

November 29, 2016

Mayor Crowell and Carson City Supervisors,

I am writing you this letter on behalf of Shaheen Beauchamp Builders LLC voicing our support for the approval of The Vintage at Kings Canyon project.


In the interest of full disclosure, Shaheen Beauchamp Builders has a vested interest in seeing the project approved as we have been selected as the general contractor by the developer. We are appreciative and grateful to be a member of the construction team, and look to add this project to our resume.

Beyond our involvement with construction, we believe the project merits approval for many reasons. Following are some of the larger issues we feel will have a positive impact for Carson City:

- Positive property tax impact - The impact the project will have in terms of the property tax base is significant. Carson City will recognize a large increase in property tax revenue collected on 212 single family homes, the assisted and independent living project, and the associated retail component; vs. the historic low valuation of the current agricultural land.
- Construction jobs – the project represents a significant capital expenditure by the developer for the improvement of the land, homes, assisted and independent living project, and the proposed retail buildings. This will bring good paying construction jobs into Carson City. The ancillary effect of the expenditures by those men and women working on the project will translate into positive sales and other tax revenue for our community.
- Local commitment - Shaheen Beauchamp Builders will be committed to using as many Carson City based subcontractors, suppliers and businesses as possible for the construction of The Vintage at Kings Canyon.

Thank you for considering my comments noted above. I feel that the project's approval and commencement will have an overall positive impact upon Carson City's economic future by providing a quality residential development option for those seeking a new home in Carson City or needing the services provided by the assisted and independent living project that The Vintage at Kings Canyon will provide.

Respectfully,
Shaheen Beauchamp Builders LLC


Jeff Shaheen
Member

From: [Eva Chwalisz](#)
To: [Rachael Porcari](#)
Cc: [Janet Busse](#)
Subject: FW: Anderson Ranch- REALTORS
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 1:09:55 PM

Item 30A

From: Hope Sullivan
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 12:54 PM
To: Eva Chwalisz
Subject: Fwd: Anderson Ranch- REALTORS

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Vince Scott <vince@scottdevelopment.net>
Date: November 30, 2016 at 12:07:11 PM PST
To: Hope Sullivan <HSullivan@carson.org>
Cc: "mike@argentumnv.com" <mike@argentumnv.com>, Bruce Robertson <RobertsonB@naialliance.com>, Jeff Shaheen <Jeff@SBBuilders.com>, "Kirsten Moates" <kirsten@scottdevelopment.net>
Subject: Fw: Anderson Ranch- REALTORS

Hi Hope,

Please see below from the Board of Realtors.

Thanks

Vince Scott

NV/CA Broker, Certified Green Builder, CDRS, Expert Witness
CEO Scott Development Companies
Sierra Sotheby's International Realty

570 Lakeshore Blvd. | Incline Village, NV 89451
t 775-832-4900 | c 775-240-0241 Vince.scott@sothebysrealty.com

SierraSothebysRealty.com

Incline Village | South Lake Tahoe | Heavenly Village | Squaw Valley | Tahoe City | Tahoe Donner | Downtown Truckee

From: Heather Lunsford <heather@carraranv.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 11:30 AM

To: Kirsten Moates; Vince Scott

Cc: Aaron West

Subject: Anderson Ranch- REALTORS

Kirsten/Vince-

Please accept my apologies for not being able to meet with you this afternoon, I am home under the weather today with a very fun head cold.

Thanks for reaching out to me regarding the Anderson Ranch project that's heading to the Carson City Board of Supervisors this Thursday. To give you a little background, the Sierra Nevada Association of REALTORS® do not usually get involved in individual projects unless there is a policy related concern. They focus on the protection of private property rights relating to public policy. Basically, policy that effects they way they do business or homeownership. At this time, we see no policy concern with regard to your project as written and proposed in the documents provided in the Carson City Board of Supervisors agenda packet, therefore we will not take a formal position.

That being said, as the contract Lobbyist for the Sierra Nevada Association of REALTORS® I have lobbied the Board of Supervisors and they know where we stand on the project. The REALTORS® support providing opportunities for homeownership and see that the Anderson Ranch project demonstrates smart growth without stretching the infrastructure system as well as providing new opportunities for homeownership.

The REALTORS® appreciated working with you and your team throughout the process to avoid impact fees and are happy to work with you to address any concerns or questions you may have. Feel free to call me, number listed below.

I have copied Aaron West, CEO of the Nevada Builders Alliance on this email to share the REALTORS® position with him as well.

