

MINUTES OF THE CHURCHILL COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

155 N. Taylor St., Fallon, NV 89406

March 22, 2022

1. Call to Order:

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 6:36 p.m. on March 22, 2022 by Chair Charlie Arciniega.

Present: Charlie Arciniega, Chair; Shane Yates, Vice Chair; Deanna Diehl, Member; Myles Getto, Member; Scott Nelson, Member; Paul Picotte, Member; and Zack Bunyard, Member.

Absent:

Planning Staff Present:

Chris Spross, Public Works Director
Dean Patterson, Associate Planner
Alexa Robinson, Office Specialist

Civil D.A. Staff Present:

Ben Shawcroft, Deputy District Attorney

2. Public Comment:

There were none.

3. Verification of the Posting of the Agenda:

It was verified by Alexa Robinson, Office Specialist, that the Agenda for this meeting was posted on March 16, 2022, between 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., at all of the locations listed on the Agenda, in accordance with NRS 241 and the Churchill County Code.

4. Consideration and possible action re: Approval of Agenda as submitted or revised:

Chair Charlie Arciniega asked for any changes to the agenda; there were none.

Member Zack Bunyard moved to approve the agenda as submitted. Member Myles Getto seconded the motion which carried by unanimous vote.

5. Public Hearings:

- A. Consideration and possible action re: Bill 2022-A, Ordinance 27, 32 & 39 – Title: An ordinance adding a new zoning district designation to Title 16 which shall be known as intensive multi-family residential district (R-3) and setting forth the uses for such a district and establishing development standards and requirements for all types of multi-family development in all zoning districts.

Dean Patterson, Associate Planner, reviewed the information from the prior March 9, 2022 meeting. He stated that he would like to get the opinions of the Planning Commission about the project. Mr. Patterson shared his initial plan, which was to go over the overview of the project and then the individual sections of the ordinance could be reviewed in detail. He amended, that if everyone on the Planning Commission had already made their review of the material and felt comfortable moving forward without going over the overview then that discussion could be skipped, and they could address any questions or suggestions from the Planning Commission.

Chair Arciniega, addressed the Planning Commission member to see how they desired to proceed. Member Bunyard stated that he felt he had enough of a review from the last meeting and from the outline provided to the members. Member Nelson also agreed that the members of the Planning Commission were satisfied with their review of the project information. Chair Arciniega agreed that he had reviewed the outline and was satisfied to move on to questions and suggestions from the Planning Commission members.

Member Getto asked if the densities of the area around Churchill Village area could be revisited and compare those densities per acre to the proposed project. Mr. Patterson responded that there are three residential zoning districts, R1, R2, and the proposed R3. The density for R1 consist of 5 units per acre equaling about 7,000 square foot lots. The density of R2 is 10 units per acre which would be the equivalent of putting a triplex on a lot that was one-third of an acre. R3 would be 16 units per acre, an example of this density would be the apartments at Keddie Street and Timothy Way which consist of fourplexes on one-quarter acre lots. To address the area that Member Getto had made his inquiry, Mr. Patterson stated that Arborwood Apartments have multiple densities but altogether they come out 17 units per acre. He also stated that those apartments are some of the nicest in town with landscaping and amenities such as playgrounds. North of these apartments is the Churchill Village, which are 18 units per acre. Mr. Patterson also reiterated from the prior meeting that the apartment complex south of the Ford dealership within the city limits of Fallon, called Morning Glory Apartments, contain 20 units per acre with very little landscaping. For comparison to the proposed R3, the R3 zoning would have less densities to all of the above mentioned existing complexes. Mr. Patterson stated that only with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) could the density be increased closer to those numbers.

