



# Carson City Planning Division

108 E. Proctor Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
(775) 887-2180 – Hearing Impaired: 711  
planning@carson.org  
www.carson.org/planning

---

## MEMORANDUM

Planning Commission Meeting of February 24, 2021

**TO:** Planning Commission

**FROM:** Heather Ferris  
Associate Planner

**DATE:** February 24, 2021

**SUBJECT:** Public comment for non-agendized items

Staff has received the attached public comment related to matters not on the agenda.

## Heather Ferris

---

**From:** Maxine Nietz <nevadamax@usa.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2021 10:40 AM  
**To:** CCEO; Planning Department; Heather Ferris  
**Subject:** For testimony for 2.18 and 2/22 meetings

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

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

---

Here's to the citizens of Lyon County. They are objecting to "shrinking lot sizes" and "crowding from high-density neighborhoods." They rightly point out that "residential tax base doesn't pay for the services that are required."

The developers in the crowd, of course, insisted that higher-density lots are "affordable" without a shred of proof.

I am seeing that all over Carson City, where developers are buying property, knowing its zoning, and then pleading poverty to the city to down-zone the property so they can "afford" to build. I don't believe them!

Our city officials just ignore residents in favor of what developers want. WE are the taxpayers! WE are the voters! Why are we being treated so shabbily?

The last planning commission item on Borda Crossing was a joke! Testimony was ignored, emails were not included in the testimony, commissioners did not seem to know what was going on.

Once again, an out-of-town developer with loads of money chooses to create a **squeezed** development in Carson City for his/her own monetary benefit, not that of the people of this city.

We have asked for CCMC 17.10 to be **suspended** so that developers cannot use this bait-and-switch chapter to completely ignore the standards of Carson City.

This developer states that he wants SF6 zoning, however **NONE** of his lots is that size. They are all in the 5,000 sf range. The nearest neighborhood lot, with the exception of the already down-zoned development to the north, is over 13,000 sf. We have asked before this, that the idea that the developer is going to “preserve or provide Common Open Space. Common open space may include common areas with no dimension less than 25 feet. At least 100 square feet of common open space per residential unit shall be designed for recreation” be **shelved**. For this 28-unit proposal, that means 2800 sf, about ½ of a single lot size for **all** the families, children, and pets in this development. In addition, it is going to be xeriscape, not green space. It is divided into two long, narrow strips of 19’ and 23’ respectively (I have measured their engineering drawings, not relying on the non-proven statements of the developer.) Each of which has a DG or paved path through the entire length. Not really appropriate for recreation and does not even meet the code requirement of a minimum of 25’.

Homes will be a minimum of 10 feet from the western boundary of the subdivision (with a 2-foot projection allowed (Duh, that is developer-speak for “I’m really only giving you 8 feet!”))

I have read the entire agenda item with staff reports and developer reports. Public comment has been submitted for this indicating that the neighborhood is **AGAINST** it. Wasn’t the planning commission selected by elected officials who are supposed to be answerable to the people?

Mr. Tanchek and his neighbors rightly point out that surrounding properties were already down-zoned to provide transition to this parcel. Now a developer is proposing to down-zone this property to provide transition to other parcels. This is a game of dominoes, a cascade of overdevelopment into a rural area of our town that has livestock and wells.

There are already proposals, from the same developer and others, to squeeze the SF1A right out of this area by building on 5,000 sf lots, and smaller.

If the goal is to cover all of Carson City with mini-lots, you are getting nearer and nearer to it. The homes proposed for these undersized lots are large, boxy, 2-

story buildings with 3-car garages. The interiors are not well designed, losing second floor space to overlooks and balconies.

Please, please we ask that you **stop** letting developers trample on the minimum 6,000 sf single-family life of our town. We don't have enough water, road money, schools, or hospital services to accommodate what this developer wants. And after he gets it, he is going back to his high-income Lake Tahoe neighborhood and will never think of Carson City again.

In my neighborhood, we are also facing this kind of thing. Andersen Ranch Estates is squeezing under-sized lots onto their plan and calling it "affordable housing" without providing any evidence that it is.

If your plan is to turn every open piece of land over to developers who will tell you anything you want to hear and to lie about the supposed "benefits" of small lots, please let us know in advance so we can move to a more home-owner friendly place.

Maxine Nietz  
[nevadamax@usa.com](mailto:nevadamax@usa.com)  
775.887.1294