Thanks, and good luck tomorrow!
Heather

Heather Lunsford
Government Affairs Director
Carrara Nevada
(775) 842-5786
Heather@carrarany.com

From: [Eva Chwalisz](#)
To: [Rachael Porcari](#)
Cc: [Janet Busse](#)
Subject: FW: Forward to Mayor and other Supervisors as needed
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 1:10:15 PM

Item 30A

From: Hope Sullivan
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 12:54 PM
To: Eva Chwalisz
Subject: Fwd: Forward to Mayor and other Supervisors as needed

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Vince Scott <vince@scottdevelopment.net>
Date: November 30, 2016 at 11:46:55 AM PST
To: Bruce Robertson <RobertsonB@naialliance.com>
Cc: Hope Sullivan <HSullivan@carson.org>, Kirsten Moates <kirsten@scottdevelopment.net>, Mike Draper <mike@argentumnv.com>, "Mark Forsberg" <Mark@oshinskiforsberg.com>, Rebecca Bernier <rbernier@lumosinc.com>
Subject: Forward to Mayor and other Supervisors as needed

Hi Bruce,

I'm actually glad I was able to respond to this, because it reconfirms my feelings of how great this project will be for Carson City and the economy in general. If you can get this to the other Supervisors as well, it may address some of their concerns as well.

Thanks.

[Below are my responses the the questions from Andrea Fisher:](#)

Why is it some important to approve a development consisting of age and occupancy restricted high density housing that is not suited to the area?

Answer: Multiple Feasibility and Market Studies have shown that the "baby-boomer" market is increasing substantially and the demand for housing in Northern Nevada to meet these market needs is currently insufficient. Carson City has and will continue to be an affordable retirement option and now will have a HIGH quality housing option for ACTIVE adults.

Why is it necessary to have a concentration of senior citizens in the middle of the west side while historically existing neighborhoods have been quite diversified?

Answer: This project will target a diverse group of ACTIVE ADULTS from all over the region seeking an active retirement lifestyle, or non-retirement, but like the proximity to Lake Tahoe and surrounding areas and the laid back, tax friendly, Nevada living. By targeting this market, the project will generate less traffic, less crime, noise, impact to schools and generate a strong tax base with higher discretionary spending dollars spinning off into the community. As opposed to the alternative high density SFR project, without age-restriction.

Why is it difficult to understand that one of the most desirable residential areas in this city deserves to be developed with appropriate sized homes on appropriate sized lots?

Answer: These are appropriate sized, quality, single level, homes on appropriate sized lots. Because of the PUD style, zero lot line pads, the lots on paper seem small. However they are surrounded with a 30% open space buffer with low maintenance landscaped yards, front and back. So they will feel larger. The market is moving away from larger, high maintenance, low efficiency, multi-level homes and moving toward a higher efficiency, single level, lower maintenance style home of HIGH QUALITY. The average price per foot, including upgrades, will be nearly \$300 per foot, more than double that of the current surrounding neighborhood.

Why should congregate care facilities become part of this development, just because the developer has come up with the concept of "aging in place."

Answer: The concept of aging in place is not a new one, but is new to the Western United States. Again, surveys, numerous studies and analysis have shown that 1) People don't like to move and they get settled and attached to their communities as they grow older and 2) Socialization is critical to health and longevity. This location provides a solid foundation for long term, aging in place, in a healthy active lifestyle. It's proximity to the downtown area and recreation encourages walking, (less driving) and allows for better, more healthy, lifestyle options. 3) The term Congregate Care does not really describe the nature of this community. It's more like a "land locked luxury cruise liner" with amenities and activities for a healthy, active, lifestyle.

Why would the board feel it necessary to amend zoning, change the master plan and issue special use permits when these changes would have a negative impact on the area and it's residents?

Answer: Quite the contrary, it will have a profound positive impact on the neighborhood and the community through an increase tax base of over \$2,000,000 (two million) annually at completion that will be pumped into schools, parks and infrastructure, property values will go up steadily as comparable sales rise with the high quality nature of this project, less traffic, noise, congestion, crime than a normal high density SFR project and all the major findings of a Master Planned community have been met and exceeded in many cases. Flood mitigation measures will improve the flood water retention, less fire hazard, green built, sustainable and most importantly a much needed economic driver for the community with job creation and spin off spending.

These are the reasons I selected this site for the development of this project.

Sincerely,

Vince Scott

Vince Scott

NV/CA Broker, Certified Green Builder, CDRS, Expert Witness
CEO Scott Development Companies
Sierra Sotheby's International Realty
570 Lakeshore Blvd. | Incline Village, NV 89451
t 775-832-4900 | c 775-240-0241 Vince.scott@sothebysrealty.com

SierraSothebysRealty.com

Incline Village | South Lake Tahoe | Heavenly Village | Squaw Valley | Tahoe
City | Tahoe Donner | Downtown Truckee

September 27, 2016

Dear Community Development/Carson City Planning Commissioners:

I have been following The Vintage proposed project since it was first made public back in April. I have studied the few changes the developer made after some select input, but I still have many reservations as to why this PUD is just not the right type of development for Carson City.

First, I'd like to reintroduce myself as a native Carson City resident with roots back to my many great-grandfather John B. Mankins (Silver Oak Park's namesake). I also would like to apologize for the long winded and late timing of this letter, but I think it is imperative that I voice my concerns about the negative impacts I believe this development will have on our community.

