insufficient water. Moreover, the developer purchased the golf course with the existing zoning in place. It is not the responsibility of City Administration to enable a speculative developer to realize value at the expense of City residents. We lack answers to simple questions such as (a) Why does this rezoning need to be approved at this time? and (b) If rezoning is approved, who will compensate homeowners for their loss in home values?

At the October 6, 2016 Badlands Informational Meeting in City Hall[1][1], a Queensridge homeowner asked "Who will pay us for the lost value of our homes as a result of this redevelopment." The response from the developer was "I cannot comment on it." When pressed repeatedly by the homeowner, the developer responded, "We do not believe that (your homes will decrease in value)."

The Queensridge homeowner was verklempt. She asked "With all the clanging and banging during construction and changes from a golf course view to a view of multifamily residential units, who will compensate homeowners for their lost value?"

Again, the developer responded "We do not believe that will be the case."

Loss of Value: I along with other homeowners have lost home value as a result of the changes being sought by the developer. More value will be lost if rezoning is approved. I have been advised by multiple real estate appraisers that the possible redevelopment of the Golf Course has reduced the value of my home on Winter Palace by \$240,000 as of November 1, 2016. City approval of rezoning will cause the value of my home to decrease even more.

---

I do not believe the developer's conclusions, views, or opinions during the Informational Meeting(s). I

ROR001035

23314

paraphrase my fellow homeowner, *"Does the developer think I am an idiot?"* Please do not approve rezoning. If the City does approve this rezoning I demand to be compensated by the developer for my loss of home value.

Sincerely,

Christian C. Johnson  
9812 Winter Palace Drive  
Las Vegas, NV 89145

---

[1][1] This meeting can be viewed at  
<https://livestream.com/cityoflasvegas/events/6388973/videos/138057939>

ROR001036

**23315**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:44:53 AM

---

**From:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 12:39 PM  
**To:** Debra Kaner  
**Cc:** Brad Jerbic; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** RE: Queensridge development

Thanks, Debbie, for your email and input.  
My best to the family.  
Carolyn



**CAROLYN G. GOODMAN, MAYOR**

Las Vegas City Hall  
495 S. Main Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

(702)229-6241

*City Hall is closed on Fridays*

---

**From:** Debra Kaner [<mailto:debkaner@cox.net>]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 11, 2016 12:59 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Subject:** Queensridge development

Dear Mayor Goodman,

Hoping you and your family are well. We last spoke at "Breakfast with The Mayor" many months ago, where you suggested we meet with Mr. Lowie to reach some compromise. Well, here we are with no additional input from the Developer since the neighbors on our street met with him.

Consequently, I urge you to require a compromise on Development Area 3 and consider how it would look like to the many homeowners, as myself, who are horribly and disproportionately impacted by the high density Development plan that will abut our homes.

I urge you to consider the homeowners'/ taxpayers' positions, and require an **open space transition zone** that is now called Development Area 3. There **already exists a concrete path for golf carts** that could extend the perimeter. The area could be a walking trail, or a dog path, or a jogging trail, or a bike trail or a children's park, but NOT a road and potential 12 foot wall.

This would maintain a remnant of the surrounding natural beauty of Nevada for which we, in our master planned community, have all paid premiums, and higher taxes to enjoy.

~~I am confused by the sets of applications that were acted on at the Planning Commission and~~  
it is stressful trying to understand all these abeyances. Since there does not appear to be a

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 P

ROR001037

23316

Development Agreement, then I am trying to understand if there are no longer any restrictions of height and distance, which the Planning Commission was sensitive to. I urge you, as our elected official, to protect the homeowners of 18+ years from piecemeal development that is not compatible with our beautiful Queensridge community. Please do what is right for our community.

Thanks, Debby  
Debra Kaner  
660 Ravel Ct.  
89145.

---

ROR001038

**23317**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:54:15 AM

---

**From:** Debra Kaner [mailto:debkaner1@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 11, 2016 12:42 PM  
**To:** Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Queensridge development

Dear Councilman Perrigo,

I am a 35 year resident of Las Vegas and an original Queensridge homeowner. I recently retired from CCSD and have been trying to downsize and sell my house. Most of us have had to remove our listings, or turn our homes into rental property because who would want to face years and years of construction noise and dirt? I urge you to consider a compromise on Area 3 of the Development plan, and how that would effect the many homeowners/taxpayers, as myself, who are horribly and disproportionally impacted by the high density Development plan that will about our homes.

