

Q1 What are your thoughts on the Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update?

Answered: 145 Skipped: 5

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not sure yet.	7/13/2026 12:38 AM
2	Affordability — Articles 7, 8, 9, and 10 Douglas County should add specific, enforceable housing-affordability standards into Title 20. General statements about “housing affordability” are not enough. Title 20 governs land use, zoning, development standards, applications, procedures, and code enforcement. Because of that, Title 20 directly affects what housing can be built, where it can be built, how expensive it is to approve, and whether developers are held accountable. I am asking Douglas County to add the following requirements into Articles 7, 8, 9, and 10: Article 7 — Land Use Regulations & Design Standards Douglas County should allow lower-cost housing types by right in appropriate residential and mixed-use areas, including ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, townhomes, small-lot homes, manufactured housing, and mixed-use residential development. The code should reduce or remove minimum lot sizes, excessive setbacks, excessive parking requirements, and design standards that increase housing costs without a clear public health or safety justification. The code should include density bonuses, reduced parking requirements, and flexible design standards for projects that include deed-restricted affordable housing, workforce housing, starter homes, senior housing, or housing affordable to local workers. Douglas County should not write a development code that primarily allows large single-family homes on expensive lots while treating smaller and more affordable housing types as exceptions. Article 8 — Development Improvement Standards Infrastructure requirements should be proportional to the size and impact of the project. Small housing projects, ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and smaller starter-home developments should not be forced to meet the same improvement standards as large luxury subdivisions unless there is a documented public health or safety need. The code should allow context-sensitive standards such as narrower streets, shared driveways, reduced parking, smaller blocks, and alternative sidewalk or drainage designs where safe and appropriate. Douglas County should reduce, defer, or waive impact fees and improvement costs for deed-restricted affordable housing, workforce housing, ADUs, and smaller housing types that serve local residents. For major residential projects, the applicant should be required to disclose how required infrastructure, fees, and improvement standards affect the expected final sale price or rent. Article 9 — Applications and Procedures Douglas County should create a fast-track approval process for projects that provide affordable housing, workforce housing, ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, townhomes, manufactured housing, senior housing, or small starter homes. Projects that meet clear objective standards should receive administrative or by-right approval instead of being delayed through unnecessary discretionary hearings. Every major residential development application should include a housing affordability impact statement that identifies expected sale prices or rents, projected fee burden, infrastructure costs, whether the project serves local workers, and whether any public subsidy, land-use approval, TDR, fee waiver, or development agreement is being used. The county should publish clear public tracking for development agreements, TDRs, receiving areas, fee waivers, infrastructure obligations, affordable housing commitments, and public benefits. Article 10 — Code Enforcement Douglas County should make development agreements and public-benefit obligations enforceable with clear deadlines, automatic penalties, interest, public reporting, and mandatory follow-up. If a developer owes money, infrastructure, mitigation, affordable units, workforce housing units, or other public benefits, the code should say the county shall enforce the agreement. It should not merely say the county may enforce it. The county should require annual public audits of all active development agreements, infrastructure obligations, TDR approvals, fee waivers, and public-benefit commitments. No developer should be marked compliant unless all required payments, improvements, affordable housing commitments, workforce housing commitments, and public benefits have actually been completed. Housing affordability should be a measurable standard in Title 20, not just a vague goal. Douglas County needs housing that local workers, young families, seniors, teachers, firefighters, service workers, and working residents can actually afford.	7/12/2026 11:27 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

3	Let the HOA's control and regulate their own CC&R's. Have a basic set of rules for the rest of the county (We already have that though) Every region of the Valley has different needs and applications that aren't even mentioned in the Title 20 code. Now, the more people that move into our county will only make it more difficult to enforce	7/12/2026 9:44 PM
4	These types of regulations need to be voted on by the citizens of Douglas county. Seems like government over-reach.	7/12/2026 11:22 AM
5	My current taxes are over 4k a year. If you pass this, I am done: moving. For some bizarre reason you are under the impression homeowners are children you can dictate and enforce ridiculous rules on. We are not. Stop telling people what we can do with our own property. Go build another roundabout or reduce the speed limit on rural roads like East Valley--flat, with AVERAGE 3/4 mile visibility--- to 35 mph as though it were midtown Manhattan. You're ruining this county. If it passes, I'm out.	7/12/2026 9:26 AM
6	I am most concerned with the statement that your goal is to ENCOURAGE GROWTH. I don't feel that terms like Smart or Sustainable justify encouraging growth. We love this place and over the 30 years we've lived here the most damaging thing we've seen is because of growth. Low income housing is a blight to an area like this.	7/12/2026 7:57 AM
7	The public does not know what your doing or why your doing it. Do a better job of explaining why.	7/12/2026 4:04 AM
8	Cut back on the RV restrictions, I haven't read trough the changes yet and will, therefore having the ability to provide better feed back. Is staff feeding you boiler plate rules without considering keeping the rural feel. Seriously I hope I don't find a restriction on how many trailers can be on a property in a rural area. I look forward to providing better feedback once I read the changes. Has Douglas county provided an easily understandable version of the proposed changes?	7/11/2026 6:26 PM
9	None yet...need to read it.	7/11/2026 5:07 PM
10	Title 20 should be a ballot measure, not voted by the board.	7/11/2026 3:46 PM
11	I think it's a huge government overreach by our BOCC in an endeavor to undermine and thwart the rights of property owners! Additionally, I believe this is another disguised money grab. I don't see any way to manage these additional restrictions at no cost to residents. I am firmly opposed to this Title 20 Code Update!	7/11/2026 2:12 PM
12	I think this is america and you should NOT worry what ppl do on their property! Period	7/11/2026 1:43 PM
13	Stop trying to control people and their property. We are not communist yet! Don't californicate our valley and don't keep adding more and more restrictions. We love our freedom not communism.	7/11/2026 1:12 PM
14	No change! If they can afford an RV, they can afford to store it so we do not have to see it!	7/11/2026 12:29 PM
15	Always good to look at from time to time.	7/11/2026 10:53 AM
16	Like most people who live here in Douglas County, I want LESS, not more, government control over my life. This is yet another example of how the Douglas County powers that be ignore the desires of the actual citizens. Shrink the rulebook, the bureaucracy, the police state. Grow the road maintenance dept, parks and rec, repair existing infrastructure, stop building, support ranches and farms. Some of us opted OUT of joining an HOA, but we can't escape you!	7/11/2026 10:33 AM
17	If the trailer is parked in the driveway off the street and is kept up looking nice not cluttered that should b ok if it is in the street it becomes a safety issue	7/11/2026 9:53 AM
18	single family zones are to be kept as such, no short term rentals or vacation rentals. Single family zones are just that, one family on one property for sale or long term rent. This is the heart of our society. People save to purchase a home in a stable neighborhood where they can raise a family. Do not change that. We love to be able to know our neighbors and feel safe and secure with out children in a neighborhood that has stability so we can learn to know our neighbors and we can look out for each other. This is the heart of a community. That is what we work and save for, that is the American Dream. Safety and stability.	7/11/2026 9:23 AM
19	It is awful, and a huge overreach. I am going to only vote for commissioners that will deregulate the county and get rid of county employees	7/11/2026 9:19 AM
20	If the trailer is parked in the driveway and the property is kept neat not overgrown or cluttered I	7/11/2026 8:12 AM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

