

Cecilia Rice

From: Roger Trott <rltrott6@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 9:23 AM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Andersen Ranch West Comments for April 26th Planning Commission Meeting

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

To Whom it May Concern:

We live in the Long Ranch area, and like many of our neighbors, we have significant concerns about the Andersen Ranch West project and its probable impacts on the rural nature of our environment.

To begin with, the project applicant must explain why the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should now approve a project that they denied late last year. The current proposal appears to be exactly the same as the project proposed last year. If the project hasn't significantly changed to address previous concerns, why should it be approved now?

With that in mind, we again submit the following comments that were submitted when the project previously came up for Planning Commission consideration.

- We are concerned about the cumulative impacts of potentially adding at least 300 homes (Andersen Ranch, Andersen Ranch West, Ash Canyon) to the upper Westside over a short period of time. This area has seen little change over the past 25 years, and this rapid growth would have a major impact on neighborhood/community cohesion, our existing culture and environment, traffic congestion and safety, schools, and flooding potential. With Andersen Ranch already in development and Ash Canyon apparently in the approval pipeline, we ask the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to put off approving any more development on the West Side in the near term. At the very least, additional development should be brought on line gradually so that the community can absorb new residents, and so that impacts on neighborhoods, roads, etc. can be assessed before new development is approved
- 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 proposed Andersen Ranch West subdivision access routes will be entering/exiting from Longview Way. Traffic effects, including safety and congestion effects, on that roadway should be evaluated. This road is regularly used by walkers, runners, bicyclists, and others.
- The traffic study did not adequately address the permanent cumulative impacts of the three developments on Ormsby Boulevard and West King Streets, particularly in the school zones. While these roads may be considered "underutilized" now, they may not be when traffic from 300 homes is added.
- Ash Canyon Road is narrow and in poor condition, with crumbling shoulders. Any additional traffic on this road, which will certainly occur with the Andersen Ranch West development, will result in adverse effects on safety and the condition of the roadway. Roadway improvements should be included as a condition of tentative map approval.

- The traffic study did not adequately address the cumulative effects of construction traffic on local roads. If Andersen Ranch West and Ash Canyon are approved, these developments could overlap with Andersen Ranch construction and overwhelm local roads with heavy construction traffic.
- Parts of the Andersen Ranch West property are in a 100-year floodplain and partially flood 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.
- Conditions for tentative map approval should require the developer/contractor to undertake significant 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 Andersen Ranch development, we understand that dust, dust palliative drift, and rodents from that development were an ongoing and significant problem for nearby residents. Those of us living in the Long Ranch area do not want to experience similar issues if the Andersen Ranch West project is approved.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project.

Respectfully,

Roger Trott & Lisa Rea
2169 Bristol Place, Carson City



ReplyForward

From: [Courtney Gallagher](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Andersen Ranch West Application - For Inclusion and Consideration at the 4/26/23 Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 10:37:56 AM

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

April 25, 2023

Planning Commissioners, please see and consider the below as you consider the request by Andersen Ranch West for their proposed development.

The application for the approval of the subdivision request for Andersen Ranch West to be heard on 4/26/23 appears to be the same exact request that was heard, and not approved, by the Planning Commission in September of 2022, and then again not approved by the Board of Supervisors in November of 2022. The crux of the denials was based on the requested use of 17.10 by Andersen Ranch and the developer to shift high density to the subject site and the lack of connectivity of roadways within the proposed development to North Ormsby.

After a review of the supporting materials for the 4/26/23 meeting, I do not see any changes to either of these pieces of the proposal as compared to how they were originally proposed. Neither Washington nor Manhattan connect through the proposed subdivision to North Ormsby, and more importantly Andersen Ranch and the developer are still requesting to utilize 17.10 to shift high density to the subject site, utilizing provisions of 17.10 in a manner that is not congruent or in keeping with the spirit of or typical use of 17.10. The proposal being heard on 4/26/23 contains the same number of proposed homes (61) on the same acreage (+/- 30 acres).