Member Bunyard asked for clarification on whether a PUD would allow for adding more units to areas with an R3 zoning designation. Mr. Patterson replied that this was correct, with a bonus density through a PUD more units per acre could be added. Member Bunyard inquired as to the specific number of units that the PUD bonus density would be allow in an R3 designation. Mr. Patterson answered that the density was based on the same base density found in the standards table which would be the above mentioned 5, 10 and 16 units per acre for the R1, R2, and R3 designations respectively. PUDs use the same density, with the exception that PUDs can apply for bonus density by providing additional beneficial facilities. Some examples from the Sky Ranch development of beneficial additions include offsite road improvements, the widening of the Wade Lane thoroughfare through the length of the development, the extra width along the Moody Lane frontage, and the creation of a lift station, and a dedicated area to provide a community services site which could involve a substation or branch of a community service. With bonus density in a PUD this would allow the densities to increase for R1 from 5 to 8, for R2 from 10 to 16, and in R3 that would be from 16 to 24 units per acre. These are not automatic increases for PUDs, developers must provide something of value to the community to qualify.

Member Bunyard requested another clarification about the requirements for a zoning change to R3, specifically that the location would need to be in the vicinity of county water and sewer services. Mr. Patterson confirmed that this is correct, R3 zones would have to connect to both sewer and water on the county's system.

Member Diehl had questions about the bonus density term mentioned on page five of the ordinance and would like clarification on its definition. Mr. Patterson replied that the section mentioned on that page is actually much longer than the excerpt taken for the purpose of this meeting which only mentions the parts which would be changing if approved. The bonus density qualifications are laid out in the rest of the PUD section of the ordinance. Member Diehl wished to hear again what the criteria for bonus density would include. Mr. Patterson explained that it is purposefully not specific to give the County room to determine what is or is not a benefit to the community. For example, this may include purchasing transfer of development (TDR) rights, as well as the community benefits mentioned earlier.

Chair Arciniega inquired as to whether there was a possibility of bonus density being granted for amenities within a complex such as a pool, a community room, or a health club on the condition that these amenities could also be used by county residents. Mr. Patterson clarified that the code only gives examples, not specifics, but that it is emphasized that it needs to be a community benefit. Most often amenities within a complex are reserved for the use of the residents of the complex and wouldn't be a community benefit. One exception may be if a complex also developed a community park, then that would benefit community members outside of the complex as well.

Chris Spross added additional clarification for the vague nature of the code's definition of community benefit. He stated that another major factor is the geographic location of the development. He made the example of a development offering to build a community park directly across the street from an already existing community park. In which case, this does not provide much community benefit in that area. However, if the development was placed a few miles from any other community park, then this could be a community benefit to that area. The code provides flexibility so that the Commissioners can decide what constitutes a community benefit.

Member Picotte had questions about the bonus density, he wanted to know if a bonus density existed within the city and if there were any examples of areas which had max bonus density. Mr. Patterson replied that he does not believe the city has any laws similar to the county code, but he also wouldn't be able to fully answer for the city as they have their own set of rules and regulations outside of his jurisdiction. Mr. Picotte explained that his concern was utilizing the max bonus density in the county too frequently may cause the county to "overtake the city's buildings". Deputy District Attorney Ben Shawcroft responded that if the city had plans to develop more multi-family housing, then the county wouldn't so desperately need this option, however at this point in time the only option for the housing shortage is to develop in the county in areas that can connect to the county water and sewer.

Mr. Picotte also inquired as to whether it was appropriate to discuss the potential project going forward and why. Mr. Shawcroft gave a statement about the matter, he stated that the county had never before been approached with a project to build multi-family housing and when faced with such a severe housing crisis, especially for multi-family units, the county has become more receptive to these developments. He also stated that the county looks for locations where these developments would be suitable before talking with developers who may be interested in pursuing these projects. The county is now in a position where it is preparing to move forward with an actual development. He explained it is not the development near Birch Lane, but a different project entirely. Mr. Shawcroft specified that obtaining this zoning is step one toward building the framework for these types of projects in the future. When the project Mr. Picotte inquired about does move forward, the commissioners will have the chance to review the special use permit for it at that time. At this meeting it would not be appropriate to get into the details of that specific project, because this meeting does not list that project on its agenda and the developers are not present to answer questions. Mr. Shawcroft then stated that the purpose of this meeting and the changes to the code are reflective of the county's interest in pursuing multi-family housing development projects. He also added that at this meeting the purpose was to amend the county code to include the new zoning designation, but when developments are proposed, they will have to make sure the parcel for their project has the appropriate zoning and if it is not, then that application will be reviewed by the board. Since R3 is new, then there will

