

From: mersea@sbcglobal.net
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Fw: Special Use Permit requested by Mr. Tom Metcalf
Date: Monday, October 24, 2022 7:24:51 PM

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

Subject: Special Use Permit requested by Mr. Tom Metcalf

Dear Planning Commission Members.

I opposed the Special Use Permit requested by Mr. Tom Metcalf for property under development on Longview Way. I live just east of this development.

More than one year ago Mr. Neighbors, Trustee of the Hop and Mae Adams Trust, proposed to build 24 homes on the land designated as 1 acre, single family.

The property involves approximately 13 acres . A petition with > 200 neighbors opposed that plan.

A compromise was reached allowing 12 homes, each on less than acre.

As the new development is planned, it becomes one home on 1/3 or 2/3 acre.

This leaves undeveloped open space on the west end of the property, and bridge leading to city paths in an adjacent neighborhood.

Perhaps this arrangement allows the zoning to remain Single Family-1 Acre Planned Unit Development, despite the homes on smaller lots.

After the compromise, members of the Public expressed interest in purchasing lots in this development, and are waiting for the parcels to go on sale.

But there is a rumor that the lots were "reserved" by builders and friends.

The rumor included Mr. Tom Metcalf reserving some of the lots.

The recent Planning Commission notice that Mr. Tom Metcalf wants to build two residences on one lot suggests that the properties have indeed been reserved.

It is fact that this land was zoned for one house on one acre, similar to the adjacent Kingston Place and Wellington developments.

Now, a commercial builder, who has acquired one or more lots in this development wants another variance. A special use permit.

The notice states that he wants to build two homes on less than one acre lot. Perhaps the second building is meant for a family member.

I see this as "the nose of the camel under the tent".

A more appropriate description is "the head of the camel under the tent with the body not far behind".

The "nose under the tent" was the first accommodation whereby the lot size was reduced for each single family home.

If Mr. Metcalf's request is approved, then he, or other lot owners, could request the same SUP for two residences on other lots.

Then we are back to the original Developer's plan of 24 homes on this property. That plan that was

scrapped.

If indeed builders own these lots, then the concept of multiple homes on other lots becomes more likely.

Such a Special Use Permit would encourage similar requests from other owners in the surrounding neighborhoods.

If Mr. Metcalf wants another residence for family member, certainly he could build one structure with an in-law quarters.

Or, if Mr. Metcalf owns other properties, he could build another residence on a nearby lot. That would negate the need for another variance.

These two options would avoid the need for two sewer and water hook ups on one property.

It would avoid the issue of what happens when the first resident dies ?

Does a separate 1,176 sq. ft. structure now become a rental unit ?

If it becomes a rental unit, what stops other owners from building a rental unit on their lots at a later date ?

Are such rental units are now allowed in this neighborhood ?

Would allowing two residences to be built on a less than one acre lot in this area set a new precedent ?

A property zoned for Single Family Residence-1 acre should not have two residences on a less than a one acre lot.

Those are my thoughts on this request for another variance .

Thank you.

Joe Walls