

**From:** [Charles Macquarie](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** August 19 BOS Agenda Item 14.D  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 17, 2021 7:04:14 PM

---

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

---

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to comment on Agenda Item 14.D:

[14.D For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to not approve a request for a variance to reduce the setback along the south-eastern property line, adjacent to John Mankins Park, on 3.45 acres zoned Neighborhood Business Planned Unit Development \(NB-P\), located at 1147 W. College Parkway, APNs 007-462-16 and 007-462-17.](#)

As a resident of the Silver Oak subdivision, which is across the street from John Mankins Park, I support the idea of an attached single family residential development at this location; however, I do not support the variance to allow a 10-ft setback adjacent to the park. A two-story building 10-ft from the park fence is not a good idea. It is not good planning either. We have a code about setbacks for a good reason – it is to prevent buildings on one property overshadowing an adjacent property. In this case the code requires a 30-ft setback. I believe this setback is appropriate in this case. If any variance is granted it should not be for less than a 20-ft. setback.

Sincerely,

Charles Macquarie  
1343 Alberta Ct.  
Carson City, NV 89703  
775-720-6847

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**From:** [laurie todd](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda meeting section 14C  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 17, 2021 8:30:26 PM

---

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

---

Hello, this is Laurie Todd and Clementine Tope ,we have the property on E Nye lane that sits right in front of this purposed Subdivision. Our concerns with 61 new homes being put in is first and foremost the added traffic to a very over used road as it is , we have had street racers up and down with no response from the Sheriff's Office when complaints were made, so adding even more traffic without more police presence is asking for accidents to happen. Nye lane is a narrow 2 lane street that has no street lights and is very dark at night with no sidewalks. Adding roughly 120 more vehicles a day to this street is just crazy. Is there going to be a stop light put in at the intersection of Nye Ln and Airport Road ? Second, we are already in a severe drought how can you justify adding more subdivisions when we don't have the water to support them. we have low water pressure at certain times as it is. Third we would like clarification of " Screening and Buffering of Adjoining Development" is this a wall, a fence ?

Thank You  
Laurie Todd  
Clementine Tope

**From:** [M M](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Cc:** [M M](#)  
**Subject:** Board of Supervisors meeting August 19, 2021 - Agenda Items 14D &14E  
**Date:** Monday, August 16, 2021 3:39:38 PM

---

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

---

Board of Supervisors,

Discussion during the planning commission meeting for the proposed Silver Oak at College Parkway staff was asked about residents' concerns about additional traffic and their safety concerns. Staff essentially said everything was done per code. The majority of the Planning Commission appeared content with the answer. Just because something is done within code doesn't make it right.

A question was asked when the last comprehensive traffic study was done? The answer was in the 1990's. This answer seemed to amuse some in the room. So with all the building and subdivisions built out in this area over the last 20 plus years the majority of the Commission thinks there is no reason to have another comprehensive traffic study done? Apparently common sense is not a requirement. Just do the minimum required.

The standard answers from staff about any questions directed to them was it is within code or it fulfilled the requirements. That was good enough for the majority of the planning commission and got the rubber stamp of approval by majority.

Yet when it came to the setback variance, code states the set back is to be increased to 30 feet from 20 for the proposed 2 story multi-family dwellings. The developer is asking for a 10 foot setback which is 1/3 of the code requirement. Despite leaning on the "meets code or requirement" answer to rubber stamp everything else about this multi family dwelling proposal 3 of the 6 planning commission board members voted to approve the variance. So, it's ok to ignore this code?

When looking at the site map for the proposed multi-family dwellings the Planning Commission chair questioned the safety of the narrow streets and stated large trucks such as Waste Management trucks would have to back all the way out of the streets and there was no place for snow removal based on the site map. I would also add the same safety hazard of backing up would apply to delivery trucks, UPS, FedEx etc and they don't drive slow. Yet despite this very serious safety issue the site map was approved by a majority of the board. I seriously question the judgment, competence and application of common sense by some of the Planning Commission. Several of the Commission members have an obvious relationship with Mr. Turner while not illegal it is a serious conflict of interest.

Does the City have an oversight committee to look at issues like this or is it something that would have to be filed with the Grand Jury?

Do citizens have the right to appeal a decision made by the Planning Commission or Board or is it just the applicant?

The rest of Silver Oak is single family detached homes with an 18 hole golf course and that is how this area was advertised and pitched to prospective homeowners. Building 15 or so single-family homes on this property would be in keeping with this and is really what should

be done. However, doing that would probably generate around \$12 million in sales vs around \$26 million in sales for the current proposal.

Sadly, it appears the bottom line here is money. The Planning Board is ignoring the obvious and severe safety issue with narrow streets. Multi-family dwellings are not consistent with the rest of the Silver Oak community. The request for a 10 foot setback instead of 30 is so more multi-family units can be crammed into this space. Again, money, money, money.

### **Letters of support with conflict of interest**

There may be more letters in the packet supporting the project signed by people with a significant financial interest and/or work for Mr. Turner but here's 4.

