

Public Comment
03/03/2023 Board Retreat

From: [Planning Department](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Rachael Evanson](#)
Subject: FW: halt development approval until remove or rewrite CCMC 17.10
Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 11:49:09 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good morning,

Please see the Public Comment below for the March 3rd meeting.

Thank you,

Cecilia Rice

Community Development – Office Specialist
108 E. Proctor Street
775.887.2180
crice@carson.org



From: Ingrid Gilstrap <ingrid.gilstrap@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 10:15 AM
To: Planning Department <planning@carson.org>
Subject: halt development approval until remove or rewrite CCMC 17.10

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Mar 1, 2023

Dear Carson City Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,

I am dissatisfied with how CCMC 17.10 is being applied. I am writing this to show my support for the **removal or rewriting of CCMC 17.10** and ask for **no more developments** to be approved using that part of the code until it has been fixed.

17.10 should be removed or revised:

- a. using Carson City residents' involvement, such as a collaborative workshop, and
- b. should only allow for as many homesites that standard building codes under Title 18 would allow, including losses for streets/drainage/utilities/etc., and
- c. should require that original zoning of a parcel and original lot sizes should be of paramount importance which developers should have to honor, keeping infill projects compatible with adjoining neighborhoods.

I hope the Board and the Planning Commission, during their joint work session this Friday, Mar 3, 2023, will move forward, halting the approval of any developments based on CCMC 17.10 until it is

either amended or removed from the code.

Sincerely,

Ingrid M. Gilstrap
682 Norfolk Dr
Carson City, NV 89703
775-720-7082

From: [Bob Weise](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Title 17
Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 11:40:06 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Cathy & Bob Weise
1777 North Winnie Lane
Carson City, NV 89703

February 28, 2023

Dear Mayor Bagwell, Supervisors and Members of the Planning Commission,

Thank you all for taking the time to host this workshop on Title 17. I will be out of State during your meeting and I have strong feelings about this issue, so please consider the following comments.

I've been a member of the Carson City community for over 65 years and currently reside on Winnie Lane near Ash Canyon Road. I am also one of those dastardly people know as a land developer and I'm responsible for Lakeview Estates, Westwood and Lightning W Ranch. I tell you this because I strongly believe that property owners have the right to develop their land within the zoning and master plan designations. Having said that, I am equally adamant that "spirit" of both the zoning and master plan must be adhered to whenever development occurs.

Carson City is a special place, so much so, that is why we have chosen to live our remaining years here. My concern is that Title 17 is being abused and the "spirit" of open space has become a farce. Historically, land developers were NEVER allowed, nor did they expect, to receive entitlement to 100% development density based on the zoning. For example, if I owned 100 acres of land zoned for one-acre parcels, it was understood that after accounting for roadways, we would be lucky to get 85 one-acre parcels. The concept of creating open space was to provide a public benefit and not to be a tool for developers to receive a full allocation of density without regard to roadways or non-buildable areas. It is pretty simple, the smaller the lot, the less money a developer has to spend to extend sewer, water, utilities and roads.

There is land that is not developable due to constraints such as slope, flood plain, fault zones, wetlands, etc. Often the master plan and zoning didn't take these issues into consideration as they were designed to create compatibility and transition between different densities and land uses. When a developer buys land, they are well aware of these constraints and they should not be rewarded for full development densities by cramming small lots into limited usable areas, especially when these small lots are not compatible with the adjacent already developed neighborhood. It is not fair to those persons living on a one-acre lot (43,560 square feet) to have adjacent lots of 15,000 square feet. After all, what is the value of a one-acre lot vs. a 1/3 acre lot? Point being, the existing home owners adjacent to the high-density development are the real losers.

The spirit "open space" is clearly stated in 17.10.005 "to preserve or provide open space, protect natural, cultural and scenic resources", it cannot be drainage ditches, sidewalk and back yards. It needs to be real open space that can be enjoyed by the community and has value to the adjacent property owners. Before Title 17 can be utilized for a project, I believe some findings need to be made. The first finding that needs to be addressed is:

What public benefit will be realized by allowing smaller lots than otherwise would be allowed under the current zoning?

The second finding should be:

How may lots can be developed on the subject parcel using traditional mapping process?

My point with these findings is that to use Title 17 a developer must demonstrate substantial public benefit in creating smaller parcels, and the density allowed should not exceed the number of lots that can be developed under traditional subdivision mapping procedures.