Important points for consideration:

• The total parcel of land is +/- 80 acres, with less than 20 acres actually being currently zoned as SF12. The developer is using 17.10 to use the small portion of the parcel zoned as SF12 to change the zoning for the majority of the parcel from SF1A to SF12. This is not utilizing 17.10 as it was intended.

• The subject site is +/- 30 acres and is zoned SF1A, yet the developer is requesting to put 61 homes within this site area with the use of 17.10 and relying on the +/- 50 acre remaining parcel to shift density from the parcel as a whole to a concentrated development within the subject site. This is not utilizing 17.10 as it was intended.

• As sited by both the Planning Commissioners as well as the Board of Supervisors, this request is attempting to utilize 17.10 allowances for density shift for a piece of the total property rather than the property as a whole. 17.10 requests require the consideration of the property as a whole, and what benefits the community as a whole, and what is gained by the community by allowing the shift of density. In this case the remaining +/- 50 acre parcel is not being considered for future development and so using the land to shift density to the subject site is inappropriate. The developer has cited that the remaining +/- 50 acre parcel will remain a ranch in perpetuity, further solidifying the fact that that acreage from the +/-50 acre parcel shouldn't be considered in the density calculation for the subject site as the public will not, and cannot, benefit from the use of that land. If they want to subdivide the parcel, then the +/- 30 acre parcel should only be considered, and the zoning of SF1A within that site should be adhered to.

• The developer seems unwilling to listen to the concerns of the

citizens, the Planning Commission, or the Board of Supervisors. Suggested changes by both entities have not been addressed. The developer seems to insultingly claim that the surrounding community and neighbors are trying to block the development of the land and only want the land to be open space. This however is simply untrue. Time and time again, the citizens have voiced their recognition that the Andersen's have the right to sell their property and thus for it to be developed. What we all want though is for the land to be developed under the current zoning of SF1A. Everyone who purchased property that borders the ranch researched the zoning prior to purchase and knew someday the land would be developed but would be developed in accordance with the 1 acre zoning which more than half of the ranch is zoned as. The Andersen's and the developer shouldn't have more rights than the rest of the community or the ability to make changes to existing zoning by the application of 17.10 in an unbecoming spirit and in application to a small portion of the total land when the bulk of the land will not be included for development or public use.

• The developer seems to think bullying is a successful tactic and continually repeat in meetings with the City that they have "checked the boxes of the application" and therefore it must be approved. This is in poor taste and not acting as a proper partner. The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have the discretion to approve or deny proposals based on the totality of findings, and as both parties noted in their respective meetings, are not required to "rubber stamp" a request simply because a box has been checked.

• At the September 2022 meeting, the Planning Commissioners specifically cited the lack of community outreach by the developer and or partnership or willingness to compromise. To date I do not believe The Andersen's, their representatives, or the developer, have made any attempts to meet with the community or neighbors, listen to their thoughts/idea/concerns and/or make any concessions. Efforts in community partnership and compromise could go a long way with the neighbors, community, and approving bodies. The Andersen Ranch East project did this, and ultimately settled on a project that was more in liking and a better fit for the community as a whole.

• Since the developer hasn't bothered engaging the community and/or offered any types of compromise, I will propose the below in compromise for the additional request for density at the subject site via the inappropriate application of 17.10. The below helps to address the concerns for density by existing neighbors and the rezoning request by the developer. The below also maintains the views for existing and new neighbors and will be in keeping with the surrounding feel of the neighborhood.

- Minimum 30 foot "buffer" between new construction and existing homes. Use this to create a groomed, landscaped, integrated pathway for walking or biking that connects to and is similar to the Longview developments to the west and south of the ranch.

- 1 acre perimeter lots with ½ acre infield lots

- Single story homes

- No streetlights

• Connecting Manhattan and Washington streets through the development to North Ormsby opens flow from the new neighborhoods directly to the main road that will be used to travel to/from most destinations from the neighborhood.

