

**From:** [John Hash](#)  
**To:** [John Hash](#); [Maria Hash](#); [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Incline Village CAB meeting 4 Feb  
**Date:** Friday, March 01, 2019 4:25:25 PM

---

Hi Julie...pls accept this as a formal complaint against Mssrs Todoroff and Eick, and it is a formal request to have their comments stricken from the package concerning our BoA request. On Feb 2nd and Feb 3rd I was advised that the IV-CB CaB Board meeting was cancelled. First by the administrative assistant of IVGID, and then by your phone call.

Yet both of these gentlemen have submitted documents that they held a CAB meeting on Feb 4th and have filled out the forms for inclusion into our package.

It is my opinion that their meeting on Feb 4th has violated the Nevada Open Meeting Act. I should have had the opportunity to attend this meeting.

If they did not conduct said meeting, they have submitted fraudulent forms.

In either case I request their submissions be removed from our packet before the BoA reviews them and begins forming an opinion based on their content.

Lastly, I believe both of these gentlemen's actions should be referred to the Washoe County Attorneys Office for violation of the Nevada Open Meeting Act, and they should immediately be removed from the IV-CaB board.

John A Hash

**From:** [Richard Kovach](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** GREENVIEW HOA GARAGES  
**Date:** Saturday, March 02, 2019 12:41:13 PM

---

Ref WPVAR 10-0001

Julee,

I am following up from our conversation on Thursday 2/28/19 about my OBJECTION to the building of garages at 692 Palmer Ct, in Incline Village. My objections are basically the same as the ones voiced from our neighbors and the NV Division of State Lands not to mention the already DECLINED application from 2 years ago.

It can be made no clearer than all the oppositions that have been submitted. It will be an eyesore, encroach on the state land and these are dwellings from the late 1970's and purchased knowing there were no garages. I am a full time Incline resident unlike the owners applying for the variance and I will have to look at the dwellings so as their vehicles do not get snow on them.

I have done a search on Zillow and there are plenty of properties for sale at this time that do have garages and perhaps this could be a solution to their unfortunate situation.

Respectfully,

Richard Kovach  
686 Wilson Way  
Incline Village, NV

Sent from my iPad

**From:** [Rick & Char Hutchins](#)  
**To:** [Thomas, Clay E](#); [Kristina Hill](#); [Stanley, Brad](#); [Lawrence, Lee](#); [Toulouse, Kim](#)  
**Cc:** [ptodorff1@sbcglobal.net](#); [Tom Cardinale](#); [Eick, Gerry](#); [Lyons, Kevin](#); [Miller, Judith](#); [Sullivan, Mike](#); [Olander, Juliee](#); [Diane Smith](#); [Rick Hutchins](#); [cjohnso7@san.rr.com](#); [Mary Bronson](#); [Norma Flaskerud](#); [Curt Smith](#); [Gail Smith](#)  
**Subject:** OPPOSE Application Case # WPMVAR19-001 (Greenview HOA)  
**Date:** Saturday, March 02, 2019 10:10:01 AM

---

Dear Board of Adjustment Members:

We are Rick and Charlotte Hutchins and live next door to where a new garage is once again being considered in front of our neighbor's home at 687 Palmer Court #1. We have learned another Washoe County meeting is scheduled on March 7, 2019 to discuss the above case we have previously strongly opposed. Please understand that the same broad group of our neighbors still oppose the variance in the above case to build a garage directly in front of our neighbor's home at 687 Palmer Court #1.

While this second application has been reduced from a two-car garage to a one-car garage, ALL the reasons for denying this application are exactly the same as was the case when it was rejected at a hearing of the Board of Adjustment in Reno in August of 2017. As before, we want to make it very clear that we support garages to be located on the side of the cul-de-sac facing away from our homes. This location would work better for traffic, and have no visual or physical impact on other property owners. But that is not what this variance is about!

We strongly recommend that you again NOT support this application because:

1. The proposed newly constructed garage will still be directly in front of our neighbor's home, negatively impacting their view from three windows -- their double kitchen window, double mud room window downstairs and two windows in their master suite upstairs. Looking from the street, the new garage would block a view of the Lake and create a "wall" of development across their front yard, which was the reason several of our neighbors objected to the original application. We live at 687 Palmer Court #2 and believe it will bring down the value of our home as well as 687 Palmer Court #3 by certainly devaluing 687 Palmer Court #1.
2. The proposed structure would still be of necessity too close to the other buildings posing a fire hazard for both adjacent properties.
3. Like the previous application, the documents filed include absolutely no dimensions regarding the structure to be constructed. If approved in this form, it appears that the width, height, and length of this building will be totally determined by the applicant. Since the previous application was for a two-car garage, we can assume this could be a very large "one- car" garage once the variance is granted!

Finally, this application contains the same misleading factual errors as the previously denied application as follows:

Section #3. "No resident view would be impacted." This is simply not true as this location would totally block the views in both directions to and from our neighbor's home, and create a an unattractive "wall" across the back of the cul-de-sac blocking a view of the Lake. This negative visual outcome is opposed not only by all members of our "Cottages on the Green" HOA, but neighbors who opposed and attended the August 2017 hearing in Reno who would lose their view to the Lake from across Wilson Way!

Section #3 "Snow removal will be dramatically improved." This statement is not true as the area covered by the variance is never plowed as a part of the public street and would have the same plowing operation as before with or without the garage.

Section # 4. No home owners in or across from the variance site would agree that this will "improve" the appearance of the area. It will crowd in a structure never intended to be there in what is now an attractive, well planned area.

