

From: [Brian Ferenz](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Cc: [Sean & Nanci Davison](#); pencelegaldefense@gmail.com; jim@nvfish.com; [Shelley Ferenz](#)
Subject: Regarding Opposition to Proposed Zone Change for Anderson Ranch West from SF1A to SF12
Date: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 2:47:47 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 in regards to expressing opposition to the Request from Andersen Colard Ranch Enterprises to rezone the Anderson Ranch West from SF1A to SF12.

In general the rezoning jeopardizes the:

- 1) Loss of Neighborhood character defined by low traffic, abundance of wildlife, publicly available open space (roads, easements, creeks, trails) as exemplified in the Long View Estates, Kensington Estates, and The Highlands Neighborhood (Long Ranch Park).
- 3) Overloading traffic patterns that are already strained by new development particularly Washington St, Ormsby, and Kings Canyon particularly with the addition of the Anderson Ranch East Development in progress and new development off of Longview on Skyview Ct.
- 4) Loss of primary wildlife easement along the Ash Canyon Creek and Irrigation ditches encompassing the Anderson Ranch West. These are frequently used by Deer, Bobcats, Mountain Lions, Coyote's, and Bears to access the few remaining fruit and nut trees in the area.
- 2) Rezoning low density SF1A to high density SF12 resulting in a transfer of 3 buildings to the originally planned 1 building. The developers plan to maintain the current ranch house and 50 acres as open space and a justification for the high density housing **SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION**. This is nothing more than a short term tactic to abuse the intent of Carson City Municipal Code 10.10 Common Open Space Development. The planning commission should require the developer to meet the intent of the Opens Space Development with the total plan for the 30 acres to be developed.

Thank you

Brian & Shelley Ferenz

2028 Manhattan Dr.

Carson City, NV, 89703

bferenz@mindspring.com

From: [Roger Trott](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Comments on Andersen Ranch West Subdivision Map
Date: Monday, September 26, 2022 9:29:15 AM

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

We live in the Longview Ranch area. Like many of our neighbors, we have concerns about this project and its impacts on the rural nature of our environment. Beyond that general concern, we have reviewed the staff reports for the Anderson Ranch West proposal being considered by the Planning Commission on September 28th. We offer the following specific comments for your consideration.

1. The traffic study did not assess potential impacts to Longview Way, including its intersections with Kings Canyon Road and Ash Canyon Road. Two of the new subdivision access routes will be entering/exiting from Longview Way. Traffic effects, including safety and congestion effects, on that roadway should be evaluated.
2. Ash Canyon Road is narrow and in poor condition, with crumbling shoulders. Any additional traffic on this road will result in adverse effects on safety and the condition of the road. Roadway improvements should be included as a condition of tentative map approval.
3. The Andersen Ranch West property is in a 100-year floodplain and partially floods during high rain events. As a result, wetlands may be present on this site. Has a wetland delineation been conducted on the site? If not, one should be conducted prior to tentative map approval. A Section 404 permit and wetland mitigation may be required by the Army Corps of Engineers prior to development of the site.
4. Conditions for tentative map approval should require the developer/contractor to undertake additional measures to control dust from onsite construction. Additionally, Carson City should commit to additional daily monitoring to enforce dust control. Although a dust permit was required for the development between Mountain and Ormsby, we understand that dust from that development was an ongoing and significant problem for nearby residents. Those of us living in the Longview Ranch area do not want to experience similar issues if the Andersen Ranch West project is approved.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project.

Roger Trott & Lisa Rea

February 23, 2022

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Director
Carson City Planning Division
108 E. Proctor Street
Carson City, NV 89701



RE: Conceptual Subdivision Map for Anderson Ranch Development

Hi Hope,

Thank you for sharing the application and Conceptual Subdivision Map for the proposed Anderson Ranch Development.

It is unfortunate that the conceptual plan is not subject to the same public noticing process as is a tentative map application. The owner/developer will no doubt at some point submit a tentative map for the subdivision based on input from the City regarding the conceptual plan. At that point, having invested a substantial amount of money in the design of the development, the owner will be reluctant to implement design changes that might be suggested by the public, regardless of merit.

As I had indicated previously, I have some concerns/comments/questions about the project. I'm hoping that you will consider this information when you provide the City's comments.