I urge you to require an **open space transition zone** that is now called Development Area 3. There **already exists a concrete path for golf carts** that could extend the perimeter. The area could be a walking trail, or a dog path, or a jogging trail, or a bike trail but NOT a road and potential 12 foot wall. This would maintain a remnant of the surrounding natural beauty of Nevada for which we have all paid higher taxes to enjoy. I remain confused by the sets of applications that were acted on at the Planning Commission and it is stressful trying to understand all these abeyances. Since there does not appear to be a Development Agreement, then I am trying to understand if there are no longer any restrictions of height and distance, which the Planning Commission was sensitive to. You, as our elected official, need to protect the homeowners of 18+ years from piecemeal development that is not compatible with our beautiful Queensridge community. Please do what is right for our community.

Debra Kaner  
660 Ravel Ct.  
89145

---

ROR001039

**23318**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW:  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:55:22 AM

---

---

**From:** Dianna Bassett [mailto:dbassett8@cox.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 11, 2016 9:58 AM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman  
**Cc:** Steven Ross; santhonly@lasvegasnevada.gov; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:**

Kathy Keck  
912 Granger Farm Way  
Las Vegas, NV. 89145  
Home: 702-255-2250  
Cell: 702-683-8067  
[kkeck@cox.net](mailto:kkeck@cox.net)

Dear Mayor Goodman and Council members,  
As a 20 year resident of Queensridge I would like to register my opinion as vehemently opposed to the proposal of development of the high density housing on the Badlands Golf Course. High density housing would only add to traffic congestion of the area and strain on schools and other services of the area, diminishing the quality of life of residents in the area.

Respectfully,  
Kathy Keck



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001040

23319

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Golf Course building application  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:58:42 AM

---

---

**From:** Vincent [mailto:vladona@me.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 3:19 PM  
**To:** Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Badlands Golf Course building application

I don't want to take any more of your time than necessary but I feel it's imperative to let you know that I STRONGLY OPPOSE the application for Phase One of land use on the Badlands Golf Course. Our concern is that this will of course be only the opening event (the proverbial camel's nose under the tent) which will lead to the complete destruction of the lifestyle of the Queensridge Community. As our representative we urge your effort on this topic.

Thank you for your time.

Vincent Latona

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001041

23320

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: BADLANDS GOLF COURSE DEVELOPMENT  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:54:47 AM

---

**From:** Irwin Malzman [mailto:icmalz@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 11, 2016 12:04 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** BADLANDS GOLF COURSE DEVELOPMENT

**I AM ADAMANTLY OPPOSED TO ANY DEVELOPMENT ON THE  
BADLANDS GOLF COURSE.**

--  
*Irwin Malzman*  
9332 Fontainebleu Dr.  
Las Vegas, NV 89145

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001042

**23321**

November 16, 2016

To the Las Vegas City Council:

I have been an Orthopaedic surgeon, practicing in Las Vegas for the past 28 years. I moved to Queensridge eleven years ago because of its location, near my kids' school, and the beauty and serenity of the golf course environment.

Three years later the value of my house dropped 40 percent in the subprime mortgage debacle. After that, home values in Queensridge were inching up until June of 2015 when it became public knowledge that an investor group, EHB, had purchased the 250 acre golf course with the water rights for \$15 million (\$60,000 per acre) and intended to develop it into home sites and high density apartment complexes. When that was announced, everyone in Queensridge immediately lost at least 20 percent of the values of their homes.

In September of 2015 EHB's underhanded scheme to push their plan through the City Planning Commission without notifying the Queensridge homeowners was revealed. This devious act, and subsequent behavior on the part of EHB engendered uncertainty in the real estate market and has kept our home values depressed. It appears to many of us that the developers believe they have the right to develop the golf course in any way they see fit to maximize the return on their investment. They only pay lip service to the homeowners' concerns.

In its current form EHB's plan will devastate home values and the quality of life in Queensridge. But it's impact won't stop there. The density of the development in area of Alta and Rampart will overwhelm the infrastructure causing severe traffic congestion on Rampart. Ingress and egress into the proposed development are not and will not be adequate. The proposed apartment complexes will have a density of 41 units per acre with some less than 600 square feet in size. There is nothing that comes close to that density anywhere near Queensridge.

