



Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 30, 2017
To: Eva Krause and Julee Olander, **Washoe County Planners**
Re: [Variance Case Number WPVAR17-0004 \(Greenview HOA\)](#)
From: Misty Moga, Recording Secretary

The following is an excerpt from the Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board on July 24, 2017.

3. *PUBLIC COMMENT –

Rick Hutchins spoke about item 8A, regarding to a garage. He said he is the president of the HOA of complex nextdoor. He believes the proposed variance encroaches on his setback. He isn't oppose to them building it, but to shoehorn in a two car garage between our unit and theirs with so little room between the existing buildings doesn't seem sufficient. It can be dangerous for the following reasons: the record snowfall year, and the snow can fall of the roof pitch. He said there is a fire safety issue. Esthetics of the neighborhood doesn't fit. He said the other complexes on the street are done well. Not oppose to building garage, just not in this location.

Coral Johnson spoke about the same variance as Rick. Putting a garage in the location, it would be jammed in there. There is room on the other side of the building. We aren't opposed to the garage, just not in that location.

DJ Smith said he opposes half of this variance. He said he has lived here since 1988. He lived in Greenview HOA for 19 years and moved in unit 1 of our HOA since 2006. It's important you realize we live for 18 years without a garage. We understand their desire for a garage. A 4-car garage is best placed in another location. In the picture he handed out, he noted the boat location. The home is only 26 feet from the corner of his garage. They are proposing a 19 foot garage. Which leaves nothing left. We would like to clarify that we support the other location. He showed the other location on a picture; 40 feet available for the garage that wouldn't have the snow, fire, esthetic issues. It would have adequate space. It's a tight space, and blocks the views from 5 of his windows, it's a constant eye sore, no space for snow removal, fire safety hazard, and there is a solution which our HOA would support.

8. DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS – The project description is provided below with links to the application or you may visit the Planning and Development Division website and select the Application Submittals page:

www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da_index.htm.

8A. [Variance Case Number WPVAR17-0004 \(Greenview HOA\)](#) - For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a variance to reduce the front yard setback from 15 feet to 1 foot and both side setback from 5 feet to 1 foot to construct 2 double car garages in the common area

- **Applicant:** Greenview HOA
- **Property Owner:** Jean Venneman , John & Doreen Maria Hash, Tao Fung, George & Nancy Learmonth
- **Location:** 692 Palmer Ct.
- **Assessor's Parcel Number:** 128-310-05

- **Staff:** Eva Krause, Planner and Julee Olander, Planner Washoe County Community Services Department Planning and Development Division • Phone: 775-328-3628 (Eva) 775-328-3627 (Julee) • E-mail: ekrause@washoecounty.us; Jolander@washoecounty.us.
- **Reviewing Body:** The following case is tentatively scheduled to be heard by the Board of Adjustment on August 3, 2017.

John Hash spoke on behalf of Greenview HOA. He said you have heard from 3 of our neighbors regarding this request. He gave some background information. Greenview was founded in 1978; there were no other PUD or garages. There was Greenview and open parking. It was summer residence only. In 2011, we bought unit #2 of Greenview HOA, then we became president of HOA. He said others moved in interested of improving the HOA with pathways lighting, defensible space, and better looking property. Mr. Smith lives to the immediate left of the subject variance. John showed pictures of the subject property. He showed where the boat is parked, there is a snow berm pushed there in the winter. He said they are never here in the winter. They would see the snow berm in the winter. A professionally built garage would enhance his view, and enhance the entire cul-de-sac. There are safety issue in winter with snow removal drivers. They didn't know if they were cars where they were pushing the snow. The snow plow drivers need to be assisted in the winter. There are three new units. And parking is a consistent issue. He said he met with Washoe County sheriff deputies about parking, and worked with alpine towing for signage. He said Mr. Smith had two ski-doods parked in their parking spot with gasoline. He said we are trying to police it, but it's not effective. We have had cars towed. That puts us in a bad situation. Carl had people with 7 cars. They parked all the way around the unit.

Gerry Eick said he needs him to be specific about the hardship reasons for variance. Andy Wolf said there are specified codes for the variance, please articulate under the categories.

John said garage #2 is what they are objecting to. It's a hardship request. There are elderly people in there. During the winter, it's an issue. We have a fulltime residents every winter. It's a hardship. The County provides for variance based on a hardship. John said he said everyone has spoke in favor of the garage, just not in the location. Rob Lorrie came out with Foretruss to analyze the location.

Gerry Eick said Garage #2 is to the left and Garage #1 is to the right. John said he doesn't own sufficient property in common area for it to be in location of #1. He said it's a Nevada conservancy lot. John said he feels they will look good in proposed location. He said they can look good without aggravations of neighbors.