The best example is the truly open space is at the South end of Longview between Kings Canyon and Washington St. There are grassy expanses where people can play with their kids and dogs, walking trails and a true sense of openness. Another example is Silver Oak. These lots are significantly smaller, yet the back yards of most of the properties are overlooking the vast open space of a golf course. What these two communities have in common is that they provide recreation and quality of life experiences that can be enjoyed by everyone in Carson City.

If you take a moment and read Section 17.10.005, the purpose of open space development, please keep this in mind - if you have a steep hillside, wetland, or canyonlands, those areas will ALWAYS be protected as Open, Natural, Cultural and Scenic areas because they are unusable! The idea of "creating open space" is to take usable land and creating trails and parks or other amenities that improve the quality of life in the development. Another example: A drainage space is NOT GREENBELT OR OPEN SPACE. At best it's public utility space and it can be in somebody's back yard or in a drainage easement, but PLEASE, IT'S A DRAINAGE DITCH NOT OPEN SPACE OR GREENBELT and it has to be there to allow for any kind of development - it's not an option to create drainage, it's a requirement for public safety that will be there regardless of the development regulations.

Sticking with this thought, Section 17.10.046 is silly. Why are private back yards considered open space? This provision should be removed. Also, Section 2.b should be increased from 100 SF to more like 1,000 square feet. Think about it, a development of 50 homes would have a population of 150 to 200+ people, and the developer only has to provide 5000 square feet of common open space, or an area 70 ft by 70 ft.

Open space should NOT have a three year maintenance plan, because what happens after three years? IT SHOULD BE PERPETUAL and the homeowners of that development need to pay for it, or the developer should set up a funding method for that purpose.

I am also concerned about the minimum setbacks stated under 17.10.030 for properties under 1 acre. Fifteen feet from the street and 10 feet from side is just too minimal, especially if the existing zoning was for parcels larger than ¼ acre.

Last but not least, transferring densities from parcels that are not contiguous, should NOT be allowed. If it is to be included, then extraordinary findings should be made on behalf of the public benefit, before such transfers are allowed.

Again, I apologize for not being able to attend this meeting and I thank you in advance for your consideration.

Kindest regards,

Bob Weise

From: [Mark Gilstrap](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: New Housing Developments in Carson City
Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 10:34:55 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to the way CCMC 17.10 is being used or interpreted in new Carson City housing developments. The new development between Mountain Street and Ormsby Boulevard is an example.

CCMC 17.10 should be revised with local community input to close the loopholes that allow developers to create smaller lot sizes and increase population density that is not in concert with the surrounding areas.

Only lot sizes under Title 18 should be allowed.

Original zoning of a parcel and lot sizes should be maintained and now allow exceptions to be taken by developers.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns at the meeting this Friday, March 3, 2023.

John Mark Gilstrap
682 Norfolk Drive
Carson City, NV 89703

From: [Ingrid Gilstrap](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: halt development approval until remove or rewrite CCMC 17.10
Date: Wednesday, March 1, 2023 10:30:13 AM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Mar 1, 2023

Dear Carson City Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,

I am dissatisfied with how CCMC 17.10 is being applied. I am writing this to show my support for the **removal or rewriting of CCMC 17.10** and ask for **no more developments** to be approved using that part of the code until it has been fixed.

17.10 should be removed or revised:

- a. using Carson City residents' involvement, such as a collaborative workshop, and
- b. should only allow for as many homesites that standard building codes under Title 18 would allow, including losses for streets/drainage/utilities/etc., and
- c. should require that original zoning of a parcel and original lot sizes should be of paramount importance which developers should have to honor, keeping infill projects compatible with adjoining neighborhoods.

I hope the Board and the Planning Commission, during their joint work session this Friday, Mar 3, 2023, will move forward, halting the approval of any developments based on CCMC 17.10 until it is either amended or removed from the code.

Sincerely,

Ingrid M. Gilstrap
682 Norfolk Dr
Carson City, NV 89703
775-720-7082

From: [Marcia Cuccaro](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Slaughterhouse
Date: Tuesday, February 28, 2023 12:17:49 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

Just to reiterate my former comments regarding the possibility of allowing a slaughterhouse in the vicinity of Carson City residences and businesses - NO!

There is plenty of land in uninhabited rural Nevada where a slaughterhouse would cause no issues (except to the animals living around it). There is no reason to put such a business near Carson City residents or businesses. Please vote NO - once and forever!

Marcia Cuccaro
1005 West Sunset Wau
Carson City, NV.