believe that is fine it should NOT be parked in the street that becomes a safety hazard for cars and pedestrians

21	Stop it. Who is going to enforce this?	7/11/2026 8:00 AM
22	No	7/11/2026 7:55 AM
23	NO	7/11/2026 7:52 AM
24	Absolutely not- we do not want more government involved in our business!	7/11/2026 7:48 AM
25	We do not need additional policing of our properties. Just enforce the ones currently in place - equally - no bending of rules for County employees or friends/family of County employees. We moved to a more rural setting to avoid HOA mentality and this smacks of HOAs on steroids.	7/11/2026 7:44 AM
26	It is government overreach.	7/11/2026 7:43 AM
27	It's government overreach. Residents should not have to have to have mandatory trash service. I already pay for it. Douglas county is going after the utility fee it will be able to collect from additional property owners. Should be a waiver for those that already have mandatory trash fees in Minden and Gardnerville. The flood zone rv restrictions and overall restrictions have to be explained better. Now you're in the garage sale management business. How are you going to enforce the new "laws" for mandatory trash service, rv regulations and garage sales enforcement. Are you going to create a new enforcement division with a 6 figure chief, more staff, a new judicial building for offices and more vehicles? Not sure if we should continue to make our beautiful less appealing for retirees on a fixed income or young families. I think you need to look at your current budget and work within your means. The county manager makes more money than the Nevada Governor! You are basically spending our money and putting it on a credit card. I'm not supporting this current board or the county manager in their additional tax schemes. You will further be making this county less desirable to live in!	7/11/2026 7:30 AM
28	I haven't attended any meetings, but in reading some of the changes, I am not happy	7/11/2026 7:27 AM
29	I really don't want to see my neighbor's RV, especially if I live in one of the denser subdivisions like Chichester or the Ranchos.	7/11/2026 7:07 AM
30	Residential on dirt roads should not be required to get trash service. Ie. our dirt road becomes so impassable that we can't get propane delivery so how is a garbage truck going to make it? Also the heavy garbage truck will destroy dirt roads not maintained by the county like ours. I guess unless the county will maintain or at lease repair damages caused by garbage trucks they need to exclude residences on roads not maintained by the county.	7/11/2026 6:55 AM
31	It is needed to protected both the ability to enjoy your property and protect their investment.	7/11/2026 6:04 AM
32	Making structural and formatting changes to the development code to improve its organization, usability, and clarity is a worthwhile goal, and I support those efforts. However, I have significant concerns about any changes that could affect property rights, development rights, or the uses permitted on private property. Combining organizational revisions with substantive policy changes makes it much more difficult for the public to identify and understand what is actually being changed. From a public transparency standpoint, this approach can undermine confidence in the process. If possible, I would prefer that the County first adopt only the structural and formatting revisions. Any proposed changes that would alter property rights, permitted uses, development standards, or other substantive regulations should then be presented separately for public review and comment so residents can evaluate them on their own merits. If the County believes all changes must be adopted together, I strongly encourage providing a true side-by-side comparison or clearly highlighted redline showing the current code alongside the proposed language. This would allow property owners and residents to easily identify substantive policy changes rather than having to search through a reorganized document. Finally, I believe private property owners should retain the greatest degree of freedom possible to use and enjoy their property without unnecessary government restrictions. Property rights are a fundamental part of individual liberty, and any new limitations should be considered only when there is a clear, compelling public need. As a general principle, I favor preserving the freedom of property owners rather than expanding regulations that limit how people may use their own land. I am opposed to additional restrictions on private property rights unless there is a clearly demonstrated public need and the benefits outweigh the costs. New regulations also create additional enforcement responsibilities and costs for the County, which should be carefully considered before expanding the code.	7/10/2026 11:16 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

