

From: Jason Kuchnicki <kuchiman@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 1:00 PM
To: Hope Sullivan
Cc: Lee Plemel
Subject: Re: Public comment on 4/27/16 Planning Commission meeting

Hi Hope,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me, explain the project in more detail, and clarify the rationale and need to reduce the minimum parcel size and required driveway approach. Based on our conversation, I have a better understanding of the project and would like to withdraw my original comments at this time. You have been extremely helpful!

Kind Regards,
Jason Kuchnicki

On Tuesday, April 26, 2016 3:41 PM, Lee Plemel <L.Plemel@carson.org> wrote:

Hi Jason,

We will provide your email to the Planning Commission for that item. However, I should note that you are in error that they are exceeding their permitted density. The property is zoned Multi-Family Apartment. The existing zoning allows them to build 29-36 units per acre, depending on the unit size. The proposed development is 14.3 units per acre, much less than the average apartment density around town of about 25 units per acre. If they chose to build apartments rather than create parcels for individual ownership, building-envelope townhomes, they would not need a variance. It's not a variance for density. We believe the creation of individual townhomes for affordable ownership is a good element of the project.

Regards,

Lee

Lee Plemel, AICP, Director
Carson City Community Development Department
108 E. Proctor Street
Carson City, NV 89701
775.283.7075

From: Planning Department
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 1:03 PM
To: Lee Plemel; Hope Sullivan
Subject: FW: Public comment on 4/27/16 Planning Commission meeting

From: Jason Kuchnicki [mailto:kuchiman@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 12:18 PM
To: Lee Plemel; Planning Department
Subject: Public comment on 4/27/16 Planning Commission meeting

Dear Mr. Plemel,

I am sorry that I will be unable to attend tomorrow evening's Planning Commission Meeting, but my wife will be working so I will be on daddy duty. I respectfully request that the following comments be read into the record during the initial public comment period and again with each of agenda item F-4A VAR-16-024 and F-4B TSM-16-023:

Dear Chairmen Esswien and Members of the Commission,

I am opposed to items F-4A and F-4B and urge you to vote no on these items. These items would enable Capstone Communities to develop the parcel beyond the allowable density and outside the existing code restrictions. Zoning and density restrictions exist to prevent exactly this type of occurrence from happening. Please bear in mind that approval of this type of "spot zoning" request would set a very bad precedent for future development in Carson City. If approved, developers will rightfully ask the question: "well they received approval, why can't we?" This is particularly important in light of the newly proposed Vintage at Kings Canyon project that seeks to develop the Andersen Ranch, located between Mountain and Ormsby and over to King St, to unreasonable levels. Thank you for considering my comments.

Jason Kuchnicki

Thank you for your attention to the matter.

Sincerely,
Jason Kuchnicki