Other items for consideration:

• The south side of the Andersen Ranch East Development appears to have a large retention ditch in addition to a "buffer" between new and old construction for the integrated

walking/biking trail. Will the Andersen Ranch West project have something similar along the border with Maison Way? There is an existing irrigation ditch that currently runs along the Maison Way border that frequently fills when there is heavy rain and with snow melt from the adjacent mountains. The maintenance of this type of flood prevention would benefit all homeowners in the area.

• Do not put bathrooms in the proposed park, it encourages the use of facilities for other than intended purposes and creates potentially unsafe environments for patrons of the park and neighborhood. Park bathrooms attract vagrants, and often end up being high crime locations.

• What are the plans to accommodate the increased traffic on North Ormsby? There will be approximately 300 additional homes now bordering North Ormsby and using it for daily travel.

○ Connecting the walking/biking trails from Andersen Ranch East to Andersen Ranch West will require crossing North Ormsby which is already a high traffic and speed road and will only become much more so with the addition of 300 homes bordering North Ormsby.

• Can the hours and or days of the week of proposed construction be revised? We have heard about the level of disruption to the lives of existing neighbors of the Andersen Ranch East project. Multiple developments of new construction in long established neighborhoods are extraordinarily disruptive and given the volume of construction in such a close proximity this disruption could go on for years and years.

• Due to the above, and impacts that remain to be seen on water pressure and availability, as well as the volume of construction traffic, equipment, and services related to the various construction projects, it was previously discussed at the Planning Commission Meeting in September of 2022 that it would be prudent to finish construction of the Andersen Ranch East project before beginning construction of the Andersen Ranch West project.

Just because something can be done, doesn't mean it should be, or that it has to be. Approval of developments should be overall to the benefit of the community as a whole, not just the developer and not at the expense of the existing community. Carson City is a wonderful city, but I am afraid if we continue to make exceptions and changes to zoning requirements that only benefit developers, we will continue to squish more and more people into tighter spaces and lose the appeal of Carson City. Original residential zoning was created for a reason, and in keeping with the master planning of the community as a whole. Original zoning provided for space between and for residents, and it seems that continually allowing for residential zoning to be condensed to smaller and smaller lot sizes will only negatively impact the community as a whole. High concentrations of people will result in Carson City losing itself and the draw of the community. Carson City will become just like any other city, packed to the gills with people, with strained resources, and residents left wondering "what happened to my town?". The residents of Carson City do not deserve this, only so developers and large land owners can make larger profit margins before moving on and leaving to develop another city, leaving Carson City and the problems created by the excess development, in their rearview mirror.

Thank you for your time, service, and thoughtful consideration, it truly is appreciated.

With Kind Regards,

Courtney Gallagher

1833 Maison Way

Carson City, NV

From: Abigail Johnson <saged183@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 2:32 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Andersen Ranch West public comment for April 26 meeting

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 Abigail Johnson. I live at the corner of Maison Way and Pardini (shown as La Rue on the Lumos maps.) I commented at the previous Planning Commission meeting on this project about the need for the proposed development to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. A defining characteristic of the area West of Ormsby Blvd is no street lights. I've been told in the past that street lights for a development of the size proposed are required. But I continue to suggest that one key responsibility of the city and the planning commission is to sustain or improve the quality of life for existing residents while engaging with developers.

Since I last spoke, the American Automobile Association (AAA) Via Magazine did an article in the Nov/Dec 2022 issue on communities to visit for dark sky tourism. The Jack Davis Observatory in Carson City was one of the nine areas featured. Please see the article here: <https://mwg.aaa.com/via/places-visit/stargazing-astronomy-spots> . The Jack Davis Observatory is less than two miles from the proposed subdivision. **I again request that the Andersen West development be mandated to use dark sky friendly lighting and that no street lights be allowed.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Abigail Johnson
4/25/2023 2:30 pm

From: Ashley Saarem <ashleysaarem@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 2:32 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Concerns About the Andersen West agenda item 6.C for the Planning Commission meeting on 4-26-23

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

Dear Planning Commission,

My husband and I are both native Carson City residents. We were both born here and are currently owning a home and raising our own family here. I have been following the CCMC 17.10 issues and was very happy to see it was unanimously repealed by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission. However, I am VERY upset to see the Andersen West agenda item 6.C for the Planning Commission meeting on 4-26-23.