33	I remember this when Proposition 13 went through. The only problem is you have to remember the taxpayers have to vote on it. Also they will remember incumbents will be voted out if they're not heard. And this can be reversed if they're not allowed to vote on it. I remember this happening in California when they tried to take Proposition 13 out. And there's still trying to do it. So don't forget the taxpayers must vote on everything otherwise it's a rule not a law. Interesting ideas brought forward.	7/10/2026 9:05 PM
34	Too much. It flies in the face of what residents want Weare trying to foster a small town community. Title 20 is overkill. We are not Clark or Washoe counties and don't need the excessive, Big Brother regulation these changes bring or codify.	7/10/2026 5:15 PM
35	Where is it?	7/10/2026 4:55 PM
36	Abolish title 20	7/10/2026 3:54 PM
37	I'm against it.	7/10/2026 3:35 PM
38	Don't turn Douglas County into an HOA.	7/10/2026 3:23 PM
39	Complete overreach	7/10/2026 2:50 PM
40	We don't need ANYMORE regulations the community is gonna regulate itself right out of freedom	7/10/2026 2:49 PM
41	I think some updates are warranted. What I don't understand is why is code enforcement making up their own rules instead of enforcing the code as written. No where in the code does it say, that after a violation is reported and code enforcement confirms that there is a violation, a letter is sent giving the violator 30 days to correct the violation. Where in the code does it say that after 48 hours you get ANOTHER 30 days?	7/10/2026 1:17 PM
42	I think it's good that the Douglas County is soliciting comments on Title 20 . . . I haven't found a link to it yet??	7/10/2026 12:21 PM
43	The county already chooses what to enforce and when, even when it does comply or go against the current code, so what difference does it make?	7/10/2026 12:12 PM
44	Too many regulations on people's private property	7/10/2026 12:02 PM
45	It's a good idea. Please include a moratorium on AI hyperscale data centers.	7/10/2026 11:44 AM
46	Stop trying to turn OUR properties into an HOA.	7/10/2026 11:43 AM
47	Please don't update the RV parking regulations. Neighborhoods with smaller lots under half acre have to park behind fences. If this is changed the neighborhoods start looking shoddy. We built our house in 1998 with an RV garage. This keeps house and area nicer if they aren't allowed in front of the fence or on the streets. Thanks, S. B.	7/10/2026 11:38 AM
48	For every regulation you want to introduce, you should be required to remove 15 already on the books. In other words, no.	7/10/2026 11:36 AM
49	Douglas County should have no say in what property owners do with their property that they pay taxes on. I own a vacant land parcel that we will be building on. We parked a truck there and were immediately turned in by our neighbors and had to remove it. We pay taxes on that land and no one should tell us what we can do with it!	7/10/2026 11:30 AM
50	Don't change laws just because new people move in and want them changed. I don't want to see RV's everywhere and hate all the new developments. Have lot size limits.	7/10/2026 11:30 AM
51	I do not feel we need further Regulation restricting Storage of RVs, recreational vehciles, Campers, boats or cars on personal properties. As a retiree, I was intentional in buying a home where I can store my „toys“, quickly access and enjoy the wonders of the either nearby lake, pine nut mountains, Hitch my horse trailer etc.. Purchasing a ranch or acreage is not feasible given today's real Estate availability and market. Not allowing full use of our property restricts could result in outrageous storage fees and financial burdens and adversely affect our overall quality of life.	7/10/2026 11:01 AM
52	Stop trying to turn us into California .	7/10/2026 11:00 AM
53	Not much	7/10/2026 10:58 AM
54	I wonder who it benefits. I hope the county uses Title 20 as a way to clean the county up,	7/10/2026 10:54 AM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

rather than loosening regulations to allow for more junk. I also hope the county starts enforcing their own regulations once this process is complete. My experience is that they'd rather not get involved. I could always move, but would prefer to stay.

55	It concerns me that residential zoning may be made easier for smaller plots to be sold and built while infrastructure to serve these new homes remains unaddressed, and new jobs are not being created to allow the new residents to work and spend in the county.	7/10/2026 10:43 AM
56	I'm against additional regulations. As long as a property isn't a fire hazard I see no reason people can't use their land as they see fit.	7/10/2026 10:37 AM
57	I haven't received copy of updates	7/10/2026 10:36 AM
58	Continued government overreach. People choose to live in areas without an HOA for a reason.	7/10/2026 10:20 AM
59	Homeowners have the right to store their RV's on their property. It's not the governments property, it's OUR property. Stop impeding our lives.	7/10/2026 10:19 AM
60	I truly believe that title 20 does need an update on its RV parking rules. There are several homes that have ample driveway space to hold an RV in their front yard without hindering the right away. I have many fellow neighbors who agree that homes without an HOA dictating, something different should be allowed to park at least one RV in their front yard without it being behind a fenced area and of course, without it hindering the right way. We live in a beautiful community where there are several camping areas for us all to enjoy and hindering that enjoyment with the RV experience due to the current RV parking rules is a shame.	7/10/2026 10:18 AM
61	I say stop infringing on homeowners property rights. Meaning if a owner owns a RV, as long as it doesn't impede line of sight or sidewalks as long as it is unoccupied it should be able to be parked anywhere on the home owners property, including driveways.	7/10/2026 10:02 AM
62	No thank you	7/10/2026 9:59 AM
63	Don't need it or want it!	7/10/2026 9:56 AM
64	I haven't read Title 20 in its entirety. However , I'm against it. There's enough government in our business already. I purposely didn't buy in a HOA just for that reason.	7/10/2026 9:50 AM
65	Not for it	7/10/2026 9:48 AM
66	If you change it, then make sure you enforce it. And not just some of it, all of it. Stop the good ol boy mentality and enforce and educate	7/10/2026 9:19 AM
67	Article 10, keep as is and more enforcement. I don't want to see our county turn into a eye sore. Beauty is in the eye of the holder, everybody thinks their rv is good, we need standards.	7/9/2026 2:45 PM
68	I bet if you asked if your constituents if they wanted to pay for a 6 foot fence in front of a 14 foot RV they'd say No Fence. Let's ask the question point blank. I think you won't because Ernie's goal is to have them in storage or have a fence cover the bottom half. I believe he's incorporating his California rules to us here in Nevada. Oh, the word used is "obscure". A 6 foot fence will not "obscure " a 14 foot RV. Also, why in the meeting Kate Moroles-O'Neil said there will be no changes to the RV codes when speaking with Mark Gardner, but hear you want us there to talk about it. Sounds like you guys made your minds up. So, other than what commissioners want changed, sounds like the only thing happening is you want to make sure what you want is in the plan and you're cleaning it up.	7/9/2026 11:02 AM
69	Regarding RV's. We have over 64% of the public that's not compliant. We should remove the fence rule since now RV's are 13-14 feet tall and a fence is only 6 feet high, this would look worse. If a persons RV has a designated spot on their property and it's 20' off the sidewalk as per code, that should be sufficient. Forcing us to store off our property costs is a few thousand dollars per year. When you are retired, that's a lot of money. I'm sure when it comes to what the public wants, you'd find it's to not have a fence rule. Ask the question point blank, do we the citizens of Douglas County think their should be a 6 foot fence in front of a 14 foot RV.	7/9/2026 5:22 AM
70	Regarding RV's, the fence requirement be removed. If the RV has a designated spot on your property that is off the street, there shouldn't be an issue. 5th wheels are 14 feet tall, a fence won't hide or improve the looks.	7/8/2026 7:51 PM
71	Long overdue. I hope this version eliminates the various contradictions found in the existing documents. as well as harmonise when possible with overlapping jurisdictions such as TRPA, state authorities, and the fire districts.	7/6/2026 3:26 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