Tom Cardinale asked about a fire department representative in support of either side. He said he would like to see some fire advisement. John said that will come later, after variance has been approved.

Gerry Eick asked Eva for a staff report. He said it's a challenge, there is a technical purpose, it doesn't seem to be fundamental purpose. Conditions of approval will state fire codes that need to be in compliance. Eva said in regard to hardships, it's hardship of the land. Eva said there isn't enough land on the other side of the property. It's an awkward shape. It's difficult to build on this lot.

DJ Smith said we believe with removal of tree, there will be space for 3 or 4 garages. It will cost money. There will be a big problem. He referenced the pictures he provided with roof line. If you put a structure there, there won't be a place for snow to go. It will fill up the space between condo and new garage because of the slopes of the roof. 3-4 feet of space is not going to be allowed. We understand the hardships. There is no where to put the garages, except the right side. It will cost more. It will be easier, cheaper to put it in the flat spot but there is a safety issue. He said there is an issue with

conservancy land. They will never grant it. We are sympathetic to the issue. He said it will create a wall. He said there are 5 windows with direct view that will be impacted. Judy Miller asked about off street parking for those condos. He said what we do, we park in front of the garage and around the complex.

Andy Wolf asked Eva about a similar project on Christina Drive and hardship of the land. He asked if the location and improvements is considered a hardship of the land, and if they are factored in when giving a variance. She said it impedes it and is part of the reason it's a hardship. They were developed a long time ago. We have tried to accommodate the hardships for winter and garages; because how the houses are built on this lot, there isn't a lot of room on either side. The way the property is laid out, it's a wedge shape pie. Both sides would be an impediment. The existing building can be a hardship.

Andy Wolf asked about private CCRs that have setbacks for this area. Eva said CCRs goes with HOA, but there isn't for this property. Most of the time they don't have setbacks for rear; and she said she would have checked it under the code. They could reduce them 15 feet in regards to slope. That's why we are here to address the setback reduction.

DJ Smith said as homeowners, we looked into this. He said it would require work and cost a lot of money for alternate location. DJ said we need to find out if we have a view easement as part of the CCRs. Andy reviewed the site plan and tree with sign.

MOTION: Andy Wolf moved to recommend denial of this variance. Gerry Eick seconded the motion to deny this variance request. Gerry said he is sympathetic with the hardship, but he said the setback is too close. He said he is concerned of putting something within 1 foot of the property line. Kevin Lyons said he hasn't been to the property. If there is better way of doing it, he recommended the comments are forwarded to the decision making body. Kevin Opposed the motion of denial. The motion passed 4 to 1.

From: DJ
To: Tahoehills@att.net
Cc: [Diane Smith](#); [Krause, Eva](#)
Subject: Case # WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)
Date: Saturday, July 15, 2017 9:07:22 PM

Ms. Kristina Hill,

By copy of this letter, D.J. and Diane Smith, homeowners located at Palmer Court, Unit #1, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada wish to formally oppose granting of the zoning variance as requested in Case # WPAVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA).

We are now emailing this opposition letter to the Board of Adjustment and the Advisory Committee and will bring hard copies to the public hearings on July 24 and August 3. Please include this letter as part of the staff reports on this case.

We have been homeowners in Incline Village since 1988. We purchased our current single family detached home in 2006. We are part of the Cottages on the Green HOA made up of the three homes at the end of the Palmer Court cul-de-sac. All three home owners are strongly opposed to this variance and will be communicating individually as well.

The following are our reasons for strongly opposing this variance.

Currently, our neighbors in the Greenview HOA have two parking spaces located directly in front of our home (we will supply photos of these open parking spaces at the hearing on July 24). This variance would allow a two car garage to replace the open parking spaces.

We will be providing you with a rendering of the proposed garage at the July 24 hearing. As will be readily apparent, this proposed garage located in this location would:

1. Be "jammed" into the narrow space between our garage and the Greenview condo building. It is important to understand that the corner of our garage is only 28 inches from the corner of the current open parking spaces! The width of the proposed garage, although no specifications appear anywhere in the drawing in the application, appears to be 19 feet wide as to the scale used. The total space between our garage and the Greenview condo is 26 feet ,6 inches, leaving only about 3 feet or less between the new garage and our current garage.
2. This two car garage in this location is simply too much "mass" too close together. Again, this application has no specifications as to height or length, but based on the scale, it appears that this garage will be about 10 feet high and 20 feet long. This mass, if built as drawn, would totally block views from our home to the front yard, out into the cul-de-sac, and mountains beyond from our kitchen and bathroom windows.
3. Currently, the three one car garages in front of the three single family homes at the end of the cul-de-sac were built by the same builder of similar design and dimensions, with attractive landscaped spaces between them. The overall effect is very pleasing to the eye and a very attractive design element in the neighborhood. Jamming a wholly out sized garage in this location would create an unattractive "wall" ruining the overall aesthetic of the area, creating a very unplanned eyesore look for our neighborhood and reduce the value of our properties. Incredibly, the application states that there would be "no visual impacts to the neighbors". Seriously??