First, a few questions:

1. Why is the Vintage project still on the City's Planning Division website, when it has been superseded by the project that is currently under construction on the east side of Ormsby Boulevard? Shouldn't the new project be shown there?
2. The conceptual application indicates that the existing zoning allows for the construction of 131 lots within the project area, but the conceptual map shows construction of only 61 lots. Does the applicant intend to develop an additional 70 lots elsewhere within the project limits, and if so, how can this application be considered complete when it does not address the remainder of the project? If the applicant does not intend to develop any additional lots, will the remainder of the project area be restricted to prevent future development?

The application indicates that the proposed development is "Consistent with the Master Plan Land Use Map in location and density." The parcel where the development is proposed, APN 009-012-21, is currently Master Planned for Low Density Residential Use, 5 to 0.33 acres per dwelling unit. The project proposes lot sizes from 0.32 acres to 0.51 acres on this parcel. Accordingly, this portion of the project is mostly but not entirely consistent with the Master Plan. However, the current zoning on this parcel is SF1A, 1 acre per dwelling unit. Some of us who live adjacent to the proposed development purchased our homes with the knowledge that this parcel might someday be divided into one acre lots because of the zoning. Other long term residents were told directly by Andersen family members that the parcel would never be developed, and that if subsequent generations of the family desired to sell the land efforts would be made to transfer this to the city so the property could remain open space. (The project site is a Priority Open Space Area for acquisition by the City in its Master Plan for the Future Open Space System.) We never anticipated the possible development of 1/3 acre lots on this parcel. Will the owner need to request a zone change for this project?

The applicant proposes to transfer density from APN 009-0120-20 to APN 009-012-21 for the purpose of creating lots that are smaller than the current SF1A zoning allows. The application indicates that this process is in accordance with Carson City Municipal Code Chapter 17.10 - Common Open Space

Development, and that "the project will cluster develop in a manner that best utilizes the available land, while implementing common space and maintaining floodplain." The conceptual map indicates a total of 3.7 acres of common space north of Ash Creek. The proposed subdivision layout is nothing more than a simple grid. How can the owner anticipate approval of the requested "clustering" when such a small portion of the total project area (80 acres) is identified as future open space, and the traditional subdivision layout does nothing to promote usable open space other than what is associated with the multi-purpose path? If open space will be provided elsewhere on the project to offset the proposed increase in density, why is that open space not indicated on the conceptual map? Will the proposed transfer of density from APN 009-012-20 to APN 009-012-21 result in the prohibition of any future subdivision of APN 009-012-20? It appears to me that the application and the conceptual map are incomplete.

The conceptual map for the subdivision proposes two new intersections on North Ormsby Boulevard, which the NDOT roadway classification maps identify as a minor collector. The southerly intersection is located roughly 270' north of the Washington Street intersection on Ormsby. The northerly intersection appears to be roughly 400' south of the existing Newman Place intersection. Because the Carson City Municipal Code and design standards do not address intersection spacing, I am referencing the NDOT Access Management System and Design Standards, which specifies a minimum intersection spacing of 660' for full access to a minor collector. This spacing could be achieved by shifting the proposed development south approximately 270'. This would have multiple benefits including:

1. Improving the access to the development by aligning the southerly access with Washington Street. Not only would this provide more direct access to the subdivision, it would eliminate the conflicting turning movements associated with the four driveways located within 75' of the southerly access shown on the conceptual map.
2. Increasing the separation between the existing Newman Place intersection and the proposed new subdivision access to meet the NDOT Access Management standards.
3. Providing a more direct alignment for the multi-purpose path on the north side of the project as it relates to the path that is currently under construction on the east side of Ormsby Boulevard.
4. Providing additional open space between the proposed new development and the existing development to the north. A similar open space area should also be provided along the western boundary adjacent to those existing homes. These changes could help to mitigate the fact that the proposed density in this area is three times the current zoning density. It would also provide a more reasonable amount of open space in accordance with the provisions of CCMC 17.10 regarding the density transfer proposed by the project.