72	Strongly urge that Article 5 Tahoe Area Regulations include the following allowing Tahoe residents to better understand Tahoe related code etc. 1) https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/TRPA-Code-of-Ordinances.pdf 2) https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/documents/Rules-of-Procedure.pdf 3) https://www.trpa.gov/wp-content/uploads/Adopted-Regional-Plan.pdf Also include specific (a statement, ask TRPA for assistance) reference to Environmental Analysis requirements which differ from the valley. Also TRPA Chapter 4 reference Required Findings as they too differ from Valley Code TRPA Chapter 3 Environmental Documentation	7/1/2026 4:46 PM
73	TRPA CODE 13.9.2. Appeal Allowed Final decisions on projects delegated to a lead agency may be appealed to the TRPA. An appeal may only be filed by an "aggrieved person" as defined in Article VI(j)(3) of the Compact. Decisions by the lead agency under independent local, state, or federal law are not the subject of this appeal process. Until such time that Douglas County has the proper memorandum of Understanding for Area Plans can staff develop some type of appeal to the Board of County Commissioners as the public in Tahoe has no recourse for a TRPA approval. "3. This chapter establishing an Area Plan, in association with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) approved by the County and TRPA, enables TRPA to transfer limited development permitting authority to the County subject to appeal provisions to the TRPA"	7/1/2026 4:19 PM
74	Consider re-evaluating noticing radius requirements. Some residential areas that could be affected do not receive information about projects. This is a common courtesy to those affected. Example: the glamping project in Tahoe another example: the many residents on Johnson Lane and Knox excavation traffic in the Valley	7/1/2026 4:14 PM
75	South Shore Area Plan. 1. South Shore Area Plan development standards (Table). 2. South Shore Area Plan permitted, development permitted, and special use permitted uses (Table). a. The following list represents those uses in the South Shore Area Plan which are permitted by right (P), require a County Special Use Permit (S), or are prohibited (blank space). "TRPA" is placed before any use requiring a TRPA review or Special Use Determination. Uses not listed are prohibited. Uses listed as permitted may require a Design Review pursuant to Chapter 20.614, CONSIDER CHANGING THIS statement: Design Review, of this code. In cases where a TRPA review or Special Use Determination is required, a County Design Review or Special Use Permit shall not be required. In all cases, the County is responsible for Building Permit and Site Improvement Permit review and approval. CHANGE TO HAVE DOUGLAS COUNTY HAVE SOME REVIEW AUTHORITY SO THE RESIDENTS MOST AFFECTED HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK BEFORE THEIR ELECTED OFFICIALS. The Glamping project is an example. It's taking an appeal at Design review to allow citizens to address BOCC	7/1/2026 4:09 PM
76	3. Standards set forth in chapter 8 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances for snow disposal requirements and road paving apply. There is no Chapter 8 Snow disposal is Chapter 60.1.4 (Water Quality) Snow standards are under TRPA Code Section 36.5.3	7/1/2026 4:01 PM
77	S. Floodplain standards. All development in floodplains that is allowed by chapter 35 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances must comply with the provisions of chapter 20.50 TRPA Chapter 35 is Natural Hazards which includes avalanche and wildfire so title should be changed	7/1/2026 3:54 PM
78	Reference TRPA Code Chapter 68 for NOISE R. Noise standards. A. Exterior noise levels must comply with the provisions in the Plan Area Statements, Community Plans, or subsection N of section 20.690.030, whichever is most restrictive. B. Interior noise levels must comply with the provisions in subsection N of section 20.690.030	7/1/2026 3:51 PM
79	Change title: Scenic corridors to Scenic Quality which is the title of the TRPA Code section 66 referenced. Ask TRPA for assistance on the narrative. It's more than just scenic corridors. Shoreline, Marina Master Plans, etc. All development within scenic highway corridors, as defined by chapter 66 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances, is subject to the provisions of that chapter	7/1/2026 3:48 PM
80	Tahoe Basin regulations 5. The terms used in the TRPA regulations, Plan Area Statements, and Community Plans are defined in chapter 11, 12, 21 and 90 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Changes Community Plans are now Area Plans. Plan Area Statements will need to be removed in another amendment in both South Shore Area Plan and Tahoe Douglas Area Plan upon subsequent approvals. TRPA Chapter 13 needs to be referenced as it is the TRPA chapter for Area Plans. Also, suggest identifying the chapters noted by name. Chapter 11 a little tricky because PAS will be eliminated but Plan Area Maps will still exist? ASK TRPA	7/1/2026 3:42 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

Chapter 12 Community will eventually cease to exist to be replaced by Chapter 13 Area Plans. Chapter 21 title Permissible Uses. Chapter 90 title Definitions.