Finally, we are simply asking that your Board once again decide to not support this application for a variance. With tax season in full swing for my husband, plus I am currently waiting for a grandchild to be born out of state, along with this short notice, we are not able to attend your hearing.

While I think that our opposition is thoroughly explained in this communication, please call my husband Rick Hutchins at (925) 989-2690 or email him at [Rick.Hutchins@novoco.com](mailto:Rick.Hutchins@novoco.com) or myself Charlotte Hutchins at (925) 890-8944 or email me at [8hutch8@gmail.com](mailto:8hutch8@gmail.com) if you have any questions about this issue concerning our home in Incline. We have been Incline property owners since 2005 at 687 Palmer Court #2 and would prefer our property and the properties on either side of us to remain as beautiful and as unobstructed as they have always been.

We respectfully thank you for your consideration of our views and for your service to our County.

Sincerely,

Rick and Charlotte Hutchins



## Olander, Julee

---

**From:** Diane Smith <hagenheightsvineyards@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 04, 2019 4:17 PM  
**To:** carl johnson  
**Cc:** Thomas, Clay E; Kristina Hill; Stanley, Brad; Lawrence, Lee; Toulouse, Kim; ptodorff1@sbcglobal.net; Tom Cardinale; Eick, Gerry; Lyons, Kevin; Miller, Judith; Sullivan, Mike; Olander, Julee; Rick Hutchins; Mary Bronson; Norma Flaskerud; Curt Smith; Gail Smith; Rick & Char Hutchins; Steve Dickson  
**Subject:** Re: OPPOSE Application Case # WPMVAR19-001 (Greenview HOA)

Thank you Carl and Laura. We will let you know as soon as we hear on Thursday.  
Diane and DJ

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 4, 2019, at 1:49 PM, carl johnson <[cjohnso7@san.rr.com](mailto:cjohnso7@san.rr.com)> wrote:

Dear Board of Adjustment Members:

My wife and I, Laura and Carl Johnson live at 687 Palmer Court #3 and oppose this application. We were notified of the public hearing to discuss the subject variance request. This is the second application that we've been notified of. The notification we received states that this variance would allow the construction of one single car garage and one two-car garage. This variance, whether for one garage or two, is an extreme exception to the front yard setback requirement of 15 feet to 1.5 feet and the side yard setback from 5 feet to 1 foot. The standard setbacks are reasonable and were established for fire protection and for appearance.

This request was rejected previously by the Board of Adjustment in Reno in August of 2017 for these reasons.

We request that you again reject this variance for the reasons below:

1. The proposed location is directly in front of our neighbor's home, negatively impacting their view from three windows. (double kitchen window, double mud room windows and two windows in their master suite) From the street, the new garage would block a view of the Lake and create a "wall" of buildings, which was the reason several of our neighbors objected to the original application. We believe that construction of a garage at this location with the reduced clearances will negatively affect the value of all 3 units at 687 Palmer Court.
2. To our knowledge, all the homes in our neighborhood conform to the setback requirements which creates an aesthetically pleasing appearance. Jamming in a structure for the convenience of one resident to the detriment of other residents creates an inequity. The opportunity to build a garage was at the time of the original construction, which would have negated the need for a variance. Current owners purchased their units without a garage or the expectation of a variance.
3. The proposed structure would still be too close to the existing buildings and thus, a fire hazard for adjacent properties.
4. The documents filed include no dimensions regarding the structure to be constructed. If approved in this form, it appears that the width, height, and length of this building will be totally determined by the applicant, bypassing regulation.
5. There are misstatements in the application. Namely:
  - a. "No resident view would be impacted." This is not true. This location would totally block the views in both directions to and from our neighbor's home, and create a an

unattractive "wall" across the back of the cul-de-sac blocking a view of the lake. We did not purchase our unit for the view from our unit alone. The decision was influenced by the attractive appearance of the neighborhood.

- b. "Snow removal will be dramatically improved." This statement is not true as the area covered by the variance is not plowed as a part of the public street and the cul-de-sac would have the same plowing operation as before, with or without the new garage.
- c. "Improved appearance" It is unlikely that the asymmetric shoehorning of a garage between existing structures could be characterized as improving appearance.

We ask that the Board once again decide against this application for a variance. I am on business travel that I cannot change to attend the hearing, but I hope that this letter will be part of the record and opinions will matter. If there are questions regarding our position, please call me, Carl Johnson at 858.231.4312 or my wife Laura at 858.204.3832.

Thank you for your consideration of our input and for your service to our County.

Respectfully,

Laura and Carl Johnson

**From:** [Pete Selvig](#)  
**To:** [Olander, Julee](#)  
**Subject:** Greenview HOA Garages  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 05, 2019 4:11:25 AM

---

Julee,

I, with two partners, built the three units at 686 Wilson Way 40 years ago. My wife, Pam, and I kept ownership of unit #3, which was recently made our primary residence.

Because of possible impending moratorium issues and other limitations, it was not the most pleasant undertaking, but very gratifying in the end.

The property was zoned R4, yet the impervious cover limitation made building four units impractical if not impossible. We were limited to three two unit structures with garage, as three bedroom units without garage was untenable, given the snow grading operations. We were totally under the gun and any thought of appealing for a variance to the conditions imposed was ludicrous at that time.

Won't approval of the subject request open the flood gates for future variance requests? I reluctantly complied with restrictions at time of building. They should bite the bullet, rather than construct garages that will look like an ugly afterthought.

Thank you for your consideration,

Peter Selvig