be no county parcels zoned R3, therefore any project wishing to have the R3 zoning designation will have to put in an application to the Planning Commissioners, and the County Commissioners, for a rezone approval.

6. Public Comment:

Chair Arciniega opened the meeting to public comment and began by reading a letter he had received from a county citizen who could not attend the meeting. The emailed letter from Lori Souba has been attached for review.

Dennis Dalla spoke about his being born and raised in a small town which became a big city. He stated that “by opening the door to this you’re just...playing with a snake that will bite your head off in the long run.”. He proceeded to say that no one in the county would expect that kind of density near them and in his opinion, it would be a shame to build apartment buildings in the outskirts of Fallon.

Upon no further public comment, Chairman Charlie Arciniega summarized the meeting’s purpose. He stated that it was to look at adding a new zoning district designation to the Churchill County code as outlined by Dean Patterson and legal council Ben Shawcroft. Based on the previous meeting in conjunction with the current meeting, the questions from the board members had been sufficiently answered. Dean Patterson requested that an item be added to the motion before the vote. The addition would be to correct an error where it was stated that multi-family is currently allowed in commercial zones, but after talking with staff it was suggested that since there has never been any use for that designation in those zones, it would be better to eliminate multi-family from commercial zoning districts. It is recommended from the Planning Department to include the elimination of multi-family from commercial zones in the use table in the motion for the findings. Specifically, it would be stated as the following change: on the row for the two to four multi-family dwellings, remove the “S” for the C1 and C2 zones. Chair Arciniega called for a motion for the findings.

Member Getto, based on the information provided in the application and staff report heard tonight, moved that the findings had been met for conformance with the criteria found in Churchill County Code 16.08.060(E)(2) regarding a county code amendment to establish a new zoning district and other associated changes with the correction for the row for two to four multi-family dwellings, remove the “S” from the C1 and C2 zones. Member Bunyard seconded the motion. The vote was five in favor (Members Arciniega, Yates, Bunyard, Getto, and Picotte) and two opposed (Members Nelson and Diehl).

Chair Arciniega called for a motion for the decision.

Member Bunyard, based on the previously adopted findings made for this project, moved to recommend that the board of County Commissioners approve Bill 2022-A amending the Churchill County Code to establish the R3 intensive multi-family residential district and other associated changes. Member Getto seconded the motion. The vote was four in favor (Members Arciniega, Yates, Bunyard, and Getto) and three opposed (Members Nelson, Picotte, and Diehl).

7. Public Comment:

Chair Arciniega asked if there was any public comment for items not listed on the agenda. There

were none.

8. Adjournment:

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Chair Charlie Arciniega adjourned the meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alexa Robinson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Alexa Robinson
Office Specialist

Application:	Bill 2022-A - County Code Amendment to add R-3 zoning district		
Use Listing:	For intensive multifamily use		
Applicant:	Churchill County	Owner:	N/A
Site:	N/A		
Designations:	Master Plan – For use in the Urbanizing Area // Zoning – New R-3 zoning district.		