81	B. Applicability to land areas. The provisions of the Tahoe Basin Regulations apply to those lands within Douglas County that are subject to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact. Add: and to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code of Ordinances, Goals and Policies and Rules of Procedure.	7/1/2026 3:31 PM
82	In Article 5 Tahoe Basin Regulations Change every reference to community plan areas. The correct term per TRPA Chapter 13 is AREA PLAN Once the Tahoe Douglas Area Plan is approved (TDAP) all references to Plan Area Statements (PAS) should be removed from the South Shore Area Plan and the TDAP. I do not believe there will be any PAS remaining. Please let me know if there are any unique situations related to PAS remaining in place Allowable uses. The uses allowed in the zoning districts are prescribed by the tables in Section D (Uses in community plan areas) and Section E (Uses in plan area statement)	7/1/2026 3:29 PM
83	Explanation and maps explaining homeowners responsibilities for ditches, culverts, etc. in non GID areas	6/11/2026 11:12 AM
84	Noticing radius in both Tahoe and Valley needs to be revised when a project is in a commercial zone but does affect nearby residential properties	6/11/2026 11:07 AM
85	I not familiar with all of title 20 but I know that some items need to be updated and come into line with surrounding communities here in Northern Nevada. I would personally like to see 20.690 updated and enforced for the community, we have some people that don't take care of their front yards in brand new neighborhoods. The other is RV parking for loading and unloading. We live in Northern Nevada where people enjoy the outdoors. Sometimes you need to not be hassled by someone who moved here from another state. We hunt and fish in this part of the country.	6/9/2026 4:01 PM
86	My comments are specific to the Tahoe Douglas District, but generally apply to the rest of the county. What are the areas you allow eVehicle charging? Does the permitting process, if there is one , address the fire risks? Is the Firedepartment part of this process. I am concerned about large commercial Transportation Hubs that are planned for the TTD ebuses. My understanding of these are, they are too much of a fire risk, and should be located outside a populated area!	5/27/2026 8:33 PM
87	it needs a lot more work! And it raises even more related questions!	5/27/2026 8:20 PM
88	Be sure to group like items. Sort your boxes first so not to over pack the Title 20.	5/27/2026 11:27 AM
89	I would like the sea cargo container code changed. It says one container per property , I think it should be limited to 200sq ft just like a shed without permit. My neighbor has a 8x40 container so that's 320sq ft of ugly. Also light pollution, led lights are very bright , decrease wattage, it should shine down, limit how many on a house , some people have many doors my neighbor has about 12 outside lights and probably over 100 solar yard lights , we need better codes to preserve our night sky. How did fire dept get involved with building permits some of the requirements and fines are ridiculous, needs to be changed Thank I will be there this Wednesday	5/26/2026 3:59 PM
90	This is not needed to keep Douglas County as it was intended to be, rural! This is just our local governments way of putting money in your pockets and robbing the town folks of their hard earned money by taxing us more and creating all these new "fees" for crap that you should covering in the first place. WE the people of Douglas County did not ask for these changes nor do we want them!	5/23/2026 5:33 PM
91	Developer Impact fees should be considered	5/21/2026 5:40 PM
92	Dark skies ordinance needs to address businesses night time lighting. The newer McDonalds on 395 is like a lighthouse beacon.	5/21/2026 8:48 AM
93	There has been an uptick in permanent Christmas style lighting in the valley where a homeowner can change the lighting color for different holidays. Everyone has adopted Christmas lights as ok but having other holidays with lights is related to dark skies issues. Time-certain hours for this type of lighting needs to be part of the Title 20 update	5/21/2026 8:44 AM
94	Fire flow standards shall be determined by the applicable fire district and in compliance with adopted fire code standards. If standards do not exist us the Table listed below Add TRPA	5/20/2026 3:34 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

Table 32.4.2-1 Minimum Fire Flow Requirements which designates land use by type requirements

