

**Oakley, Katherine**

---

**From:** roxanna dunn <roxanna\_dunn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 7, 2023 5:26 PM  
**To:** Oakley, Katherine  
**Subject:** neighborhood zoom meeting re: ADUs

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Since I cannot get on to the Zoom meeting due to a Spectrum internet outage that has had the internet down for many Incline Village users since 4:00 a.m., I will send my comments in this email. My comments obviously do not reflect on whatever explanations you offered in the Zoom meeting.

Ostensibly, ADUs are being touted as a way to increase the availability of workforce housing, and yet there is a proposed change to the STR ordinances allowing ADUs to be used as STRs. Contradictory messages here.

I understand the benefit of allowing ADUs in large urban areas as a way to counteract decades of sprawl. But Washoe Tahoe has been built as a rural community with coverage limitations preserving open areas that filter drainage into the lake, a natural treasure over which we have stewardship. Efforts to increase density are applying urban solutions on a rural infrastructure - particularly, our very limited roads. We live in a vulnerable forested area where the risk of wildfire will only increase over the next few decades as climate change brings higher temperatures, drier conditions, and more severe weather. We are facing this as the county vigorously promotes development and has yet to provide an evacuation plan that addresses how our substantial population can be moved out on our three egress roads.

What needs to be in place before these changes are enacted:

- A solid evacuation plan that translates changes in density to hours required for evacuation in general and in specific areas with limited ingress/egress and assesses the consequent risk.
- A pilot program that shows that ADUs provide workforce housing and are not used primarily as STRs
- An environmental impact analysis that shows that there are methods in place to counteract any negative environmental impact of the relaxation of coverage limits.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanna Dunn  
Incline Village resident

**Oakley, Katherine**

---

**From:** barbara stinson <barbarastinson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 14, 2023 5:06 PM  
**To:** Oakley, Katherine  
**Subject:** RE: Washoe unincorporated area granny flats

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Cannot link to meeting.

What is goal of this legislation? To help families and residents, or to create rentals on county property?

I voice ONLY OWNER OCCUPIED property for the main residence be eligible to rent or use an accessory dwelling.

I absolutly do not want the landlords, mold in one property, to be allowed to build and rent another unit . This is subdividing rental property for more rentals and will crash the neighborhoods. There are 3 new rentals near me and already I see horror stories.

Family values.  
Family property  
Owner occupied main property  
Tax break they rent to a family or disabled person.

Please !!!!

No rented main property shall be allowed to rent a second unit on that same property.  
No

Please keep homes and neighborhoods safe from crazy congestion and untold amounts of rentals being placed in former stable neighborhoods.

Barbara Stinson

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

On Wed, Dec 13, 2023 at 12:58 PM, Oakley, Katherine  
<KOakley@washoecounty.gov> wrote:

Hello,

Under what is being proposed, an Administrative Review permit would be required, but yes it would be possible. If you're on septic, you would also need to check with Northern Nevada Public Health. Right now, we have no

## Oakley, Katherine

---

**From:** Hugh10000 <hugh10000@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 22, 2023 9:08 AM  
**To:** Oakley, Katherine; Larry Chesney  
**Subject:** Upcoming Planning Commission Agenda Item 3

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Mrs. Oakley,

I have read the proposed revisions to the development code Article 406 regarding battery charged fences. The following requirement for marking such fences, "WARNING: ELECTRIC FENCE." confuses the operation and identification of such fences with normal electrically charged fences used for controlling livestock. It is apparent from the proposed description in the development code that a "battery charged fence" is a low voltage device while it is common knowledge that an electrically charged fence is a high voltage device by necessity and function.

The proposed description given to describe what a battery charged fence is appears insufficient to separate its use and function from an electrically charged fence, which is an everyday common item in the agricultural community. As read, the given description leaves the two items to be identical - which thus could lead common electrically charged fences to be subject to regulatory control. I do not believe that the Senate Bill 208 to which your item refers intended to include electrically charged fences in the mandate.

I highly recommend that this description be modified with a single line, at the beginning of the description reading thus"

"A battery charged fence as addressed by Article 406, is not an electrically charged fence intended for the use of livestock control"

Such a definite delimiter in description will eliminate future regulatory confusion regarding what, exactly, a battery controlled fence actually is.