It is also not clear whether EHB even has the will to follow through with its plan to develop the course into estate lots. People I've talked to in the real estate business are doubtful that there will be a market for those expensive properties in this location. If EHB can't sell the lots for estates they may decide to divide them into smaller parcels or tracts. We homeowners really have no idea what will be in our back yards! The uncertainty of this ill-defined project is alarming.

Like most homeowners, my home is my biggest investment. This development plan represents no less than a huge transfer of wealth from Queensridge owners to EHB who bought the golf course at a fire sale price. The treatment we have received from EHB is patently unfair. The beleaguered homeowners of Queensridge deserve a break and some protection from our elected leaders on the city council.

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001043

23322

James Manning, M.D.  
9728 Verlaine Ct  
Las Vegas, NV 891218

---

ROR001044

**23323**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Redevelopment Project  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 12:01:58 PM

---

**From:** Abraham Nagy [mailto:nagyaj@nvhi.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 9:43 AM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Badlands Redevelopment Project

I am a community member of Queensridge and I am writing to you to strenuously object to the Badlands Redevelopment Project.

People who bought homes in Queensridge did so with the understanding that a golf course will remain the centerpiece of the development. The original intent of the design of Queensridge was to maintain a golf course in perpetuity of the housing area. The developers of the Badlands Redevelopment Project have exploited poorly worded terminology in zoning laws to advance their desire to profit at the expense of others.

Due the proposed plans of development, I have been unable to sell my home as I live on the golf course. The only way I could sell my home is if I take a substantial financial loss on the property and this is impractical.

The impact the housing development proposed will be substantial to the community. Although traffic studies have been reported stating that the impact will be minimal, for those of us who live in the area, we already know the traffic has already become congested and dangerous in the area. The proposed plan will only further make this situation worse.

I am vigorously asking that you please reject the Badlands Redevelopment Project.

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM JIM NAGY, M.D.  
NEVADA HEADACHE INSTITUTE  
8285 WEST ARBY AVENUE, SUITE 320  
LAS VEGAS, NV 89113  
TEL: (702) HEADACHE  
(702) 432-3224  
FAX: (702) 749-7146  
WEB: [NEVADAHEADACHE.COM](http://NEVADAHEADACHE.COM)

Submitted after final agency

Date 11/16/16 Ref 101-107

ROR001045

23324

A letter to those who care:

11/14/2016

The Queensridge HOA membership continues to determine as 'unacceptable' the changes proposed to the Badlands Golf Course, which weaves through the development. The lack of solid information as to the entire proposal, which now appears to be done piece-meal has placed HOA members on alert and made them very skeptical of any proposal.

The underlying bitterness is a direct result of the lack of trust the HOA has for EHB, the Badlands owners and developers. EHB initially displayed and discussed the transformation of the Badlands Golf Course property from a golf course to a variety of residential areas with varying density. After several meetings which included shouting matches and the inability to hear and understand the various proposals, EHB has 'taken their ball and left.' This while threatening the residents with what they would do if we did not go along with their plan. As a result, the skepticism shown EHB continues after HOA members were told they would lose the golf course, an integral part of the community. The high density and uncertainty of projects on the golf course acreage is at the very least disconcerting.

As the process winds through the courts and endures city council votes, the outcome remains uncertain, other than it's going to take extensive time and money to settle this impasse. We have yet to see Environmental Impact Statements, flood control plans or a traffic study, stating the impact resulting from thousands of new residents added to an already very congested area.

We have a right to expect a certain quality of life that is not marred by continual construction and a plethora of unknowns and an end result that is questionable. Our community was built on quiet, uncrowded and open spaces, to change this now is not acceptable.

This is not golf course parcel owners wanting something to compensate them for their golf course loss. Rather, it is about all of us losing our community to high density, heavy traffic, potential flooding issues, overcrowding of schools and years of disruptive construction.

Concerned Queensridge HOA Members

Neal and Linda Painter

301 Selfridge Street

Las Vegas, NV 89145

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

p

ROR001046

23325

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands destruction and Queensridge from Leslie Parraguirre  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:41:59 AM

---

**From:** Leslie Parraguirre [<mailto:lgp@lvcolours.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 4:05 PM  
**To:** Bob Beers  
**Cc:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** RE: Badlands destruction and Queensridge from Leslie Parraguirre

Dear Bob;

Why of course I am familiar with the shared map from the HOA. It would be why I contacted my Councilman and Mayor.  
Again it is not clear to all those concerned.

