

Eva Chwalisz

late Material.

From: Kathe Green
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 2:32 PM
To: Eva Chwalisz; ktokheim@lumosinc.com
Subject: FW: PC Agenda for November 30 meeting
Attachments: Comments Regarding RV Park.docx

Please add this to the late materials received for tonight. Kathe

From: Ware, Phillip B [<mailto:pware@dot.state.nv.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 1:12 PM
To: Kathe Green
Subject: RE: PC Agenda for November 30 meeting

Kathe,

I thought I would send this to you during my lunch hour. If it is not too late please place this in your work file. Thanks for your assistance!

From: Kathe Green [<mailto:KGreen@carson.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2016 9:31 AM
To: Ware, Phillip B <pware@dot.state.nv.us>
Subject: PC Agenda for November 30 meeting

Mr. Ware, attached is the information for the Planning Commission meeting of November 30, including the information for the proposed RV Resort. If you would like to review the information in its entirety, please open the link below. Let me know if you have any problems with access.

Kathe Green, Assistant Planner
Carson City Planning Division
108 E. Proctor Street
Carson City, NV 89701
(775) 283-7071
KGreen@carson.org

<https://www.carson.org/government/meeting-information/agendas/-planning-commission-agendas-with-supporting-materials/11-30-16-agenda-w-supporting-material>

This communication, including any attachments, may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any review, dissemination or copying of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of the original message.

1.

Quality of Life/Property Values:

- Alcohol would be sold on the premises. What prevents the property from becoming a hangout during low occupancy periods; or having raucous "tailgating" parties that disturb the peace? *Even if a raucous party never occurred, an RV with music and TV playing is disturbing to adjacent and nearby residents. This has a severe impact on west side residents who only have a 20' buffer as currently designed.*
- Restaurant / Retail / Pool / Recreation-Club room facilities on site will draw traffic over and above RV traffic. Will existing infrastructure handle added traffic, e.g. *Old Hot Springs is narrow with open bar ditches; Research becomes narrow when significant on-street parking is present; Goni, like Old Hot Springs is narrow with open bar ditches?*
- The subject has a proposed density of 5.66 upa (215/38) while maintaining very little open space on the west side (a 20' buffer). *In my view, the density is too high for the infrastructure provided by existing roadways and the 20' buffer is too narrow. A minimum of 100' is preferred.*
- Will security be provided 24/7 to handle neighborhood complaints?

2.

Stress on infrastructure:

- Street widths for main entry; are widths sufficient on Research/Goni/Old Hot Springs to handle significant bump in large motorcoach and RV trailer traffic? *How will this affect the existing NDOT facilities and storage yard"? Have traffic studies been provided city planning?*
- Common sense would dictate that if the existing narrow roads were heavily traveled and backed up with over-sized vehicles, it would detract from the desirability of living in nearby homes and working in nearby business parks, thus diminishing the values of commercial and residential property.
- Holly Avenue emergency ingress/egress: what is the probability this will become routine use instead of sporadic use? What assurances can be given? Would there be an emergency vehicle crash gate or no restrictions on usage?
- Additionally, this project decision will one day create various other issues: impeding the evacuation process of people trying to evacuate in a timely fashion with many over-sized vehicles on the narrow roadways, or given accident or traffic jam on existing neighborhood streets, a hazardous situation for Holly Way/Louise Drive residents. *In response to this I recommend an agreement with the city to allow offsite development to occur across existing city park lands for primary and/or secondary access to the RV Park. This alleviates added traffic to existing narrow, 2-lane streets.*

- Traffic Impact Statements may be flawed unless resort area traffic models are recognized.
- Increased traffic congestion from the RV Campground will increase the response time for our first responders, creating potentially life threatening events to all those residents within its proximity.
- Existing infrastructure especially streets do not support 215 RVs (@100% occ) plus added traffic for retail, restaurant and community center activities. Have planners truly considered the impact of event based 100% occupancy; 75% to 80% occupancy; 50% occupancy; 25% occupancy. Shouldn't City Planners and the public have the right to review feasibility of the proposed plans?
- Do lot dimensions, setback, density and use comply with existing zoning and ordinances?

3. **Financial burden to taxpayer / Economic**

- Western Insurance, the owner is an insolvent insurance company. What assurance is there that taxpayers won't have to subsidize or bail out an insolvent owner to finish/complete or manage the project? Does Western Insurance have the capital on hand to develop the project? Is there a lender involved? Who has performed a feasibility analysis for the proposed RV Park to determine that this will not be a "white elephant" project or a partially completed project left to deteriorate and attract undesirable transients?
- What assurance can be given that this is not some kind of strategy, i.e. that the real intended owners will pick up the property for back taxes or by-through mechanic's lien laws?
- Who will manage the proposed resort; what is their track record; what restrictions are in place to control transient residents?
- There is potential loss of additional transfer tax revenues if the property were to be developed in an alternative fashion, e.g. modern business park or light industrial.
- We don't have any issue with a land owner wanting to make money from their property. But we DO have an issue with them making money at the cost of hundreds of families losing THOUSANDS of dollars of value in their homes, especially if the project is unsuccessful.

4. **Environmental impact:**

- There is a lot of paving associated with 215-RV spaces:
 - Storm water: What assurance is there that storm water runoff will adequately be handled by existing capacity without flooding lower elevations of local neighbors, commercial business park and SFRs?
 - Air Quality: 215-RVs produce a lot of exhaust fumes.
 - Noise: Toy haulers will bring ATVs; what restrictions will be in place to keep illegal vehicles off neighborhood streets? Are you going to allow adjacent, undeveloped City Park lands and nearby BLM lands to become inundated with high decibel generating ATVs? It has been observed that local police does not have the manpower to enforce current violators, much less additional ATV traffic. Similarly, a large concentration of Harleys during "Street Vibrations" will result in intolerable levels of noise for adjacent residents.

5. **Close**

- Support for the health and safety of the RV Campground visitors will further stress the demand on public services and create excess cost to the City Budget. You referenced 15,000 gallons of additional water usage, what will additional sewer connects do to existing sewer capacity?
- Is it in the best interest of the long range growth of Carson City to provide this highly dense, seasonal and transient population directly into established, business parks and residential neighborhoods?
- Is it in the best interest of the current employees and residents, as well as future residents to insert an ill-conceived, highly concentrated population of transient individuals if it does not permanently improve the safety, health, order or welfare of the city?
- In the end, does the Commission wish to sustain and promote the quality of life in Carson City, or should the decision simply be to promote the subsequent owner's quantity and quality of life? This proposed development, even though compliant with existing TC zoning, is inconsistent with the surrounding community, would irreparably harm traffic flow on existing, constrained infrastructure and is unfair to your constituents.