In addition - it is specifically noted in the proposed new section that a battery charged fence may not be surrounded by an electrically charged fence - which virtually eliminates the use of battery charged fences on properties wherein electrically charged fences are used for livestock control. Please note condition of use 3:

"The battery-charged fence shall be surrounded by a nonelectric perimeter fence or wall that is at least 5 feet in height"

the term "nonelectric" can be interpreted to virtually eliminate the prospect of the two fences being utilized together on the same property.

I believe the proposed Section 110.406.50 f wording is not sufficiently written with the clarity and description necessary to 1. Properly address SB 208 intent in regulation and 2. Properly identify, and

separate by definition the two items addressed above (battery charged fences vs electrically charged fences).

I have read the proposed revisions to the development code Article 406 regarding battery charged fences. The following requirement for marking such fences, "WARNING: ELECTRIC FENCE." confuses the operation and identification of such fences with normal electrically charged fences used for controlling livestock. It is apparent from the proposed description in the development code that a "battery charged fence" is a low voltage device while it is common knowledge that an electrically charged fence is a high voltage device by necessity and function.

Please note that the proposed signage requirement for battery charged fences serves to introduce confusion regarding exactly which type of fence is present - as a battery charged fence is not likely to produce an electric shock upon contact while an electrically charged fence will. This vagueness could lead to an unintended safety issue wherein a person confuses the signage with a low voltage fence and intentionally contacts himself/herself with a fence that is charged with a high voltage (thinking such is a low-voltage fence). Such a contact with the certain individual could interfere with medical devices and be life threatening.

Thus, the signage requirement is both insufficient to separate the two devices and could very well be unsafe (and possibly life-threatening) in certain instances.

Please include this email as a comment for this item in the upcoming Planning Commission Meeting and forward this email to members of the Planning Commission.

Hugh Ezzell, Civil Engineer  
(775) 240-2692

Larry if you agree with the above, please forward to the secretary of the Planning Commission - Hugh

December 29, 2023

Washoe County Planning Commission  
1001 East Ninth Street  
Reno, NV 89512-2845

**RE: Development Code Amendment WDCA23-0004**

Chair Pierce and Commissioners:

My name is Pat Davison. I testified at the October hearing about the Master Plan Update as it relates to implementation of the Housing action items. My interest then is the same as now - increasing the supply of affordable/attainable housing for existing and future residents.

I support these changes proposed by staff:

- Allow detached ADUs as an allowed use by right on parcels over ½ acre in size in LDR, MDR, HDR, LDS/LDS2 regulatory zones (reducing regulatory review)
- Allow detached ADUs in the MDS/MDS4 zones to use the AR process rather than the Board of Adjustment SUP process (reducing regulatory review)
- Update the maximum square footage for both attached and detached ADUs
- Add “minor accessory dwelling unit” as a new smaller detached residential type with incentives

ADUs are a solution for generational housing – where family members can live together but separately. A financial motive is not involved and the end result is that decent and safe housing is provided.

ADUs are also one tool in your toolkit to increase the supply of affordable rental housing, even if only by a dozen units each year. There is no easy or single solution. Increasing supply drives market prices down. Why do we as a County want more homeowners to take the time and spend the money to build an ADU for long term rental purposes?

Because we desperately need it. Residents who today live in substandard housing are the beneficiaries of any County change to incentivize the creation of more affordable/workforce housing. Those residents could be the young professional just starting his or her career path but spending more than 30% of monthly income on rent, a four person family crammed into a much too small apartment, or the minimum wage earner who may be living in his or her vehicle. ADUs can help those households realize a decent and stable rental option.

On December 20, KOLO News Channel 8 aired a story about the Eddy House exceeding capacity. Here is the link to that video story:

<https://www.kolotv.com/2023/12/21/eddy-house-calls-community-support-following-an-uptick-local-chronic-homelessness/>

The Channel 8 news story contains comments from Trevor Macaluso, the CEO of Eddy House:

*“ The homeless population for youth represents about 1 in 10 of the homeless in our community. Again, roughly 10% of the homeless in our community are this 18 to 24 population. ’*



*But the cost of living is becoming too expensive for some.*

*'We do not have affordable housing in our community. When a one-bedroom apartment in our community is costing \$1,500 to \$2,000 a month, and landlords are requiring more significant incomes in order to rent to you, it is a problem for the youth who are 18-24 and not making \$45,000, \$50,000, and expecting them to go have a place to live.'*"

So the big question – how do we get more homeowners to take the time and money to build an ADU for rental purposes? We can't force homeowners to build ADUs and we don't want to ignore necessary health and environmental regulations.