This is the greatest parcel in all of Carson City in my opinion, and it makes me sick to think of this land being developed AT ALL! Please consider leaving this as open space and maintaining this beautiful piece of property. Can the Open Space Committee PLEASE take a serious look at this??

I understand that it has been "grandfathered" into 17.10 since it was submitted before that was repealed; however, we all agree that 17.10 has at times been abused and stretched beyond its true intention which has resulted in some very undesirable outcomes when it is actually built out. This being said, if we have to allow Andersen West to be submitted under 17.10, we MUST hold any developer to the MOST STRICT interpretation of its code to ensure Carson City and its residents don't have any more inconsistent and very controversial housing developments go in.

I am mostly opposed to the sharing or transferring of density in this application. When I read 17.10.025 (1) "Residential. The total number of dwelling units in the proposed common open space development shall not exceed the total number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning district(s). The gross site area may include more than 1 parcel and it is not mandatory that the parcels be contiguous, although they must be located in the same geographical vicinity, as determined by the director." It seems clear to me that the "gross site area" of this project is only the 30 acres on the north side that is currently zoned SF1A. That allows for 30 homes total, but they are proposing to put in 61 homes because they reduced the allotted homes on the south parcel that is NOT EVEN PART OF THIS PROJECT. That is over double the density! The true spirit of 17.10.025 is to combine two parcels to make one contiguous neighborhood with possibly a creative layout or clustering of lots for better use of the 2 parcels. It is NOT to cram more lots on one piece of land and sometime in the future see what is to be built on the other.

We all agreed, 17.10 was not good for Carson City! We need to get the best possible outcome by using the absolute strictest application of 17.10. **Please vote NO on this**

project or even NO on the entire proposal of developing that Andersen West parcel altogether!

Sincerely, a very concerned lifetime Carson City couple,

Ashley & Brett Allen

From: Leo Mankins <lamankins@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 2:46 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Andersen West - Planning Commission Please vote NO

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

Dear Planning Commissioners:

PLEASE VOTE NO ON THE ANDERSEN WEST PROJECT - Item 6.C

My name is Annette Mankins, and I have lived in Carson City for over 60 years along with my two daughters, their families, and now my three great-grandchildren live here as well.

I attended the March 3rd meeting at WNC and was thrilled to see CCMC 17.10 unanimously repealed by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission. But I was sad to recently hear the Andersen West Project was going before the Planning Commission on April 26th with even more abuse and twisted interpretation of its guidelines.

I understand the concept of being "grandfathered" in to be considered under 17.10, but the City and residents agreed that 17.10 was not benefitting Carson which is why we got rid of it. So now, when the last 17.10 project is being looked at, we need to hold it to the highest standards 17.10 can require. We definitely should NOT bend and stretch how to apply it for the benefit of the developer and the detriment of the City and surrounding neighbors.

I disagree mostly with the transferring of density in this housing project. I was told they are using the 17.10.025 (1) "Residential. The total number of dwelling units in the proposed common open space development shall not exceed the total number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning district(s). The gross site area may include more than 1 parcel and it is not mandatory that the parcels be contiguous, although they must be located in the same geographical vicinity, as determined by the director."

The only part of this project being developed is the 30 acres on the north side which I have been told is zoned for 1 acre lots. Why did 30 homes allowed get turned into 61 lots, more than DOUBLE? It is not fair and is a far stretch of this section's wording. This is proposed only to increase the profits to the landowner and developer. This part of the code was for helping to make a better neighborhood layout on 2 or more parcels planned together! The other 50-acre parcel on the south end is NOT even being developed yet and NOT part of this project at all. It shouldn't play into the number of homes allowed. This is another example of an abuse of 17.10.