I respectfully ask that full schematics in color with more master plan and architectural detail be submitted. After all per your words below, new dwellings would "be backing up to the existing" residents that paid premiums for those lots. What will they be looking at? It is unclear to all I have visited with over the past several months and remains so.

I had also heard you were on the side of this development so I'd say respectfully, sir, I am not surprised at your response.

How very sad that you cannot simply ask for the best possible presentation so we all know where the chips fall at the end of the day.

Good Day;  
Leslie Parraguirre

---

**From:** Bob Beers [<mailto:bbeers@LasVegasNevada.GOV>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 9:18 AM  
**To:** Leslie Parraguirre  
**Cc:** John Bear; Vicky Skilbred  
**Subject:** RE: Badlands destruction and Queensridge from Leslie Parraguirre

Mrs. Parraguirre –

Thank you for writing.

I have not heard the developers say the alternative to the proposal before us this week is dormancy. On the contrary, they have already had a pre-application meeting with staff to start the wheels turning on exercising the existing zoning. This would be lots and houses of equivalent size backing up to all current dwellings on the course, and then wherever any more can fit. The only legal way

Submitted after final agenda.

Date 11/16/16 Room 101-107 p

ROR001047

23326

for the city to prevent development under the existing entitlement would be for the city to purchase the land, at current market value, in a process called inverse condemnation, and that would not be fair to all the other taxpayers in the city.

The existing zoning is roughly quarter- to half-acre lots up and down the existing 250 acres. Existing homeowners should expect one or two lots the same size as theirs with a house the same size as theirs abutting their property. The owner is suggesting that the alternative plan would provide more value to more people over the long-term compared to moving forward with the existing zoning, but they are ready to do that if the city says no to the alternative, and have already met with staff on it. The map from that meeting was requested by your HOA's representatives. Did they share it with you?

Development of Badlands seems a certainty, unless your HOA or an individual homeowner has a legal argument. I would note that such a contractual right at Silverstone Ranch elsewhere in city limits has resulted in the property being dry and abandoned for over a year now.

Access for construction will not be through the existing HOA gates. You should not notice much impact on an interior lot.

Bob Beers  
Las Vegas City Council, Ward 2

**From:** Leslie Parraguirre [<mailto:lpp@lvcolours.com>]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 13, 2016 1:36 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; [sgross@lasvegasnevadaa.gov](mailto:sgross@lasvegasnevadaa.gov); Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Badlands destruction and Queensridge from Leslie Parraguirre

Honorable Goodman and fellow councilmen,

While I know many of you, I have not weighed in to date about this issue surrounding our home in Queensridge South.

I am just now aware of the meeting during business hours this week, ( which I might add seems very oddly scheduled considering the gravity of this issue),and will be in flight therefore unable to personally attend. I hope this email will be read and taken seriously as I helped to design all of Queensridge along with the Peccole family, Mark Fine and many other qualified community design professionals over 15 years ago. I also worked on the international team developing Park Towers with the Molaskys and Mark Fine.

---

For those who do not know my background, I have been an Interior Design

ROR001048

23327

Professional, having owned three successful companies over the past 39 years. Colours, Inc., is located downtown and will be 30 years old in 2017. I carry a general contractors license, class B, and am registered with the state fire Marshall's office. We design luxury estates, commercial properties as well as handle model home merchandising. I am a lifelong Las Vegan. Our daughter is a 5<sup>th</sup> generation Parraguirre Nevadan.

The concept of this development of Badlands and all of the rather vague drawings and materials I have reviewed leave me wondering.....Why are my city fathers and Madam not asking for far more detailed schematics not only in plan view, clearly defining the greenbelts, infrastructure of egress, roads, fire access, crash gates; not to mention full details of what this development will look like vertically with the help of elevations and exterior color palettes?

No wonder all of the residents are shook up! They cannot be expected to understand the project let alone the absurd density, without FAR more details. This is most important to you, the council, to have the benefit of a clear picture and allow yourselves on our behalf to truly make an informed decision!

I follow the philosophy of "Holistic" design in urban planning; harmonious design is critical. Our entire city and county is filled with bad examples of quick decisions of the past. We have benefited from those mistakes in the planning of our city and county in recent years, by demanding full schematics from developers looking it "insert" mass density into a large existing communities thoughtfully planned out by those that came before them.