The proposed Development Code amendments reduce the regulatory and cost hurdles currently in place. Eliminating or reducing the cost and time involved can be significant incentives. That being said, ADU permitting and construction could still be daunting obstacles. Not to mention that adding an ADU might increase property values so there could be an increase in property taxes after construction is done.

The all important issue of water overdrafting, if I understand correctly, is addressed by existing regulation which covers the need for purchase of additional water rights, installation of a water meter, drilling a new well, and/or affidavit from the State Engineer – all designed to protect the aquifer.

Neighborhood compatibility of detached ADUs on smaller lots is addressed through three mechanisms:

- 1) outright prohibition (on parcels around ¼ acre in size);
- 2) continuation of current policy requiring detached ADUs on parcels ½ acre or smaller in zones LDR, MDR, HDR, LDS/LDS2 to go through the AR process; or
- 3) the new requirement for parcels ½ acre or smaller in the GR and GRA zones to go through the AR process.

And I am sure there will be more discussion soon about ADUs and Short Term Rentals.

There is always a balancing act involved when formulating land use policy. I think the proposal before you has the correct balance – eliminating some of the hurdles while retaining a strong regulatory framework.

I just have a couple of closing comments:

- 1) please ask Planning staff to keep track of ADU permits separately by type (attached or detached) and regulatory zone. Of greatest interest to me and likely to you is if the changes did result in more ADUs being constructed over the next few years.
- 2) and if the Washoe County Commission does approve these changes, the County e-newsletter and other information/communication venues should be utilized to promote these changes so they aren't the best kept secret in town.

Thank you for considering my comments.



Pat Davison  
35 Clydesdale Drive  
Reno, NV 89508

**Oakley, Katherine**

---

**From:** Paul Juhnke <pwjuhnke@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 22, 2023 8:06 AM  
**To:** Oakley, Katherine  
**Subject:** Washoe County Zoning

**[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]**

xx

Kat;

You have no right to change the 30-year-old, established zoning on our property! If you want to change zoning, do it on your own property.

Or you can plan for undeveloped, un-zoned property to be appropriately zoned as part of your professional duties as part of the mandated Urban Planning Process. During that process, you can zone undeveloped property in Washoe County the way you think it should be zoned, for proper and appropriate community development for everyone involved.

That must be done BEFORE I decide to purchase and develop a piece of the property. Stealing our property value and zoning rights after-the-fact are not activities you are authorized to do. Stealing our property value and zoning rights amount to theft and fraud, when committed by a public official. As a public servant, I must remind you, and other members of the Planning & Building Division, that you are not authorized by the voters of Washoe County to commit property crimes, and you should stop all activity that conspires to do so.

Sincerely,  
Paul Juhnke  
5410 Ventana Parkway

## Oakley, Katherine

---

**From:** barbara stinson <barbarastinson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 2, 2024 3:15 PM  
**To:** Oakley, Katherine  
**Subject:** RE: Washoe unincorporated area granny flats

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Good information.

.. if looking asleep size of adu, don't pressure small small units. That would be like putting up a shed for a family to live in. Tacky and not good for mental health.

.. concerning

inventor grounds and rental property. I hope that the family new " investor class" "Trusts" that own rentals , and other properties that are used as rental.

Please limit the ability to build Adu.

Example,

An investor group buys 3 homes in a neighborhood. They rent then out. Then they put a new ADU on each property. Now the neighbor is living next to 2 rentals and an absentee landlord. Multiply it by the other properties that they buy...

You have an out of building and resid3nts in a formerly stable neighborhood.

Also, parking should be in an alley or on the property.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

On Tue, Jan 2, 2024 at 10:03 AM, Oakley, Katherine  
<KOakley@washoecounty.gov> wrote:

Hi Barbara,

Sounds very busy! In short, the ADU portion of the proposed amendments are intended to lower barriers to ADU development where appropriate. Right now, in most places a special planning permit is required for a detached ADU. However, when we reviewed these permits over the last 4 years, we found that none of them were denied and very few received public comment of any kind. This indicated to us that the process we were making people go through to build a detached ADU was unnecessary and could be changed. People with parcels half an acre or smaller would still be required to go through the additional planning permit due to the greater impacts development on a small lot can have. Parcels smaller than 2 acres that are on septic will also still be limited by Health Regulations to contain only one dwelling unit.

Some other changes proposed to ADU's are aimed to increase consistency across our code. Right now, there are different maximum sizes for attached or detached ADU's. We are proposing that they be the same, for more