**Heidi McFadden** – She failed to mention she is a real estate agent with RCM Realty and stands to make significant sales commissions from these multi-family dwellings and of course would rather have ~\$26,000,000 in sales generated vs. ~\$12,000,000 from unattached single family homes that would be consistent with the rest of Silver Oak. Obviously, a significant financial interest in this project.

**Christina Rice** – She failed to mention she is a real estate agent with RCM Realty and stands to make significant sales commissions from these multi-family dwellings and of course would rather have ~\$26,000,000 in sales generated vs. ~\$12,000,000 from unattached single family homes that would be consistent with the rest of Silver Oak. Obviously, a significant financial interest in this project.

**Terrie McNutt** - GM Silver Oaks Golf Course – Employed by Mark Turner not a Silver Oak home owner.

**Doyle Katafias** – Supports the project but failed to mention he is the Owner of DEK Electric and does a lot of work for Lanturn Investments. Obviously a significant financial interest in this project.

### **Manhard Consulting letter of appeal on behalf of Lanturn Investments VAR-2021-0232**

In the letter at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point -

“It is also our belief that voting against staff recommendations without an argument substantiated by facts is arbitrary and capricious.”

I would use the same “arbitrary and capricious” argument for those on the Planning Board that voted to approve the site map even after the Board chair pointed out the safety issues with narrow streets and that Waste Management trucks, FedEx, UPS, USPS and other large vehicles would have to back out of these narrow streets. There would also be a problem with snow removal as well.

I respectfully ask the Board of Supervisors to vote no on Agenda items 14D and 14E. The builder is very experienced and talented and I'm quite sure can come up with a project for this property that is profitable, safe, meets codes and is consistent with the rest of the Silver Oak development.

Thank you,

Michael Moriarty

**From:** [Svetlana G](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** August 19, 2021 Board Meeting Comment  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 17, 2021 10:47:08 AM

---

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

---

Good morning,

Please elaborate on what measures are taken to assess and mitigate the increase in student load for Carson City schools, when reviewing subdivision requests. Also, please advise, to which extent the issue of students outnumbering school capacities is considered, when making a decision to approve or reject such requests.

Thank you,  
Svetlana Grabelnikova.

**From:** [Chas Macquarie](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** August 19 BOS Agenda Item 14.D  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 17, 2021 7:07:49 PM

---

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

---

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to comment on Agenda Item 14.D:

[14.D For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to not approve a request for a variance to reduce the setback along the south-eastern property line, adjacent to John Mankins Park, on 3.45 acres zoned Neighborhood Business Planned Unit Development \(NB-P\), located at 1147 W. College Parkway, APNs 007-462-16 and 007-462-17.](#)

As a resident of the Silver Oak subdivision, which is across the street from John Mankins Park, I support the idea of an attached single family residential development at this location; however, I do not support the variance to allow a 10-ft setback adjacent to the park. A two-story building 10-ft from the park fence is not a good idea. It is not good planning either. We have a code about setbacks for a good reason – it is to prevent buildings on one property overshadowing an adjacent property. In this case the code requires a 30-ft setback. I believe this setback is appropriate in this case.

Sincerely,

Charles Macquarie  
1343 Alberta Ct.  
Carson City, NV 89703  
775-720-6847

**From:** [Rachel Cail](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Carson dispensary curbside  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 10, 2021 1:18:50 PM

---

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

---

Curbside pickup at dispensaries should continue to be legal. There is no reason to change it now.

Rachel Cail

--

Namaste ~ Rachel



**From:** [Midge Breeden](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Centennial Tennis  
**Date:** Friday, August 6, 2021 2:37:49 PM

---

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

---

Thank you for approving the funding to replace the tennis courts at Centennial Park. Tennis is a great sport that is inexpensive and can be enjoyed by all ages.  
Thanks for reinvesting in the future of active sports in Carson City.

--

Midge Breeden  
1775 Chaparral  
Carson City, NV 89703  
775 883-2255  
"A healthy planet is a green planet"

**From:** [bepsy strasburg](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Constitution Day Celebration  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 18, 2021 10:45:54 AM

---

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

---

On September 17, 1787, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention met for the last time to sign the document they had created. This is an important day in our nation's history and Constitution Day needs to be celebrated through activities, learning, and demonstrations of our love for the United State of America and the Blessings of Freedom Our Founding Fathers secured for us. The Constitution allows the government of we the people to evolve in the safest way possible towards equality and the pursuit of happiness.

2021 is the 224th anniversary of this important day. Being the capital city of Nevada, we need to acknowledge this milestone every year and especially now to remind everyone of our freedom.

Question to the Board of Supervisors:

1. What is the City planning to celebrate Constitution Day between September 17-23?
2. On September 2<sup>nd</sup>, there is a proposed joint meeting of the School Board and Board of Supervisors. Please put Constitution Day in the meeting agenda so we can discuss programs in real-time that the City and the School District can do to celebrate this important annual anniversary.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bepsy Strasburg and Richard Nagel

**From:** [Jim Barnett](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** PUD at W. College Parkway  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 17, 2021 2:01:51 PM

---

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

I urge the Board of Supervisors to turn down the request for a 52 unit PUD on W. College Parkway. As a resident of the Silver Oak community I do not find the plan to fit in with the current single family plan. This is far too many units for this size property. The silver oak neighborhoods have some 2 story properties but not in a cluster as this is proposed. I am not against building growth but I do expect it to conform with the existing neighborhood.