Queensridge residents are requesting a clear and informed picture and I fully agree. It has always been expected in my work and I see this as far more important an issue. It greatly effects our home and estate values and could destroy the designed continuity we so carefully planned years ago to ensure we would offer a gated community beautifully designed for years to come.

There really should NOT be any rental properties as suggested in the Phase one condo space. There are rentals being built at warp speed all around us. Phase three as well as any area adjacent to the existing course owned sites should truly be deeded to greenbelt, featuring trees transplanted and saved from the golf course. Steve Wynn did this, so be thoughtful in asking the same of this developer, please.

---

ROR001049

23328

To be clear we do not live on the course. We have an interior lot in San Michelle on a ½ acre parcel. I suppose I could say nothing because I am not on the course like those most affected, but I clearly know the trickledown effect this will have on us, not to mention how this entire deconstruction and debris will impact our daily lives.

In Closing, I want to share a comment made directly to me by one of the investors of this project; “ You better get your friends to agree to our plan or we will just let'er go dormant...becoming your own wasteland”. Charming.

I greatly appreciate your taking the time to read my opinion. Maybe this can't be stopped but certainly you can demand a fully developed schematic package; in plans and full elevations and exterior materials boards to feel fully informed and to help us, the residents, that have been here for a very long time to feel like this will be a benefit not a detriment. Knowledge is truly power.

Sincerely;

*Lgparraquirre*

Leslie G. Parraguirre

---

ROR001050

**23329**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Queensridge  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:33:55 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Pi7ru [<mailto:pi7ru@aol.com>]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 10:08 PM  
To: Tom Perrigo  
Subject: Queensridge

Please, Mr. Perrigo, Vote NO on Mr. Yohan distroying Queensridge. I live here. It is my home.  
Rosalind Ruth Pike - 801 Aquitaine Court, 89145

Sent from my iPad

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001051

23330

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Golf Course Development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:37:35 AM

---

---

**From:** L Prock [mailto:jabberjaws1830@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:27 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Badlands Golf Course Development

Mayor Goodman and City Council members

I purchased my home in Queensridge, on the golf course, in September, 2014. I paid a premium for my property. I am a widow and felt that Queensridge would be the perfect place to spend my last years.

I was not told that the golf course would be sold and developed until January, 2015. I am very upset that you would allow a development in the middle of such a prestigious community as Queensridge.

I DO NOT want 61 houses developed behind my property, nor do I want to see all the congestion at the corner of Rampart and Alta with the building of 2,400 multifamily units, 200 assisted-living units and 75 single-family estate properties on larger lots, plus 2 towers.

All of the peace and tranquility that I imagined would come with purchasing my home in Queensridge is about to come to an end. Please do not let this happen to our Queensridge community!! When will Mr Lowie ever present a complete plan for what he proposes for the Badlands Golf Course? His ideas change every month!

LoisAnn Prock  
9817 Queen Charlotte Dr

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001052

23331

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: I request that you vote against the rezoning requests related to the Badlands golf course.  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 12:01:31 PM

---

**From:** Joan Silverstein [mailto:matschka1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 2:02 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** I request that you vote against the rezoning requests related to the Badlands golf course.

I want to express my concern and dismay about the rezoning proposals to be voted on for the Badlands golf course. I strongly oppose the proposal. The proposal is based on a number of deceptions and questionable assumptions, including the following:

- We were told that the developer had purchased the golf course and then determined that it was not profitable as a golf course. However, based on the testimony of his architect at the Planning Commission meeting, he had been exploring options for housing on the site for at least one year before that. .
- The developer has claimed that he had to convert the golf course to houses and condominiums because he said that the golf course was not attracting golfers. However, based on the testimony of residents at the hearing, Badlands has been one of the busiest, most successful golf courses in Las Vegas.
- The developer is being granted 30 years to complete the project. The is at least 10 years more than is traditionally granted for the completion of similar projects. This is even more of a concern because of the vagueness of the proposal, which allows him to make changes after the proposal is approved.,
- There was no school study approved before the project was presented to the Planning Commission. At the meeting, the school district informed us that they would work with the developer, but no plans were discussed before the meeting and, to my knowledge, has not yet occurred. Given the large number of students that could be added to the district by the project, this is a vague promise. More schools or more sessions may be required, but none of this is known.
- There was a supposed traffic study. However, based on the testimony of people who live and work in the area, it is questionable that the area can support the increased traffic.
- We were told that there will be no disruption to the residents currently living in Queensridge. However, disruption has already begun and can now continue for up to 30 years, based the proposal. For example, housing prices have dropped significantly since the rumors began. Residents who are trying to sell their homes are not able to do so unless they substantially lower their price. Even with a lowered price, it is difficult to attract buyers. This also creates a hardship for those of us who remain because of the drop in equity in our homes. For those of us who are middle class and retired, this represents a significant loss in our retirement savings.