Although I believe most people would dream to see this beautiful piece of property be preserved for future generations as irreplaceable open space, I'm saddened to hear that the Andersen Family hasn't been cooperative toward this idea. Therefore, trying to choose the BEST development of this property is of dire importance and a rush in the decision making process would be an injustice to the people of Carson City.

The proposed Vintage PUD has numerous problems I'm not even going to expand upon: inadequate water supply (if we have all the water Carson needs, we wouldn't be on rationing to water our lawns/gardens over the summer months); flood dangers; impact to the night sky darkness for neighboring residents from the parking lot lights and public building lights; 24 hour traffic from workers, food service, and emergency vehicles for the assisted living facility; six foot iron fence surrounding their compound (locked from 7 pm to 7 am) isn't very welcoming for other residents to use the pathways they tout as "for the community"; the City would be burdened with maintaining the pathways and open space if the HOA fails in the future; our hospital and doctors are already over-burdened, especially with Medicare and Medicaid patients, and this project would add many more because of the age restriction in addition to the already approved senior care center further south on Mountain Street slated to be built....I could go on and on.

However, I'd like to focus on a couple major problems this development poses. One of my biggest concerns is that the Vintage is asking for Master Plan and Zoning changes from what is currently documented. Residents surrounding the Andersen Ranch bought their properties under the agreement that Zoning and Master Planning was SET for this property if/when it was ever developed in the future. They were depending on that! Master Planning should be upheld and very slow to be changed. As you know, the developer is not asking for just small changes in the lot sizes from the present zoning which is SF 1 Acre (about 38% of total site), 12000 sq ft (about 52%), and 6000 sq ft (about 10%). The Vintage proposes zero lot lines in a large majority of the east portion of the development (127 houses). All of these figures are taken directly from the PUD application numbers. To further show the negative impact of this higher density to surrounding residents, the western portion of the development is about 30 acres currently zoned 1 acre SF. That would yield about 33 homes, but this plan crams almost double the number, 59 homes into that same area. That is not what the surrounding neighbors trusted the City's zoning to be. Then on the eastern portion of the site, current zoning would allow 56 homes on 6000 sq ft lots and 146 homes on 12000 sq ft lots (202 homes, and only homes, period). My in-depth study of parcel maps shows the very smallest lot in all of the surrounding existing neighborhoods to be about 7300 sq ft.

But instead, there will be 127 ZERO lot line homes (lots of 1690-3365 sq ft) and 26 homes on 8500-10000 sq ft lots PLUS an additional 84,500 sq ft of commercial type buildings with 96 beds for assisted care living. The feel of this development will be far from the same as the surrounding quaint neighborhoods with nice yards and private space for their residents. These neighborhoods are highly sought after in the real estate market for their atmosphere and character, and these types of neighborhoods are what give Carson City its charm and appeal. We should not set a precedent that Carson City allows Master Plan and Zoning changes to increase density and build large commercial type buildings with 24 hour services within existing quiet, established neighborhoods.

Another of my concerns with this PUD is the “retirement community” stigma these types of developments put on Carson City. Our city has worked hard to be a growing, vibrant community for ALL ages. It is imperative that we attract people from all ages to come live, work, and raise their families here in our wonderful city. We don’t want to send a message out to the world that we are for 55 and older. We need to be all inclusive and welcoming especially with the expected growth from the arrival of businesses to the Tahoe Reno Industrial Center like Tesla, Panasonic, Switch, etc. This is the largest industrial complex in the nation, and we don’t want to miss this opportunity. We don’t want to send a message NOT to come to Carson unless you are retiring. We have worked tirelessly to promote a lively community with the downtown redevelopment projects and to have some of the most exceptionally performing schools K-12 in Nevada; not to mention the nationally recognized, valuable programs WNC has to offer to help develop a well trained workforce. Even personally, my eldest 23 year old daughter is in the process of buying her first home here in Carson because this is the BEST place to start and raise a family in her (and my) opinion. My husband and I started and are growing an engineering business here in Carson, and we need educated, young engineers who want to come to Carson to live and work for our thriving company. Please don’t send out the message that only retirees should move here.

I also disagree with the model of alienating seniors. Many studies show and I also believe it is more healthy to integrate not separate them from other age groups. I have heard every senior say, “Kids are what keep you young.” Neighborhoods with mixed ages are more desirable: empty nesters next to retirees next to young families. This is a healthy environment and builds a strong community that supports one another, not just their own age group’s interests.

Of course I would love to see the Andersen Ranch preserved, forever saving the picturesque meadow and mountain views, but if it is to be developed, please let it resemble and compliment the surrounding neighborhoods with homes, trails, and parks ONLY. For all the above reasons, please do not approve The Vintage PUD with the required Master Plan and Zoning changes including large buildings that have 24 hour services. A development more in step with the Kings Canyon Highlands (Longview Ranch Estates) subdivision with vast trails and open space would be a much better fit for this priceless piece of land.

Thank you for your consideration,

LeAnn Mankins Saarem

Dave M. Saarem

LeAnn Mankins Saarem and Dave M. Saarem
2188 Alfred Way, Carson City, NV 89703
saarem@sbcglobal.net