Proposal: Churchill County is proposing to establish a new residential zoning district. The current residential zoning districts are:

- E-1 First Estate District
- R-1 Single Family Residential District
- R-2 Multi-Family Residential District

The proposed zoning district is titled:

- R-3 Intensive Multi-Family Residential District

The new ordinance provides for multi-family development with an intensity that is customary for large apartment complexes. The ordinance:

- Establishes the new zone
- Makes adjustments to the R-2 zone to coordinate the zone description, its allowed density, and its development standards with the new R-3 zone.
- Makes adjustments to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) standards to incorporate the new zone into those standards and coordinate it with the other residential zones.
- Establish allowed uses for the new R-3 zone in the Use Table, along with adjustments to the R-2 zone to coordinate the two zones.
- Establish a new section to provide development standards for all multi-family development (whether in the R-2 zone, R-3 zone, Planned Unit Developments, etc.)
- Significant changes are made to the two existing table and their notes that provide **Intensity and Dimension Standards**. In addition to the above noted changes for the R-2 and R-3 zones, changes are made to:
 - o Streamline the use of the tables by combining the two tables and their notes into one table with notes
 - o Eliminate duplication
 - o Correct errors
 - o Refine existing standards
 - o Provide complete standards for cluster developments

Two primary elements of residential zones are density and allowed uses:

- The changes provide a tiered and increasing allowance of density and is coordinated between zones: The proposed **Intensity and Dimension Standards** table shows the changes in maximum density:
R-1 = 5 units/ac; **R-2** = 10 units/ac; **R-3** = 16 units/ac.
- Similarly, the PUD standards use the same maximum base densities, but allow the option of requesting bonus density in exchange for providing additional beneficial facilities:
R-1 = 8 units/ac; **R-2** = 16 units/ac; **R-3** = 24 units/ac.
- The **Use Table** provides differences in what uses are allowed in different zones often in a tiered and coordinated way. The R-2 zone was adjusted to limit the number of residences to 4 or fewer per lot. Thus, a home, duplex, tri-plex, four-plex, or a pair of duplexes can be placed on a lot. Only the R-3

zone allows more units on a lot. **Note** that placing more than a duplex on a lot becomes more difficult with more units unless connecting to a community sewer and water system.

- Because of the intensity of population in an R-3 development, a limited number of commercial and community uses are proposed to be allowed. Community uses that are similar to apartments are allowed. Commercial uses that commonly provide neighborhood services are allowed.
- The commercial zones currently allow multi-family development, but proposed changes to the Use Table will prohibit future multi-family development. There have been few or no such developments since the zoning code was established, and a handful that pre-date the zoning code. These will become non-conforming uses. They may continue to operate as they have, but if the use ceases, they lose their nonconforming status and may not be re-established. New multi-family developments that are desired in the current commercial zones would need to be re-zoned to R-3, or use a PUD.

A number of other minor changes and corrections were included in the ordinance:

- Special provisions for cluster developments currently exist for a few specific standards (in specific table cells). But those don't extend to all standards (in other cells), and cluster lots cannot normally meet those standards. Changes are made to the fill gaps for missing standards, and streamline their use. Notes 4 and 6 are edited to fix errors and clarify the application of standards.
- Changes are made to correct errors in standards for PUDs. Specifically, the current table has separate rows for PUDs in each zone; yet the table entries were wrong, incomplete, or blank. These rows are proposed to be eliminated, with a general note (***) on each applicable zone directing the reader to the PUD section regarding dimensional standards. This greatly streamlined the table and eliminated the errors.
- Changes are made to correct inconsistent density terminology, to coordinate tiers of increasing density among the residential zones, and to clarify that density refers to the number of **residences**, not to commercial, industrial, and other uses.
- The dimensional standards table for residential zones did not have height limits, while the table for commercial zones did. When the tables were combined, this column was added to provide a standard for all zones.
- The standard establishing 1 single family residence per lot (when allowed) is Note (1) in the current table, but it is located in the wrong place, and does not fully describe the application of the standard. The table and note are edited to correct this.
- The current tables have errors throughout the columns for Minimum Average Lot Width, and Minimum Lot Width, including consideration of lots on cul-de-sacs. Errors are corrected - for example, the Minimum Average Lot Width should be the larger number.