I strongly urge you to vote against these proposals.

Very truly yours,

Joan Silverstein, Ph.D.  
916 Granger Farm Way

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

P

ROR001053

23332

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Badlands Development Applications  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:57:23 AM

---

**From:** Anne Smith [mailto:[anne@smithculp.com](mailto:anne@smithculp.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 10, 2016 4:12 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Lois Tarkanian  
**Cc:** Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** Proposed Badlands Development Applications

To: Mayor Goodman and City Council Members

We are strongly opposed to all the applications being considered at the City Council Meeting on Wednesday, October 16, 2016 for the following reasons:

1. We own and live in one of the 7 single family houses on Ravel Court that immediately abut the proposed high-density development. Even though the developer has withdrawn original applications relating to the 250 acres he is asking for R4 zoning in this area known as the Seventies and there is no Development Agreement associated with the remaining applications. So, it is a moving target and very confusing to us. It looks like there will be no height/setback/ road restrictions if these applications are approved. We are strongly opposed to the applications coming before you on October 16, 2016 as they will allow the Developer to build multi-story buildings immediately next to our houses. This is the highest density zoning that would be approved anywhere in the City and is not compatible nor harmonious with an existing master planned community. Never mind the fact that it is enclosed inside the Queensridge Master Planned Community. You would be allowing the developer to come back later and propose more high density and high-rise condos right within a few feet of our homes, and be setting a precedent for similar rezoning in other master planned communities in Las Vegas. The impact to our house and property values is already devastating. We are not rich people as has been portrayed on social media and to the media, we are regular working people whose personal

---

Submitted after final agency

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001054

23333

value is tied up in our homes. Even if we were willing to sell at the 20-30% depreciation that has occurred since the announcement of this development, no one is interested and no offers have been made to sellers who for personal reasons need to sell.

2. We are very concerned that adding an ultimate 2400 residences and 4000- 5000 people in the middle of our existing community of 2000 people will destroy the quality of life that we enjoy and that prompted us to move to our Queensridge home over 18 years ago. He also intends to tear up the entire open space during the next 15-20 years of construction causing dust, noise and environmental impacts. Your predecessors had great foresight in approving a master plan with designated open space in the midst of a growing population. We urge you to preserve this open space. Although we know we were not guaranteed a golf course in perpetuity, the General Plan shows the area in question would be parks/recreation open space.
3. As you consider proposed development and associated zoning changes, we urge you to deny the current applications and require a truly open process for public/existing Queensridge resident concerns to be heard and addressed in a manner much more responsive and meaningful way before any application is resubmitted. **Our severely impacted street is disproportionately impacted by the proposed high density (R-4) being proposed** compared to the rest of Queensridge and there has been **no mitigation** offered. The residents of Ravel Court met with the developer in February and asked for renderings of our post-development views so that we might discuss ways to mitigate the impacts. Despite repeated requests for such renderings, we have received nothing to this date. There was no sincere interest on the part of the developer to hear our concerns and what he could do to reduce the impact on us. The developer has shown you renderings of views from existing homes adjoining proposed multi-acre estate homes, which are not guaranteed. He didn't show you views of multi-story condos looming up behind our homes. It is not just the 7 homes on Ravel Court that would have multi-story condos immediately adjacent. Between Tudor Park, Fairway Point

ROR001055

23334

and Ravel Court there are at least 33 homes directly impacted by the dense, immediately adjacent multi-story development in area currently proposed to be zoned R4. Some of the Planning Commissioners were sensitive to the drastic impacts that high density development in the original Development Area 3 would have on these 33 homes when they suggested that consideration should be given to leaving Development Area 3 as an open space transition zone between the high-density development and our existing homes.

4. We also have many concerns with the developer's proposed design standards and the previously proposed developer agreement, which are moving targets and have changed too many times to count or keep up with. We have no certainty as to anything he will ultimately build.

We urge the City Council to hear and address our concerns so an acceptable solution can be reached.