95	Add the TRPA Code of ordinances Development and Community Standards Table 13.5.3-1 Minimum Development Standards for Area Plans for reference in Article 5 for clarification	5/20/2026 3:30 PM
96	I welcome it! The current rule regarding RV parking is obsolete and does need to be updated. Parking an RV on your own property (drive way, paved side yards) not causing right of way issues should be allowed. The current law of RV must be in side yard behind a 6 foot fence for properties less than 1/2 acre is unrealistic and the enforcement of such put on neighbors vs the city actually taking ownership of the law only causes hate amount neighborhoods. The proposal I read and would recommend is as follows: One RV/trailer can be parked in a designated paved side yards/driveway on owners property without right a way obstruction for homes less than 1/2 acres as long as HOA rules allow it.	5/20/2026 7:45 AM
97	I believe that Title 20 should be Consolidated but the real issue to me is code enforcement.	5/20/2026 6:08 AM
98	Code discussion and consideration to address AI Data Centers should be considered for the TITLE 20 update	5/19/2026 9:39 AM
99	I suggest that the The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Bi-State Compact be part of the Title 20 section for Tahoe Area Regulations as it's mentioned in code often.	5/15/2026 1:44 PM
100	Definition of vacant lot and what is allowed, if at all, to be stored on that lot.	5/15/2026 1:39 PM
101	I strongly suggest that a Master Definitions list contain all items being moved to sect 1.14, Section 5, etc. be maintained for ease of finding definitions. Not all people are contractors, need permit info, etc. the general public would most likely go to a Master Definitions Page	5/7/2026 10:52 AM
102	I respectfully request that the code be revised to permit trailers and RVs on properties smaller than one-half acre, subject to reasonable conditions. If a property is well maintained, in full compliance with applicable regulations, and the trailer or RV is appropriately sized and consistent with the surrounding aesthetic, there is a strong case for allowing such use. A more flexible standard—focused on upkeep, visual compatibility, and adherence to existing health and safety codes—would better reflect the diversity of property sizes while still preserving neighborhood character. This adjustment would provide property owners with practical options without undermining community standards.	5/5/2026 9:30 AM
103	Amend this code 20.50 Stormwater management to allow fines for non-compliance in keeping ditches and culverts clean. Title 20.50 (Floodplain Management) and 20.100.060 (Public Drainage) apply to development in the floodplain. Title 20.50 was first created by ordinance 158 on June 5, 1956, as a Douglas County Subdivision ordinance where minimal drainage requirements were required in code. On March 13, 1980, ordinance 331 was approved by the commission, creating flood hazard areas within Douglas County. The county joined the Nation Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) by adopting this code, which allowed the county to regulate the uses of land considering the economic importance of the land to its owner and the county, and the hazards to life or property incidental to its use. This was the first-time regulations were put in place establishing areas requiring floodplain zoning regulations. This was created to reduce the loss of life or property and economic loss caused by flooding. Douglas County, Nevada P a g e 19 Stormwater Master Plan March 2024 The purpose of the current code today is to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare, and to minimize adverse impacts to public and private losses due to flooding in specific areas through the implementation of provisions designed to minimize rescue and relief efforts associated with flooding, prolonged business interruptions, notifying property owners that land is located in a special flood hazard area, and to coordinate with local partners to implement the Carson River Regional Floodplain Management Plan in conjunction with Carson River Subconservancy District. The current code defines the adverse impacts and the requirements needed for the development of land within the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA). The current code sets special requirements for development within the FEMA SFHA and are usually more restrictive than the federal requirements.	5/1/2026 3:06 PM
104	It may be too early to criticize, but things are moving pretty slowly at this point.	4/29/2026 9:29 AM
105	Consider revising the requirements of Accessory Dwelling Units. There are many cases where allowing them with less restrictions would enable aging in place or multi generational living on single family lots.	4/24/2026 10:17 PM
106	Please remove/revise the minimum design standards to be a list of minimum features that	4/24/2026 10:14 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

must include a certain number of. The prohibition of Flat Roofs is not in line with current "Mountain Modern" design trends, and the requirement for min 18" overhang also restricts design styles. Consider allowing an HOA approval to supersede this requirement, as said approval indicates compliance with min design requirements in that development.

107	It could be improved so that it's easier to research and understand. If anything, I think it can be more strict as opposed to less strict. This is such a beautiful valley and even some of the nicest neighborhoods are being junked up by Joe the junk man. Let's take this opportunity to clean things up and make Douglas County more beautiful than it already is. Nobody wants to look past a junkyard to take in the beauty of Jobs Peak whether living on less than a half acre or 5 acres. Thank you.	4/24/2026 1:28 PM
108	This is a preliminary list for most common terms: Suggest Tahoe Area Regulations have their own DETAILED DEFINITION SECTION in Article 5. TRPA does have many of the definitions, just referring to TRPA Chapter 90 not good enough. Tahoe residents deserve ease of finding definitions. Many terms are for both Tahoe and Valley. Area Plans Town Center High Density Tourist District (Casinos) Resort Recreation Event Center (Tahoe Blue Event Center) TRPA (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency) APC (Advisory Planning Commission) versus DC PC GID (General Improvement District) Golf Course (listed valley) Church/Synagogue (religious assembly TRPA definition could be for Valley covering both) Microtransit Transit Facility Industrial Services Government Offices and facilities Community Center (Kahle Center) Post office SSTMA (South Shore Transit Management Association) Governing Board (versus BOCC) BMP Best Management Practices Coverage Achievable Housing Affordable Housing Alluvial Soil Type Boat Launching Facility Commercial Floor Area Conservation Areas Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) Environmental Assessment (EA) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) GIS Grading Season High Water Line Land Capability District SEZ Stream Environment Zone Specific Plan A comprehensive long-range program for the further development of a facility or area. See Chapter 14: Specific and Master Plans TAU Tourist Accommodation Unit VHR Vacation Home Rental	4/22/2026 12:41 PM
109	Some definitions may be Tahoe specific (Glamping) some maybe Valley (Agrihood) Suggested added for clarity to section 1.12 or 1.13 if more appropriate Assisted Living/Memory Care facility (Large and small grp home confusing and are different in some cases) Conservation Easement (land held in perpetuity explain further) Stormwater Retention Basin different than conservation easement Development Agreement Specific Plan Timeshare (Walleys and example) Vacation Home Rental (is different than a bed and breakfast which is defined) Agrihood (Valley specific) Park Development agreement description of use) Glamping (Tahoe specific) but could happen in Valley in the future Synagogue (you have a church description) Cell tower/emergency communication tower similar to Wireless communications but different	4/22/2026 12:03 PM
110	Current info in the Tahoe Area Regulations: 20.703.095 Accessory uses. Accessory uses may be permitted per Sections 21.3.1. through 21.3.8. of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. 20.703.100 Reserved 20.703.110 Reserved 20.703.120 Reserved Helipad for a hospital should not be considered an accessory use. There are too many unknown public health and safety issues, environmental impacts, etc.	4/22/2026 11:29 AM
111	For Article 5. Currently stated in the South Shore Area Plan: "In addition to the County, there are GIDs, private companies, and homeowners' associations that provide and maintain quasi-public services and facilities. The following public facility and service providers operate in the South Shore Area Plan: ● Edgewood Water Company ● Kingsbury GID ● Douglas County Lake Tahoe Sewer Authority (former Douglas County Sewer Improvement District No. 1) ● Douglas County School District ● Barton Healthcare System In most cases, the County has little or no jurisdiction over these agencies and private entities. Therefore, service and facility planning is done with little input from the County." Proposed/suggest that it is made clear that the public and county should have input on the Barton hospital project. This is a unique location directly adjacent to the Tahoe Douglas Area Plan residential zone on Kahle Drive all the way to the Beach Club. PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY of the residents should be considered first. Community character and adjacent community character must also be considered and is already clearly stated and should not be removed form the current Tahoe Area Regulations	4/22/2026 11:17 AM
112	When updating Title 20 Tahoe Regulations will be Article 5. Maintain critical information. Current section 20.703.090 South Shore Area Plan permitted, development permitted, and special use permitted uses (Table). Hospitals are a SPECIAL USE (S) and should remain a SPECIAL USE in town centers and newly to be proposed Healthcare Subdistrict requiring a Special Use Permit. Furthermore, the section below must be maintained to protect adjacent	4/22/2026 10:49 AM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