CCC 16.08.060(E)2 *The commission, in forwarding a recommendation to the board for approval of a zoning map amendment or consolidated development code amendment shall make the following findings of fact:*

- a. *That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with and supports the goals and policies of the master plan.***

Most goals and policies in the 2020 Master Plan do not address the specific subject of multi-family development, but there are some. The Population and Housing Chapters identify a severe shortage of rental properties, which are mostly apartments, and encourages opportunities to develop them. The proposed R-3 zoning district complies with these policies, and can help alleviate the shortage.

The Master Plan Chapter 9 (Public Services and Facilities) policies requires that intensive development be connected to a community sewer system and water system, and the proposed R-3 zone also requires this. Furthermore, community systems are only located in the Urbanizing Area, and the Master Plan specifically

indicates that all zoning districts are acceptable in the Urbanizing Area. The proposed R-3 zone complies with the public services policies and the policies establishing a land use designation system.

Policies regarding compatibility with adjacent uses will come into play when the R-3 zone is applied to individual locations.

- b. That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with existing adjacent land uses and will not have detrimental impacts to other properties in the vicinity.***

Compatibility with adjacent land uses cannot be determined until the R-3 is proposed for specific locations and permit applications submitted. The changes proposed for the Use Table (included in the packet) are intended that uses within an R-3 zone will be compatible with other allowed uses in the zone. Zoning code standards include providing buffers and friction zones between different types of land use to improve compatibility between them; but that would be addressed when individual projects are proposed.

- c. That the proposed amendment will not negatively impact existing or planned public services or facilities and will not adversely impact the public health, safety and welfare.***

The impact on public services and facilities cannot be determined until the R-3 zone is proposed on a specific location. However, community sewer and water systems must be available to propose the zone. Impacts to roads and other public services are considered at the time of a permit application for a project. No negative impacts will result from the code amendment at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

MOTIONS FOR FINDINGS: The motion should be modified by the Planning Commission as needed.

- ☐ Based on the information provided in the application, in the staff report, and heard tonight, I move that the findings [**HAVE BEEN // HAVE NOT BEEN**] met for conformance with the criteria found in CCC 16.08.060(E)2 regarding a County Code Amendment to establish a new zoning district and other associated changes.

[For APPROVAL - Staff Report provides adequate findings.]

[For DENIAL – add additional findings:] Specifically, the project fails to **[ADD NEEDED REASONING RELATED TO CRITERIA]**

MOTIONS FOR DECISION: The motion should be modified by the Planning Commission as needed.

- ☐ Based on the previously adopted findings made for this project, I move to recommend that the Board of County Commissioners [**APPROVE // DENY**] Bill 2022-A amending the Churchill County Code to establish the R-3 Intensive Multi-Family Residential District and other associated changes.



CHURCHILL COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING

March 22, 2022

Development Code Amendment

BILL 2022-A

Establish new R-3 zoning district
(Intensive Multi-Family Residential)
&
Related changes and corrections

A solid orange horizontal bar spanning the width of the slide at the bottom.

Changes to Zoning Descriptions **(p. 2)**

New R-3 district description

16.08.185: INTENSIVE MULTI-FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R-3)

Changes to R-2 district description

16.08.180: MULTI-FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (R-2)

- **Coordinate urban resid. zones (R-1, R-2, R-3)**
- **Distinguish moderate v. high intensity**
- **Emphasize sewer and water connections**

Use Table Changes

(Exhibit A – separate)

Added a column for R-3

R-3 uses are mostly the same as R-2

Coordinated R-2 and R-3 uses

- **R-2 changed for up to 4 units on parcel**
- **R-3 for 5+ units (apartment complexes)**
- **R-3 does not allow single family residential**
- **R-3 allows community services similar to apts.**
- **R-3 allows neighborhood commercial**