Rosemary Anne Smith and Gordon L. Culp  
653 Ravel Court, LV 89145

---

ROR001056

**23335**

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: GPA-62387, ZON-62392, SDR62393  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:42:49 AM

---

---

**From:** JRSSTACEY@aol.com [mailto:JRSSTACEY@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 2:17 PM  
**To:** Carolyn G. Goodman; Steven Ross; Stavros Anthony; Ricki Y. Barlow; Bob Beers; Bob Coffin; Itarkanian@lasvegasnevada.gov; Tom Perrigo  
**Subject:** GPA-62387, ZON-62392, SDR62393

Dear City Counsel,

I am writing to voice my OPPOSITION to the above requested agenda items, which will alter the existing Master Plan of my community, Queensridge.

As a homeowner in Queensridge, I am extremely concerned and sickened about how this Rezoning and High Density Residential change will effect the following:

1. Traffic in the Rampart, Alta, Charleston, and Hualapai areas. As it is now, the traffic on Alta, which is constantly speeding over the 35 mile speed limit, makes it extremely difficult to exit the north gate. There are traffic accidents at Hualapai and Alta on a weekly basis, a young man was killed at this intersection just a couple of months ago.

The traffic on Rampart is in overload, with Boca Park, Tivoli Village, the Suncoast, and existing residential traffic. An Unbiased Traffic Study should be done before even considering approving an additional 720 units to this area.

2. The overcrowding this will cause in our local schools needs to be considered, since our classrooms are already overcrowded and under funded.

3. The added strain this would put on Fire, Police, & Emergency Medical Personnel. We no longer see traffic police checking for speeders, because they are spread too thin. A recent burglary in Queensridge was reported to Metro, it took them nearly an hour to respond.

4. The new flood control measures that have been verbally proposed will cause storm run-off to move at such a rapid speed as to cause severe flooding & damage to Queensridge.

5. Property values have dropped significantly in Queensridge, and with the Construction Traffic and Noise that this kind of development will bring for 10 to 15 years to come they will surely continue to drop. Lets face it, if this 720 units is approved, we residence in Queensridge are going to be fighting the first 4 applications on this property for the next 10 years.

Tripling the density of a completed Master Planned Community is unprecedented. We all know this is just the door opener for the remainder of the entire development of Badlands Golf Course.

PLEASE VOTE NO!!

Respectfully,  
Sandra Stacey 308 Kingsclear Court, Las Vegas, NV. 89145

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date: 11/16/16 Item: 101-107

P

ROR001057

23336

**From:** Tom Perrigo  
**To:** Caman Burney  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Golf Course Development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:40:18 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: tmsteffora [mailto:tmsteffora@cox.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 12:01 PM  
To: Tom Perrigo  
Subject: Badlands Golf Course Development

Mayor Goodman and members of the Las Vegas City Council,

My parents and I moved to Las Vegas, Nevada from the East coast in 1958. I had already learned, in kindergarten in Pennsylvania, about the "wide open spaces" out West. I have watched Las Vegas grow over the 58 years I have lived here. I chose Queensridge for the large lots and privacy. I purchased my home in Queensridge in May of 2002 for my Father and myself to be close to my place of employment. Now that I am retired I look forward to spending my days enjoying my home in the quiet, beautiful community of Queensridge. I understand that the Badlands golf course was never owned by the residents and was purchased by Yohan Lowie. How can Mr. Lowie say the golf course is losing money when there are new golf courses proposed for the valley? Maybe the golf course needs to be brought to a higher standard to attract golfers. I understand that the Badlands golf course was not guaranteed to be a part of our community for all eternity. However, I Do Not understand the need to develop such high density within the center of our community! There is no plan that has been presented by Mr Lowie for the development of the entire golf course that has not been changed numerous times. The original plan of The Preserve was to feature large estate lots, minimum of 1 acre with a maximum of 60 homes on 183.7 acre and 120 acres of open space. The latest proposal is to put 61 homes at the corner of Alta and Hualapai. The City needs to look at this development from the side of the homeowners and negotiate a plan that both sides agree on. The density of the entire project needs to be lowered. I cannot see where Alta, Charleston and Rampart / Fort Apache will ever be able to handle the additional traffic that 720 units will contribute to the streets, let alone the 3,000 +/- planned overall.

Sadly the values of our properties are declining due to all the uncertainty. Listed homes are not selling. This is Las Vegas, Nevada on the West Coast with plenty of space for construction! Please Do Not allow our community to become as congested and dense as the East Coast!