neighborhoods not in the Town Center: 20.703.300 Authority to condition development permits. A. Whenever this Title or TRPA Code of Ordinances authorizes the Director, the Planning Commission, Board, or other body to condition applications for development permits, the official or entity, after review of the application and other pertinent documents and any evidence made part of the record of the public hearing, may, in addition to those standards and special conditions required for particular types of development permits, impose additional conditions reasonably necessary to assure the following: 1. Conformity with the goals and policies embodied in the TRPA Regional Plan and Code of Ordinances; 2. Standards which are generally or specially applicable to particular uses including specific conditions relative to operation of the use; 3. Compatibility between the proposed development and adjacent development and neighborhoods; 4. Preservation of the character and integrity of adjacent development and neighborhoods; and 5. Protection of the health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the county.

113	Do not change critical language in Tahoe Regulations Chapter 20.703 as related to maximum allowed height in Town Centers (reference page 13-3 Area Plans in Tahoe regional Planning Agency code) and do not accept Barton Hospital project proposal for a new healthcare district request to exceed current Town Center restriction of 56ft. Code exceptions requested by a specific project should not be a reason to change code. This will set a precedent for future projects in Tahoe. Furthermore, Title 20 proposed article 5 should add the TRPA TABLE 13.5.3-1: MINIMUM DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR AREA PLANS for clarification.	4/22/2026 10:39 AM
114	The sign ordinance needs to be updated and enforcement needs to happen time-certain after 60 days. Code needs to be more restrictive. Fines need to happen upon violation being reported, then additional daily fines for non-removal. Why have a code that is not enforced. You've received several from me personally. If the sign is not on contiguous property then it's illegal. negotiating weekends only is outrageous and has resulted in over a dozen+ signs from 395 down Jacks Valley Rd. as an example. It's sign pollution as well	4/13/2026 2:57 PM
115	Reference Code 20.664.140 LIVING in an Recreation Vehicle (RV) versus parking an RV on a driveway, side of the house etc. is illegal and should be stated in the definition for clarity. DC code prohibits long-term living in a RV. Code identifies duration for temporary living	4/12/2026 3:41 PM
116	I'm concerned about the difficulty of implementing property for agricultural uses and the changes to definitions which may unintentionally curtail agricultural rights, and/or create conflicts with restrictions intended for dwellings.	4/8/2026 4:56 PM
117	I hoped you would have red-lined drafts of the proposed changes before the public hearings.	4/6/2026 10:58 AM
118	Parking Trailers , motor home, boats on Toiyabe ave on parcels smaller than 1/2 acre YES OR NO just be consistent- neighbor says he does it , why cant I . Send newsletter make it clear yes or no . 2nd important issue is the retaliation by those who find out public information and it makes your life miserable tell you to move yell talk behind your back . Tought Gardnerville was nice place to live - codes ordinances go along ways as long as their not disguised because of who you might know or being afraid of retaliation I've lived it here . Please be aware .disclosure when properties bought always to late. problem becomes hateful most of the time.	4/5/2026 9:11 AM
119	I have reviewed. Community cats feral cats . Toiyabe ave surrounding areas nuisance for homeowners (many) have spoke to town of gardnerville with no help in this area . I have done due diligence to control population , after being verbally abused my feeders and place they live 30 total DAWG has been helpful spay neuter return but I had to give up my end of the deal trying to help due to my health and constant retaliation over this matter. I feel there should be a clear and decisive ordnance rules - cats free to roam but I feel I am and some neighbors are reasonable persons addressing this situation and fairness for this nuisance should have a resolve . Cats welfare checked by animal control I appreciate that - what about the welfare of a reasonable person homeowners. Unreasonable persons should be as helpful in neighbors communities please - desperate plea for help with this situation has been noted many times but avoided - people problem - more than cat problem - how many cats are you allowed to have .	4/5/2026 8:59 AM
120	Needing rules governing data centers, data mining and the like. There seems to be a BIG build being planned behind Autumn Hills in former Bentley land with mega solar wattage (way more than a home), 2 million gallon water tanks/ rights to a spring), etc. This land is right next to state forest and fire risk is high.. not to mention this is near homes. Not certain the build but it is BIG.	3/31/2026 5:07 PM
121	The BOCC's performative failure to match the fire and WUI codes enacted by the fire districts	3/18/2026 1:59 AM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

was juvenile and counterproductive. It makes me wonder if the title 20 update isn't anything more than a handout to the builders and developers. The fire districts and the NV Fire marshal are on the right side of safety and public good. I hope the BOCC can get with the program and join in.