> Recommend removing multifamily from commercial zones

- **Error to correct – remove “S” in C-1 & C-2**

Density Changes

(Standards Table)

Added R-3 to standards table (p. 8)

Checked nearby counties for comparison

Fixed open-ended density for R-2

Coordinated R-1, R-2, & R-3

- **Use increasing & tiered density**
- **R-1: 5 units/ac. (~7000 sf lots + roads)**
- **R-2: 10 units/ac. (previously not stated)**
- **R-3: 16 units/ac.**
- **>>Compare local city apts. - 17-20 units/ac.**

Density Changes

(Planned Unit Development Section)

Added R-3 to PUD code section (p. 3-5)

Coordinated densities among R-1, R-2 & R-3

- **Start with base zoning density in table**
- **PUD allows bonus density for providing additional beneficial facilities.**
- **R-1: base 5/ac. // bonus 8/ac**
- **R-2: base 10/ac. // bonus 16/ac**
- **R-3: base 16/ac. // bonus 24/ac**

New standards for ALL Multi-family Development **(CCC 16.16.020.8 – page 9-10)**

- **New section (I)**
- **Describes how density is calculated (A)**
- **Requires balcony, laundry, trash site (E)**
- **3 paragraphs (B, C, D) that establishes a tiered requirement for open space.**
 - **2-4 units: Landscaping yards**
 - **5+ units: 20% of project site in open space**
 - **20+ units: tenant amenities**

Intensity and Dimensional Standards Tables (CCC 16.16.020.1)

- **Currently found in 2 tables with notes**
- **Deletes them and combines into one table with notes**
- **Eliminates redundancy and streamlines the table**
- **Fixes errors and fills in missing standards**
- **Adds R-3 zone and coordinates it with other residential zones**

Zoning District	Site Development Standards								
	Area And Density		Site Dimension Standards				Minimum Setbacks (Ft.)		
	Minimum Parcel Area *	Maximum Residential Density ¹	Minimum Lot Width (Ft.)	Minimum Average Lot Width (Ft.)	Minimum Distance Between Dwellings (Ft.)	Maximum Height (Ft.)	Front ^{7, 8, 10}	Side ^{**} , 8	Rear ^{**} , 8
A-5 ^{6, 4}	5 acres	1 per 5 acres	150	200	60	35	30	25	40
A-10 ^{6, 4}	10 acres	1 per 10 acres	200	300	60	35	30 ⁵	30 ⁵	40 ⁵
E-1 ^{***}	1 acre ⁹	2 per acre ⁹	60/30 ³	100/80 ²	20	35	30	10	20
R-1 ^{***}	7,000 sq. ft.	5 per acre	60/30 ³	100/80 ²	10	35	20	6	20
	Corner lots 7,500 sq. ft.	5 per acre	75	n/a	10	35	20	6	20
R-2 ^{***}	5,000 sq. ft.	10 per acre	50/30 ³	60/80 ²	10	35	20	5	20
R-3 ^{***}	8,000 sq. ft.	16 per acre	50	60	20	35	20	20	20
RR-20	20 acres	1 per 20 acres	500	600	60	35	30	30	40
C-1 ^{***}	1 acre ¹⁴	n/a – except for PUDs	80/30 ³	100	n/a	35	30 ¹²	n/a	10/20 ¹¹
C-2 ^{***}	1 acre ¹⁴	n/a – except for PUDs	80/30 ³	100	n/a	45	30 ¹²	n/a	20
I ^{***}	1 acre ¹⁴	n/a – except for PUDs	80	100	n/a	65	40	20 ¹³	30

NOTES:

* For non-PUD land divisions, the area of road easement or right-of-way may contribute to meeting the minimum parcel area requirement for parcels of 1 acre or more, and shall be excluded for parcels of less than 1 acre.

** A detached accessory building may occupy not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total area of a rear yard. No such accessory building shall be nearer than 5 feet to the rear and side of the property line nor closer to main buildings on the same or adjacent lots.