Finally, we would also make the following information available to the County:

1. According to County records, the lead person petitioning for this variance purchased his unit last October for \$599,900. After making internal improvements to his unit, this owner has just listed the same property for \$1,375,000. Further, the listing assumes this variance is granted stating that it will have an "enclosed garage", which is "pending". We would note that he obviously has no long term interest in the neighborhood and is simply "flipping" the property for his profit. We do not oppose his desire for a profit, but please, not at the expense of our

homes and the neighborhood.

2. Our family previously lived in unit #3 of the Greenview condos for 18 years, without an enclosed garage. Every purchaser of those condos was well aware that there was no enclosed garage included. We however, purchased our home with the clear understanding that people in the Greenview HOA would be able to park in front of our home, but not totally block our view and create a crammed in wall in front of us. Approving this variance will create a large and negative changed condition for our property.

3. Finally, it is important for the County to note that there is a less expensive and readily implementable option to putting a two car garage in front of our home! That option is to simply locate a four car garage in the proposed location of the other two car garage. We have measured the area, and with possibly the loss of one tree, there is 40 feet available to put a four car garage! This garage would duplicate the four car garage located directly across the street from the Greenview condos. It would serve the exact same function, be less expensive to construct, obstruct no one's view, fit much better into the neighborhood, and be supported by our HOA. We will be providing photos of this area at the public hearing as well.

We thank you in advance for your serious consideration of our request to deny this variance, and stand ready to answer any questions you may have. In fact, we would strongly recommend for you to visit the site and see the issues we have described in this letter for yourself. Please contact us and we will be pleased to meet with you.

Sincerely,
D. J. and Diane Smith
Phone: 916-712-8045 or 707-592-6268
Email: djsmith102047@gmail.com

D.J. Smith
Smith, Watts & Hartmann
925 L Street, Suite 220
Sacramento, CA. 95814
Phone: (916) 446-5508

Sent from my iPhone

NORMA & DON FLASKERUD

680 Wilson Way #2 Incline Village, NV 89450

541 Maureen Lane Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

NormaJ49@gmail.com

July 31, 2017

Eva Krause, Planner Washoe County Community Services Department Division of Planning and Development

Dear Ms Krause:

The subject of this letter is to protest the zoning variance requested in Variance Case #:WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)

We have owned our property in Incline Village since 2004; it faces Palmer Ct cul-de-sac and the area where the two garages are proposed to be built. We would not want to see that in our line of sight. The current condos sit nicely among the trees and frankly there really is not room for two garages, nor, if they change their request, one extra garage!

The reduction in normal set-backs for the front and side yards illustrates there isn't room for them.

The fact the person requesting this bought a unit to flip it for a profit after he builds garages is amazing to us; why wreck our pastoral, mountain environment so he can make money? It makes no sense to do this with so many neighbors affected in a negative way! Variances might be ok when they are for the good of many but that is not applicable here. We trust the Planning and Building Division will uphold the current zoning; it is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,

Norma & Don Flaskerud (925-766-6679_

Sincerely,

Your Name

From: [Krause, Eva](#)
To: [Olander, Julee](#)
Subject: FW: Variance Case Number WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)
Date: Friday, July 28, 2017 10:50:35 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Eva M. Krause, AICP

Planner | Washoe County Community Services Department | Planning & Building Division
ekrause@washoecounty.us | o 775.328.3628 | f 775.328.6133 | 1001 E. Ninth St., Bldg. A, Reno, NV 89512



Connect with us: [cMail](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | www.washoecounty.us

From: John Bronson [mailto:biz.bronson@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2017 10:41 AM
To: Krause, Eva
Cc: John Bronson
Subject: Variance Case Number WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)

July 28, 2017
680 Wilson Way #1
Incline Village, NV, 89450

Via e-mail

To: Eva Krause, Planner Washoe County Community Services Department Division of Planning and Development

From: John and Mary Bronson

RE: Variance Case Number WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)

This message is to express our opposition to the zoning variance requested in the case number referenced above.

Our home has a direct line of site into the Palmer Court cul-de-sac where the two two-car garages are proposed.

These structures would dramatically change the character of the neighborhood by creating a "Chinese wall" of structural mass jammed into an area that is clearly not suited for them. The fact that the proposal for these structures is requesting an extraordinary reduction in set backs on both the front and side yards is reason

**WPVAR17-0004
PUBLIC COMMENT**

enough to deny the requests.