Thank you for listening to my voice on this life changing issue!

Tania M. Steffora  
301 Windfair Court

t

---

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107

10

ROR001058

23337

**From:** [Tom Perrigo](#)  
**To:** [Carman Burney](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Badlands Golf Course Proposed Development  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:56:07 AM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Beers  
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2016 4:50 PM  
To: 'yasmina@cox.net'; Tom Perrigo  
Cc: belinda@queensridgehoa.com; John Bear; Vicky Skilbred  
Subject: RE: Badlands Golf Course Proposed Development

Thanks for writing, Dr. Takieddine:

Unfortunately, the land has been zoned residential from before you moved next to it, and zoning trumps master plan, under Nevada law. The only legal way to prevent development under the existing zoning would be for the city to purchase the land, at current market value, in a process called inverse condemnation, and that would not be fair to all the other taxpayers in the city.

Every one of the purchase agreements I have seen have disclosure statements, initialed by the purchaser, stating that the community has no interest in the golf course land, and that it can go away. Have you checked yours?

The existing zoning is roughly quarter- to half-acre lots up and down the existing 250 acres. The owner is suggesting that the alternative plan would provide more value to more people over the long-term compared to moving forward with the existing zoning, but they are ready to do that if the city says no to the alternative, and have already met with staff on it. The map from that meeting was requested by your HOA's representatives. Did they share it with you?

I am sorry if you have suffered a drop in the value of your home due to the announced closure of the golf course, and the loss of the view is heartbreaking. Its development seems a certainty, though I continue to hope that your HOA or an individual homeowner has a legal argument. I would note that such a contractual right at Silverstone Ranch elsewhere in city limits has resulted in the property being dry and abandoned for over a year now.

Bob Beers  
Las Vegas City Councilman Ward 2

-----Original Message-----

From: yasmina@cox.net [<mailto:yasmina@cox.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2016 4:43 PM  
To: Tom Perrigo; yasmina@cox.net  
Cc: Stavros Anthony; Bob Coffin; belinda@queensridgehoa.com; Ricki Y. Barlow; Lois Tarkanian; cgoodman@lasvegasnevada.com; Bob Beers; Steven Ross  
Subject: RE: Badlands Golf Course Proposed Development

Dear The Honorable Mayor Goodman and Respectable City Council Members,

I, as many in our community, have been living with uncertainty and fear since we became aware of the potential developments on the Golf Course.

---

The proposed developments would certainly and significantly worsen traffic in our neighborhood, decimate our property value (estimated between 20-40%), and diminish the quality of our lives (living on a construction site versus a golf course). Furthermore, it would lead to the distortion of our lovely community by allowing the building

Submitted after final agenda

Date 11/16/16 Item 101-107 p

ROR001059

23338

of structures that are not harmonious with the standards (height/elevation & density) Queensridge was built on.

I paid more than a half million dollars to purchase my property in what I believed was a MASTER PLANNED COMMUNITY on a golf course. Is it fair that I now face the possibility of living on a construction zone for 5-20 years (as indicated by the developer) facing a perimeter wall?

Was I the victim of deception or that it the way it is? The interest of an individual law abiding citizen does not count while the interest of the developer with his/her millions do count.

I wish for second you all put yourselves in our shoes. Only then, you would begin to realize the mental anguish and emotional turmoil will all the uncertainties that I and many others have been going through.

The developer withdrew few applications without prejudice from the original application that were not approved by the Planning Commission during their meeting in October, 2016. Do we have to live in fear wondering about the new hidden agenda and schemes of the developer for years to come? The developer has monies and time to push his agenda that I do not have to protect my own interest.

I certainly hope that once for all you put an end to this ongoing saga.

We entrust you all to protect the interests of all citizens. I appeal to you not to gamble with our community and way of life. I am certain that all and every one of you would fight to protect his or her living community and neighborhood if or when you face such an uncertainty.

I sincerely hope that your re-affirm our faith in our official institutions by hearing our voices and not marginalizing or trivializing our fears and concerns. Fear and uncertainty are very destructive.

Respectfully Yours,

Marwan A. Takieddine, M.D.  
9332 Provence Garden Lane  
Las Vegas, NV 89145  
(C) (702) 498 - 9986

Nevada Kidney Disease & Hypertension Centers  
2420 Professional Court, Suite 150  
Las Vegas, NV 89128

Fax: 702/853-0096

ROR001060

23339