Regarding the purpose of CCMC 17.10, Code section 17.10.05 reads as follows:

The purpose of this chapter is to set forth regulations to permit variation of lot size, including density transfer (cluster) subdivisions, in order to preserve or provide open space, protect natural, cultural and scenic resources, achieve a more efficient use of land, minimize road building and encourage stable, cohesive neighborhoods offering a mix of housing types. (Emphasis added)

CCMC 17.10 was created to benefit BOTH the developer and the public as noted above. The conceptual map however shows only the benefits of increased density afforded to the developer. Where is the open space within the project that will be created by the transfer of density, beyond the 3.7 acres noted on the conceptual map for APN 009-012-21?

The project area as defined by the application includes APN 009-012-20. The conceptual map, however, shows only that APN 009-012-21 will be fully developed with little (3.7 acres) open space. Why does the conceptual map not include any plans or open space for APN 009-012-20? Again, the application and the conceptual map appear to be incomplete.

The flood hazard information contained in the conceptual plan is incomplete and misleading. While the Anderson Ranch Conceptual Drainage Memo acknowledges that the project site contains two flood hazard areas, Zone AO and AE, the FEMA FIRMette map submitted as a part of the application covers only a small portion of APN 009-012-21. FEMA map 3200010091F, however, shows that virtually all of APN 009-012-21 is in flood zone AE. Why was this map not submitted as part of the application?

As noted previously, the project site continues to be a Priority Open Space Area for acquisition by the City in its Master Plan for the Future Open Space System. The City has had opportunities to work with the landowner to acquire this land for open space purposes but chose not to do so. I believe that many of the landowners in this neighborhood would still like to see the City pursue acquisition of all or a portion of the project area. I would certainly contribute to such a cause if the land could be protected from development in perpetuity.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this potential project. Please feel free to contact us with any questions.

Yours truly,

Jeffrey L. Foltz
1701 Newman Place,
CC, NV 89703

Jim Pincock
1735 Newman Place
CC, NV 89703



Chapter Four: Design Standards and Specifications

Table 4-1: Access Spacing Standards (continued)

| Roadway Class | Location/ Posted Speed Limit | Full Access | | Limited Access | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | Signalized Intersection Uniform ¹ Spacing | Unsignalized Intersection/Roundabout Minimum ² Spacing | Left-in/Right-in/ Right-out only Minimum ² Spacing | Right-in/Right-out only ³ Minimum ² Spacing |
| 6: Minor Collectors | ≤ 30 mph | 1,320' | 660' | 440' | 200' |
| | ≥ 35 mph | | | | 250' – 400' |
| 7: Frontage/Service/ Local Roads | - | As necessary for the safe operation and proper design of adjacent accesses | | 330' | 200' |

Notes:

All dimensions above are measured from center-to-center of accesses.

The spacing standards provided above also apply to private, direct access. Restrictions may be placed on the access permit. Refer to the rest of the document for additional information.

¹ Uniform spacing refers to the exact spacing to be achieved. Any spacing either greater or smaller than these standards is considered a deviation.

² Minimum spacing refers to the minimum spacing to be achieved between two adjacent accesses. However, greater spacing may be needed, depending on other requirements. Refer to the rest of Chapter Four for these standards.

³ Where applicable, the range of spacing values corresponds to a range of speeds. The greater spacing values will be required at higher speeds.

From: [Kitty Flynn](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: SUB-2022-0374
Date: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 10:07:05 AM

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

Carson City Planning Commission,

We have lived on the west side for the past fourteen years and have been concerned about our safety in the event of a need to suddenly evacuate. It would take hours to get out of our neighborhood due to the lack of streets and the routes to safety. If you approve all these new homes with the increase in population, it may be near impossible to get to safety.

Recently on Ormsby I had to drive through a huge dust cloud that was impossible to see through for a few seconds from the other development you approved between Ormsby and Mountain. Due to the drought our front lawn was dying because we could not water it enough. We have since spent several thousand dollars to have a rock yard.

There should absolutely be a moratorium on new construction due to the lack of water, not to mention the housing recession. It is irresponsible for the homes to be approved at this time. We would be better off if you filled these acres with solar panels than flood this confined area with all these people using resources that are stressed already. Please Use Some Common Sense!

Kitty Flynn
1322 Clemens Dr.
Carson City, Nv. 89703

Sent from my iPad