Again, Vote NO on this project. We all agreed CCMC 17.10 had problems, so we need to get the best possible outcome by using the strictest rules allowed.

Sincerely,
Annette Mankins
2340 Avery Road

From: Dave & LeAnn Saarem <saarem@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 2:50 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Vote NO on Andersen West for 4-26-23

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

Dear Planning Commission:

I have been deeply involved with the issues surrounding CCMC 17.10 for many years. At the March 3rd Retreat of the BoS and Planning Commission, I was so happy and relieved that 17.10 was finally recognized for its flaws and was unanimously repealed! Many Supervisors and Commissioners stated how the true spirit of 17.10 had been lost, stretched, and sometimes abused. The good intentions of 17.10 had been convoluted to mostly benefit developers' profits, and most proposed tentative maps that were approved were not what Carson City got in reality when the projects were built out. One clear and prominent example is Andersen Ranch Estates on the east side of Ormsby Blvd. Now, the City and residents are facing another, but as I understand, the last application submitted under 17.10, Andersen West.

My first observation about projects under 17.10 is that we have learned from our past. We MUST apply every restraint and restriction to the fullest degree under 17.10. We cannot let loose or vague interpretations be used by the landowner or developer to maximize their profits at the sake of our City and neighboring residents. We MUST stand strong to our beliefs that 17.10 can be taken advantage of and twisted into something we all don't think is a quality product and can actually negatively impact some residents personally.

I am strongly opposed to the Andersen West's interpretation of transferring density from one parcel to another. I understand that staff states it could be part of 17.10.025...

17.10.025 Density and intensity standards.

1. Residential. The total number of dwelling units in the proposed common open space development shall not exceed the total number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning district(s). The gross site area may include more than 1 parcel and it is not mandatory that the parcels be contiguous, although they must be located in the same geographical vicinity, as determined by the director.

I respectfully but absolutely disagree. It is the true intent and spirit of 17.10 to encourage open space and unique lot layouts (clustering) to encourage the best use of the land along with allowing for constraints such as creeks, ravines, hills, etc. It was never intended to be a means of transferring density for no apparent reason or benefit. Also, I believe "the gross site area" stated above in 17.10.025 is intended to apply to where the actual development and neighborhood is to be built. Specifically, the 80 total acres is currently 30 acres on the north (SF1A) and 50 acres on the south (SF1A and some SF12), but the ONLY parcel being developed or even considered in this application is the 30 acres. Therefore, logically the 50 acres has nothing to do with this development. Heather Manzo with Planning stated the 50 acres have not been reviewed nor looked at in any

way. It has only been suggested to put a restriction on its density reduced by the 31 homes they transferred to the Andersen West project. Even our best laid plans cannot guarantee when and how the remaining 50 acres will be developed sometime in the future. But it surely doesn't benefit anyone right now to bend and stretch 17.10 to allow for more than DOUBLE, 61 homes instead of 30 homes, on this 30 acres. The first sentence of this same section under 17.10.025 states "*total number of dwelling units in the proposed common open space development shall not exceed the total number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning district(s).*" There are only 30 homes entitled on the 30 acres, and actually under Title 18 that would be reduced by another say 15% approximately for streets and other requirements. The proposal is asking for 1/3 acre lots where 1 acre lots were zoned and relied upon by adjoining neighbors when they bought their property. There just cannot be any justification for including both parcels in this Andersen West project. They have nothing to do with one another!

We have all already agreed we don't want 17.10, and it wasn't good for Carson in many ways. But if we are forced to consider one last project, we need to be extremely strict about the application to encourage the best possible outcome. Please, I whole heartedly encourage you to vote NO on this project! We cannot afford to approve another controversial and upsetting development for the residents of Carson City.