Thank you,

James Barnett  
1625 Turner Ct  
Carson City, NV 89703

**From:** [Jason Fatzer](#)  
**To:** [Public Comment](#)  
**Subject:** Testimony in Opposition for Tomorrow's BOS Meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, August 18, 2021 9:49:18 AM  
**Attachments:** [Board of Supervisors.docx](#)

---

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

---

My name is Jason Fatzer and I am submitting written testimony in opposition to agenda items 14D and 14E for tomorrow's Carson City Board of Supervisors' meeting. Please contact me if you have any questions.

775-224-4722

I am attaching a word doc and I will paste the context in this email as well.

Good Morning,

My name is Jason Fatzer for the record.

I am here to ask the Carson City Board of supervisors to not just to uphold the 3 to 3 decision to maintain the city minimum setback of 20 feet with an additional 10 feet for each story above 1 story, but to reverse the decision of the Planning Commission and deny in whole the request to build the multi dwelling unit development on the corner of West College Parkway and Oak Ridge Drive. Here are my reasons:

FIRST: An actual full traffic study has not been completed in this area of West College parkway since 1993. The drawing included in the notice mailed to residents is not an accurate depiction of the area as it is today. It is unclear if traffic modeling based on the 1993 study accounted for possible new homes and vehicles in the vacant land north of Silver Lake Drive or in the mostly vacant business complex east of the senior living community. The planned 52 units will bring 100 or more new vehicles into a 3.45 acre parcel. The 2 access points into this planned community are from east bound traffic traveling on West College and on Oak Ridge Drive near the corner junction. I believe this will back up traffic to turn left onto Oak Ridge from westbound College Parkway due to the three vehicle size of the turn lane, or create unsafe u-turns. This is already an issue as it is right now. I also believe that traffic exiting and entering from the Oak Ridge Drive access point will increase traffic safety concerns for park visitors and residents along Oak Ridge Drive and continuing south of John Mankins Park. The posted speed limit is 25, but living directly across the street from the park, I can attest that vehicles do not observe the posted speed limits and use the street as an acceleration launch point until they skid to a stop at the south end of the park. I have personally witnessed vehicles full-on hitting the hazard markers at the park.

ADDITIONALLY: As stated by Member Kilgore in the Planning Commission meeting held earlier this month, this Multi Dwelling unit development does not fit the surrounding Silver Oak community. The current existing density of Silver Oak is an average 11 homes in a space the same size where the developers are requesting to build 52 units, between a busy park frequented by families with small children and a senior living community. I feel this increases safety concerns for our senior neighbors

and small visitors.

FURTHER: Snow Removal and Plowing have been an issue on Oak Ridge. After any snowstorm light and heavy, Oak Ridge Drive is not immediately plowed, if at all. There have been many storms in the last seven years as a Silver Oak resident where more than a foot of snow has been left unplowed on the road for days with a snow berm at the College Parkway junction left to create issues entering traffic. This will create dangerous road conditions when combined with the addition of a 100 or more vehicles using the roadway, adding to my first point of the no recent traffic study. Not to mention the issue of where the snow within the planned development will be moved to by the private snow removal services, further complicating snow accumulation and traffic conditions on Oak Ridge drive itself.

FINALLY: Developers plan on a communal trash bin area. This creates the opportunity for any resident of Carson to feel free to dump unwanted trash, mattresses, or old furniture because the community will not be gated. We see this situation at other apartment and townhome complexes in Carson City that are ungated, specifically the ungated apartment units on Silver Oak Drive. This is unsightly, unwelcome, and would be inconvenient for the residents of the planned development.

I am not opposed to growth here in our Silver Oak Community or any other parts of Carson City. I take pride and responsibility as a Carson resident. I believe that adding a planned development of this density is a gross amount of growth in such a small land area, with access points that will most assuredly increase unsafe traffic conditions for residents, our neighbors, and visitors.

And for all of my issues stated, I formally ask the Carson City Board of Supervisors to reject in whole, the planned 52 unit planned development on the corner of West College Parkway and Oak Ridge Drive. We ask the developers to consider building a more reasonably sized development in the area, much like the Park Place community just developed south of the park.

Thank you.

**From:** [Carson City](#)  
**To:** [CCEO](#)  
**Subject:** Lanturn Investments request for 1147 W. College  
**Date:** Monday, August 16, 2021 1:07:14 PM

---

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

**Site Visitor Name:** Nancy Kaifesh

**Site Visitor Email:** nancy6051@sbcglobal.net

I am asking that this request be denied in all aspects. The last thing Oak Ridge Dr needs is more congestion and heavy traffic. We already have to deal with people using Oak Ridge as a thru-way between Winnie & College Pkwy. Density creates more crime and we have enough of that going on at night at John Mankins Park. Cramming 52 units on that small piece of property will allow the drug dealers at the park to have customers within walking distance. The current homeowners did not sign up for this. This is nothing more than greed on the part of the developer.