

Planning Commission Public Comment Emails WTM20-005 and WSUP20-0021 (Woodland Village Town Center) – January 5, 2021

-----Original Message-----

From: Pimphill21 <jpimphill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 4, 2021 5:53 PM
To: Olander, Julee <JOlander@washoecounty.us>
Subject: Coldsprings tentative subdivision case # WTM20-005

>
> My name is Jacob Himphill and I live at 18325 beechwood ct in
> Coldsprings right in front on the proposed new subdivision. I've
> lived here for 17 years and own my home. I love it out here for the
> peace and quiet and being able to enjoy the pace of life out here. Now
> with the proposed 111 townhouses right near me, that's not the type of
> community I want to live in or raise my kids! I bought my house in a
> master planned community that did not have townhouses planned in it.
> Therefore I'm 100% against it and if gets approved more then likely I
> will leave Coldsprings

From: Diana Berlin-Smith <nvappraisal@charter.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 5, 2021 4:12 PM
To: Herman, Jeanne <JHerman@washoecounty.us>
Cc: 'hollybullock@ebmc.com' <hollybullock@ebmc.com>; Olander, Julee <JOlander@washoecounty.us>; CAB <cab@washoecounty.us>; Chvilicek, Sarah <chviliceks@unce.unr.edu>
Subject: RE: case Number WTM20-005; WSUP20-0021 Woodland Village

To Whom It Concerns,

This is my comments and information gathered for your consideration regarding the change proposed to allow 111 single family attached home to be built in Woodland Village.

As a residential appraiser I analyze and report market participant's reactions in

value in the real estate industry. I have been a licensed appraiser since 2009. I also back Village Parkway.

The Proposal for a zoning change for the building of 111 single family attached homes will have an affect the properties that back this road or have no obstruction to mitigate the road noise from the "851 additional cars with a maximum of 71 PM hour trips" on this road.

From the Traffic Impact Report:

“the project is expected to generate a851 average daily trips and a maximum of 71 PM peak hour trips. Although a majority of the traffic will access the site from Village Parkway minimal improvements are recommended. A majority of the improvements are proposed at the three ingress and egress intersections along Village Parkway and include signage, striping, crosswalks and turn lanes for each intersect”.

FHA recognizes the influence of road noise and states this externality must be analyzed by the appraiser.

From the FHA Single Family Housing Policy Handbook 4000.1

(A)Definition Externalities refer to off-site conditions that affect a Property’s value. Externalities include heavy traffic, airport noise and hazards, special airport hazards, proximity to high pressure gas lines, Overhead Electric Power Transmission Lines and Local Distribution Lines, smoke, fumes, and other offensive or noxious odors, and stationary storage tanks.

(C)Required Analysis and Reporting. The Appraiser must consider how Externalities affect the marketability and value of the Property, report the issue and the market’s reaction, and address any positive or negative effects on the value of the subject Property within the approaches to value. (1) Heavy Traffic. The Appraiser must analyze and report if close proximity to heavily traveled roadways or railways has an effect on the marketability and value of a site because of excess noise and safety issues.

Fannie Mae recognized it and has a section in the lending form for this type of location externality.

UAD: Location Influence on Value

Specify the influence Location has on the value of the property.
Enter a description when "Other" is one of the selected factors.

Influence on Value	Select up to two Location Factors	
<input type="radio"/> Neutral	<input type="checkbox"/> Residential	<input type="checkbox"/> Landfill
<input type="radio"/> Beneficial	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial	<input type="checkbox"/> PublicTransportation
<input type="radio"/> Adverse	<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
	<input type="checkbox"/> BusyRoad	
	<input type="checkbox"/> WaterFront	
	<input type="checkbox"/> GolfCourse	
	<input type="checkbox"/> AdjacentToPark	
	<input type="checkbox"/> AdjacentToPowerLines	

Enter a brief "Other" description (ex. RRTracks)

I posted a poll for my peers (appraisers) to answer. Of the 53 answers I received, 37 approximately 70% said a property subject to road noise would consider the location to be adverse. 12, approximately 22%–voted for what the market says and 4, less 1 percent neutral with no change.

In a stable market, if a single family subject backs a busy road and subject to road noise, would you consider the location as possibly one of the following?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Added by you Adverse	 37 votes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Added by Tim Rusch Depends on what market says	 12 votes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Added by you Neutral	 4 votes
<input type="text" value="Add an option"/>		

I also engaged with local realtors and including Darrell Plummer, The Nevada Real Estate Commissioner. All stated that a location that is subject to road noise from traffic, in a stable market, usually sale for less or with more concessions and experiences more than average Day on Market to sell. Market participants such as buyers would always prefer a home without road noise if given a choice between two similar properties and offer less than a property that is not subject to road noise.

120 homes that will experience greater traffic noise due to backing, siding or within close proximity to the street of Village Parkway. Note: Most homes listed back Village Parkway. I understand that only homes within 120 ft were notified. I request that all homes that will experience greater traffic noise be these be notified.

10 – Snow Valley Dr, 8 – Flamingo Dr, 18 – Blackbird Dr, 3 – Jacana Ct, 13 – Fairfax Ct, 22 – Georgetown Dr, 11 – Alexandria Ct, 4 – La Casa Ct, 3 Fontana Ct, 2 – Cherryleaf Ct, 2 – Almondleaf Ct, 2 – Silverleaf Ct, 2 – Lanceleaf Ct, 5 – Ivywood Ct, 2 – Beechwood Ct, 5 Vineyard Ct and 5 Narowleaf Ct.

Please be aware that existing homeowners and children that take Village Parkway to school will be affected by changing the zoning and allowing these attached homes to be built in this area.

Diana Berlin-Smith
18215 Fontana Ct

Reno, NV 89508
775.233.5059
nvappraisal@charter.net

From: Allison Speth <allison.n413@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 5, 2021 5:33 PM
To: Olander, Julee <JOlander@washoecounty.us>; Washoe311 <Washoe311@washoecounty.us>;
Herman, Jeanne <JHerman@washoecounty.us>
Subject: Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP20-0021

Hi. My name is Allison, and I'm ten years old. Personally, I think that the idea to put apartments in Cold Springs is just plain dumb. I'm concerned about traffic safety as well. First of all, there is a park right next to this build site, as well as a middle school teaching grades 5-8. There are lots of very young kids who play at this school and the park. And of course, nobody wants to look out their front window just to see a bunch of three story buildings. And, according to my family's research, people would travel in and out about 850 times per day. There are also lots of kids playing outside daily, and kids might even have to walk through the apartment complex to get where they need to go. Now, I know what you're thinking. "There can't possibly be kids playing outside every day, especially in this weather." But I go outside with my friends at least once a day. And every time I ride in my car to go somewhere, I see at least one person walking or hanging out with their friends.

I hope you don't end up building apartments in our small community, and honestly, I don't think this will benefit anybody in any way.

-Allison Speth