PLEASE VOTE NO on Andersen West. Carson City deserves the best, strongest decision.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

LeAnn Mankins Saarem, multi-generational native Carson City resident for 54 years
Dave M. Saarem

From: Maddi Saarem <maddisaarem@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 2:55 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: CCMC 17.10

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

Dear Planning Commission:

I am a native Carson City resident, born here and currently putting down roots and raising my own family here. I have been following the CCMC 17.10 issues and was very happy to see it was unanimously repealed by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission. However, I was frustrated to see the Andersen West agenda item 6.C for the Planning Commission meeting on 4/26/23.

I understand that it has been "grandfathered" into 17.10 since it was submitted before it was repealed; however, we all agree that 17.10 has at times been abused and stretched beyond its true intentions and has resulted in some undesirable outcomes when actually built out. This being said, although we need to allow Andersen West to be submitted under 17.10, we MUST hold any developer to the MOST STRICT interpretation of its code to ensure Carson City and its residents don't have any more inconsistent and very controversial housing developments built.

I am mostly opposed to the sharing or transferring of density in this application. When I read 17.10.025 (1) "Residential. The total number of dwelling units in the proposed common open space development shall not exceed the total number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning district(s). The gross site area may include more than 1 parcel and it is not mandatory that the parcels be contiguous, although they must be located in the same geographical vicinity, as determined by the director." It seems clear to me that the "gross site area" of this project is only the 30 acres on the north side currently zoned SF1A. That allows for 30 homes total, but they are proposing to put 61 homes because they reduced the allotted homes on the south parcel that is NOT EVEN IN THIS PROJECT. The true spirit of 17.10.025 is to combine two parcels to make one contiguous neighborhood with possibly a creative layout or clustering of lots for better use of the 2 parcels. It isn't to cram more lots on one piece of land and sometime in the future see what is to be built on the other.

We all agreed, 17.10 wasn't good for Carson and where it's residents want to see Carson in the future. Therefore, we need to get the best possible outcome by using the strictest application of 17.10. Please vote NO on this project.

Thank you,
Maddi Banfield

From: Taylor Saarem <taylorasaarem@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2023 2:58 PM
To: Planning Department
Subject: Andersen West - Vote NO!!

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

Dear Planning Commission:

I was a born and raised Carson City resident and currently own a home and plan to raise my future family here. I have been following the CCMC 17.10 issues and was very happy to see it was unanimously repealed by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission. However, I was troubled to see the Andersen West agenda item 6.C for the Planning Commission meeting on 4-26-23.

Since it was submitted before it was repealed, the project was allowed to be heard. However, we all agree that 17.10 has been abused and stretched beyond its true spirit and has resulted in some undesirable outcomes when actually built out. We MUST hold any developer to the MOST STRICT interpretation of its code to ensure Carson City and its residents don't have any more inconsistent and very controversial housing developments go in.

I am mostly opposed to the transferring of density in this application. When I read 17.10.025 (1) "Residential. The total number of dwelling units in the proposed common open space development shall not exceed the total number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning district(s). The gross site area may include more than 1 parcel and it is not mandatory that the parcels be contiguous, although they must be located in the same geographical vicinity, as determined by the director." It seems clear that the "gross site area" of this project is only the 30 acres on the north side currently zoned SF1A. That allows for 30 homes total, but they are proposing to put 61 homes because they reduced the allotted homes on the south parcel that is NOT EVEN IN THIS PROJECT. The true spirit of 17.10.025 is to combine two parcels to make one contiguous neighborhood with possibly a unique layout of lots for "better" use of the 2 parcels. It IS NOT to cram more lots on one piece of land and sometime in the future see what is to be built on the other.

We all agreed, 17.10 wasn't good for Carson! So we need to get the best possible outcome by using the strictest application of 17.10. Please vote NO on this project.

Thank you,

Taylor Saarem
903 Wagner Dr.