*** Lot size, density, and dimensional standards for planned unit developments will be established during approval of the project; and where not established shall be determined by the building official and Director at the time of issuance of a building permit.

1. To determine whether various residential structures are allowed in a zone, refer to the use table in CCC 16.08.250. The maximum residential density for single family dwellings on existing parcels is 1 per parcel except as allowed elsewhere in this title, such as for accessory dwellings and 2nd permanent dwellings. The maximum residential density for multifamily dwellings and the creation of new parcels for single family residential development is as stated in the table.

2. Minimum average width for those lands with frontages abutting a cul-de-sac.

3. Minimum frontage width for those lands with frontages abutting a cul-de-sac.

4. Except when the lots are created as part of a cluster development, then the minimum parcel area and maximum residential density shall be in conformance with CCC 16.12.040.4 as an allowed exception to the Master Plan policies for Public Services and Facilities and section 13.02.010.

5. Setbacks for lots within the Hazen or Stillwater town sites shall conform where possible to the following:

Front minimum setback = 30 feet

Side minimum setback = 10 feet

Rear minimum setback = 20 feet

6. Lots created as part of a cluster development shall use the site dimension standards and minimum setbacks standards established for the E-1 zoning district.

7. Setback is from any road easement; where corner lots shall have 2 front yards.

8. Setbacks for detached accessory dwelling unit shall be the same as those for a primary dwelling unit.

9. Minimum lot size is 1/2 acre if water or sewer facilities are provided; 1 acre if facilities are not provided.

10. An additional setback of 30 feet more than the listed distance is required along all State and County-maintained roads with speed limits greater than 25 miles per hour, unless the lot is less than 1.5 acres in size.

11. This setback applies when the property abuts a Residentially zoned or residentially used parcel.

12. 10 feet of this setback that is adjacent to the street will be dedicated to landscaping.

13. 20 feet or a width equal to the height of the structure, whichever is greater.

14. If community sewer and water services are extended to the property, the minimum parcel area is 5000 square feet.

Options for Bill 2022-A

- **Continue the hearing to another night**
- **Make a recommendation tonight**
 - **Include error correction:**
“except making the following change – on the row for 2-4 Multi-Family Dwellings, remove the S for the C-1 & C-2 zones.”

From: souba REDACTED
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 4:11 PM
To: REDACTED
Subject: R-3 zoning input

County Planning Commission,

My name is Lori Souba and I am a county resident and county homeowner for over 20 years. I am a nurse at Banner here in Fallon and I am at work today, so I cannot attend the special meeting tonight, but I would like you to hear my input on the new zoning proposal.

16-24 units per acre is incredibly high density for a county. That is the density normally found in a city, and that is where it belongs, because a city has the services to meet the needs of that many people, and the citizens of a city expect and accept that kind of density.

We in the county value our rural way of life, and R-3 zoning would destroy that way of life. No one living in the county expects to have high density housing in or near our neighborhoods. We chose the rural way of life for a reason. We like the open spaces and the quiet. That is why we purchased houses in the county and not in the city. R-3 housing is absolutely incompatible with rural living, and if the precedent is set and the county commission chooses to allow spot zoning (or for that matter ANY zoning changes in existing rural neighborhoods) this R-3 zoning will destroy the rural way of life, because EVERY developer will ask for it.

Right now my neighborhood is fighting spot zoning of R-1 in the middle of our E-1 neighborhood, and I am positive that if R-3 were available to the developer, he would ask for it, because the more dense they build, the more money they make.

10 years from now, looking back, everyone will look and this crazy random zoning throughout the county and wonder why this incredibly high density housing was ever even considered, much less allowed within our rural neighborhoods.

Please do not add this extremely high zoning designation to the county. Leave the high density housing to the city where it is expected, and where it belongs.

Thank you for your time,

Lori Souba
REDACTED

March 22, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.

[illegible]