122	Title 20 especially regarding RV's and trailers definitely needs to be revamped.	3/9/2026 11:53 AM
123	I appreciate your hard work and think it's good to visit updating, I am concerned about the section concerning RV & trailer parking behind fence and think it should stay intact as to create uniformity, safety and to protect our neighborhood property values. I understand a few want it removed because they have nice units but if left up to the homeowner I see the neighborhood deteriorating/looking junky as they see their units as OK and it's a slippery slope. We need standards. Thank You	3/9/2026 7:50 AM
124	I'd like to keep RV's & trailer behind a fence on side of yard behind house to keep uniformity in the neighborhood and safety. It's starting to get junky in a lot of neighborhoods with lack of enforcement.	1/29/2026 7:07 PM
125	Far too complex and confusing.	1/29/2026 1:13 PM
126	Keep it the same regarding RV parking behind fence, let's not junk up our neighborhoods	1/22/2026 6:45 PM
127	Please update rv codes. I pay registration and plate my motorhome like my car. It should not be treated any differently.	1/16/2026 2:29 PM
128	<i>I think people should be able to store their RVs, 5th wheels, trailers, campers etc., on their own property as long as they don't "junk" it up.</i>	1/15/2026 8:53 PM
129	I respectfully request that the City Council consider adopting a more practical and resident-friendly approach to the proposed RV ordinance. Homeowners should be permitted to park an RV or trailer on property they legally own, regardless of lot size. If the ordinance requires RVs to be screened behind a fence, existing fences should be allowed to remain as they are. Property owners should not be forced to modify or replace current fencing to comply with new standards, and those existing conditions should be grandfathered in. Allowing temporary on-street parking for up to 72 hours before and after travel is a reasonable compromise that supports residents preparing for and returning from trips. Many residents—particularly retirees—own RVs and trailers and should not be burdened with the significant cost of off-site storage when they have the ability to store these vehicles on their own property. Thank you for your consideration and for working toward a fair and balanced ordinance for all residents.	1/15/2026 2:34 PM
130	A homeowner has the right to keep an RV on their own property no matter where. In the back, in the front, on the side... is their home.	1/15/2026 7:14 AM
131	As long as an RV is kept clean, is not a hazard, and is not an eyesore, it should be acceptable to park on your property.	1/15/2026 4:58 AM
132	I believe this should be updated with all the growth. I'd like to comment on RV's and required fencing: I feel that we purchase our homes and should be allowed to our RV's or boats or quads on our property without the required 6' fence! I definitely don't want the property to be turned into a junk yard of broken down crap attracting rodents etc. but when an owner keeps his property clean we should have the right to have our property on our land. I wish there was enforcement the "backyard junk owners" and on things like: too many horses/goats/sheep etc on a persons property causing unhealthy conditions for the animal AND the neighbors. Having to smell the unclean environment of manure is disgusting and can be very unhealthy.	1/15/2026 4:05 AM
133	Get rid of the ridiculous 6 foot fence for RV nonsense. We live in a free country, I should be able to park my legally registered, running, insured vehicle anywhere on my property I want. Leave that crap to the HOAs.	1/14/2026 10:29 PM
134	The ranchos are not a HOA . I should be able to park a trailer on the side of my house .i am not building a fence to put my trailer behinds get over it . THIS was never a rule when we bought our house . I'm sure there are other things to worry about . Like paving roads , bike trails, sidewalks etc.	1/14/2026 10:27 PM
135	I'm unfamiliar with it in detail but understand it may change and effect rv parking in my neighborhood. I would like to be kept informed on meeting dates so I can attend and learn more and voice my thoughts.	1/14/2026 9:14 PM
136	I think it's wrong. Private property should be private. If you have to get rid of your Rv that you	1/14/2026 9:01 PM

Title 20 Consolidated Development Code Update Feedback

can finally afford because you can't afford a 6' privacy fence to hid it is a ridiculous rule when it's on your own property the county shouldn't have a say. if your yard was trashed or unsafe that's one thing but just to park your RV in the backyard that's ridiculous.

137	No more new codes.....	1/14/2026 8:23 PM
138	Would like to see RV and trailer parking /storage allowed on our driveways as long as it is well maintained and not lived in.	1/14/2026 2:56 PM
139	Needed	1/14/2026 11:54 AM
140	I feel you should legally be able to park your Rv and trailers on your property - if you want to enforce this - you better higher 10 more code enforcement agents - cause I will be reporting every violation- if I'm required to move mine - Carson and Reno both allow it - get with the program!!	1/14/2026 11:33 AM
141	It should be changed to where if your RV is clean and nicely parked on your property there shouldn't be a violation.	1/14/2026 10:11 AM
142	A clear definition of all types of roads needs to be included in Title 20 - secondary access, emergency, etc. as developers go to cheapest method instead of what is best of development and surrounding communities. The public needs to know.	1/6/2026 9:24 PM
143	Title 20 sections should be amended to required better planning of subdivisions with sufficient ingress and egress - developers go to lowest denominator - insufficient present provisions for health and safety in Title 20. This results in poorly planned developments that long-term will likely fail in some manner or form.	1/6/2026 9:23 PM
144	The organization clerical changes are good. Suggest much better definitions in Title 20.676.040 of the required findings so that developments can be more thoroughly assessed for their viability and actual adherence to master plan and safety and health of our county.	1/6/2026 9:20 PM
145	Long overdue. Trying to understand the code currently is difficult for staff and residents	12/16/2025 7:28 PM