Furthermore, information has been brought to our attention that the main person requesting the change is trying to flip the unit he recently bought for a more than 100% profit. This is a strong indication that this person has no long-term interest in the neighborhood and is merely seeking the variance to make a profit at the expense of those of us who live nearby.

We bought our home on Wilson Way four years ago in large part because of the natural ambience and greenery of the neighborhood, and we are full-time residents. It would be extremely disappointing to have our front view so drastically altered and we request that the Washoe County Planning and Building Division uphold the zoning as is and deny this variance.

Sincerely,

John and Mary Bronson

Phone: 703-980-0524 or 703-980-4989

e-mail: biz.bronson@gmail.com

31 July 2017

To: Eva Krause
Planner Washoe County Community Services Department
Division of Planning and Development

From: Laura & Carl Johnson
687 Palmer Court #3
Incline Village, NV, 89450

Subject: Variance Case Number WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)

The purpose of this letter is to express our opposition to the subject zoning variance. Our opposition is as follows:

- The proposed structure would have a negative impact to appearance of our portion of the Palmer Court cul-de-sac. Shoehorning a structure into an inadequate space would create an esthetic imbalance. The esthetic impact is likely to also have a negative impact on the property value of 687 Palmer Court #1, one of the units in our HOA. Besides maintaining a consistent standard for development in Incline Village, the purpose of our zoning rules is to ensure that the actions that benefit one homeowner financially, do not impact his neighbor negatively. The requested variances in front and side setbacks will likely have this effect.
- The question of property value impact is significant in this case. The person behind the variance request purchased his unit last year 10/13/16 for \$599.9K. It was listed 4/27/17 (6 months) for \$1,375K (currently listed at \$1,250K). The listing includes a detached garage, not yet built. Clearly a portion of the price presumes approval of the variance. We see no commitment to the long term interests of our community. While we certainly hope that the seller achieves maximum value for his unit, we cannot support it at the expense of others.
- We purchased our home 3 years ago and have enjoyed it and IV. We've met most of our neighbors and feel a sense of community on our small street. Our decision to purchase was influenced, in part, by the reputation of Washoe County's Division of Planning and Development for protecting investments of homeowners.

Respectfully,
Laura and Carl Johnson
Phone: 858.231.4312
Email: cjohnso7@san.rr.com

**WPVAR17-0004
PUBLIC COMMENT**

Washoe County Citizen Advisory Boards CAB Member Worksheet



Citizen Advisory Board: Incline Village / Crystal Bay

Meeting Date (if applicable): 07/24/2017

Topic or Project Name (include Case No. if applicable): WPVAR17-0004
GREENVIEW HOA GARAGES

Please check the appropriate box:

My comments were (or) were not discussed during the meeting.

Identified issues and concerns:

What are the dimensions of the proposed garages, did you receive permission from the neighbor
behind the back garage where the boat is? Where is the snow going to fall right against the next door neighbor with
a window that could break.

Suggested alternatives and/or recommendations:

Start over again and submit plans with dimensions and make it a one car garage where the boat is parked.

Name Pete Todoroff Date: 07/21/2017

(Please Print)

Signature: Pete Todoroff

This worksheet may be used as a tool to help you take notes during the public testimony and discussion on this topic/project. Your comments during the meeting will become part of the public record through the minutes and the CAB action memorandum. Your comments, and comments from other CAB members, will and shall not collectively constitute a position of the CAB as a whole.

If you would like this worksheet forwarded to your Commissioner, please include his/her name.

Commissioner's Name: Marsha Berkbigler

Use additional pages, if necessary.

Please mail, fax or email completed worksheets to: Washoe County Manager's Office
Attention: CAB Program Coordinator
Post Office Box 11130, Reno, NV 89520-0027
Fax: 775.328.2491
Email: stone@washoecounty.us

From: Jennifer Tynes
To: [Krause, Eva](#); [Olander, Julee](#)
Cc: [Diane Smith](#); [Mary's Mail](#); billtynes@gmail.com
Subject: Variance Case WPVAR17-0004 (Greenview HOA)
Date: Wednesday, August 02, 2017 8:53:39 AM

My husband and I are full time residents in Incline Village and live across the street from the proposed project to construct two, two car garages on Palmer Court.

We are strongly opposed to the request for a variance. The location of the structures would be an unsightly blight in a beautifully forested neighborhood and one of them would completely block the front of an adjacent home.

We have reviewed the plans that are online that show that neither structure will match or fit in architecturally with the existing condominium building.

Since we are unable to attend the hearing tomorrow, please accept this email as our strong opposition to granting the variance.

Regards,
Jennifer and Bill Tynes
684 Wilson Way, Unit A
Incline Village, Nevada 89451
775/831-6378