

**Public Comment Received - 2024-06-06 PC Meeting - LDC24-00047**

Carter Williams &lt;WilliamsCa@reno.gov&gt;

Sat 4/27/2024 10:26 PM

To: Reno Planning Commission &lt;RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov&gt;

 1 attachments (74 KB)

Public Comment - 11 - 2024-06-06.pdf;

The public comment form has a new entry from the public:

**Planning Commission Meeting Date:** 2024-06-06**Agenda Item or Case Number:** LDC24-00047**Comments:**

I am against the Planning Commission approving QualiChem Conditional Use Permit LDC24-00047 due to the proximity of the subject chemical warehouse to the Truckee River in Verdi, NV. Per the Application, the warehouse will be storing large volumes of HazMat chemicals while being located only 300-400 feet from the river which supplies 85% of the water to Reno/Sparks and beyond to Pyramid Lake. I also question the fact that a large volume of HazMat chemicals is already being stored in this warehouse as of this writing. A secondary issue is that there are no spill prevention barriers provided between this warehouse and the Truckee River. A third issue is that the main east-west railroad line tracks are located behind this building which poses yet another danger factor to the situation. In conclusion, I believe this warehouse should be located in a region safely away from the area's water sources and water tables. Thank you for your consideration.

**Email Address:** billderas76@gmail.com**Phone Number:** 5105662875**Address:** 1655 Cricketwood Circle, Reno, NV 89523**Name of Commentor:** Bill Deras*This comment was submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)**Submitted:* 4/28/2024 5:26:03 AM

## Public Comment Received - 2024-05-15 PC Meeting - LDC24-00050 The Canyons PUD Amendment

Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>

Sun 4/21/2024 2:20 PM

To:Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

 1 attachments (75 KB)

Public Comment - 9 - 2024-05-15.pdf;

The public comment form has a new entry from the public:

**Planning Commission Meeting Date:** 2024-05-15

**Agenda Item or Case Number:** LDC24-00050 The Canyons PUD Amendment

### Comments:

I am concerned about the proposed changes to The Canyons amendment. Specifically extending around the road to wrap in front of (west side) of the hill. The wrapping around to the west of the hill will greatly impact the noise level to the existing neighborhood below and will have a significant negative impact on the general surrounds. There is also concern for the diminished views from not only the existing neighborhood but the greater Damonte Ranch community. This road would be the highest visible road on the western slope of the Virginia Hills. Does everyone in the valley floor really want to look east and see yet another cut into the Virginia Hills for a road? In the original approved PUD plans this road would have ended in a cul-de-sack on the east side of this hill and thus not be visible to the greater community. Extending it around to the west side is stated to improve access. The original plans addressed the streets and public access along with water and other utilities to have even received Planning and City approval. It also addressed improving the "open areas and trails" and vegetation to be consistent with plants and trees native to the Truckee Meadows environment. So the improved access in this amendment really means that it's easier and possibly less costly for the developer. It appears that the new owner is looking to reduce costs and improve the ease of developing in the foothills. This is not unreasonable. However, it should not be the burden of the City of Reno or its residents to make building in the foothills easier. This proposed amendment professes to "fix issues" and streamline all the documents to align with the City of Reno plans and regulations. This should not be a justification for the changing of the plans so significantly as to increase the number of homes by 30, and reduce the amount of open space and trails to extend the road around the west side of the hill. Finally, having a new owner of the property should not necessarily allow them to make such significant changes to the PUD that was so vigorously deliberated in the first place. In fact, the new owner should have been aware of the existing PUD and have the expectation to abide by them. The Canyons PUD as originally approved should be the standard. I believe the proposed amendment should not come at the expense of the City or the larger Reno community's diminished quality of life and I therefore respectfully request it be denied. Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.

**Email Address:** tolles2018@gmail.com

**Phone Number:**

**Address:** 10450 Mine Shaft Dr.

**Name of Commentor:** Catherine Tolles

*This comment was submitted on behalf of: self as homeowner (self if blank)*

*Submitted: 4/21/2024 9:19:58 PM*

## Illegal re-zoning SF-3, SF-5

David M &lt;dm89509@gmail.com&gt;

Mon 4/29/2024 7:31 PM

To: Harris Armstrong <ArmstrongA@reno.gov>; Arthur Munoz <MunozA@reno.gov>; Silvia Villanueva <VillanuevaS@reno.gov>; Manny Becerra <BecerraM@reno.gov>; Kerry Rohrmeier <RohrmeierK@reno.gov>; Alex Velto <VeltoA@reno.gov>; JD Drakulich <DrakulichJ@reno.gov>; Michelle Fournier <FournierM@reno.gov>

This is to advise you that the Planning Commission's attempt to re-zone SF-3 and SF-5 is illegal.

From a recent City report: (<https://www.reno.gov/government/departments/development-services/zoning-code/zoning-code-clean-up>)

**"Staff's recommendation** was to allow duplex, triplex and fourplex development to be allowed in two additional single family zoning districts, SF-3 and SF-5, but only after approval of a Conditional Use Permit, **which requires a public hearing process**. The **Planning Commission's recommendation** was to allow duplex, triplex and fourplex development to be allowed in all four of the single-family zoning districts **by-right, meaning without any public review process.**"

So, while I have a great deal of legal experience, I am not a lawyer. So, I am compelled to ask what the hell are you trying to pull here, as one does not have to be a lawyer to see that **YOU ARE REQUIRED TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING**. There is no "district by-right" as these areas are not already zoned as such. How can you "by-right" if there is no existing "right" in the zone? Corruption, that's how.

Let me define "by-Right" for you related to real estate:

A by-right approval (also known as an as-of-right approval) is granted when a development proposal strictly conforms to zoning and building codes and, thus, qualifies for construction without requiring discretionary approval.

**Once again, SF-3 and SF-5 ARE NOT ZONED FOR MULTI-FAMILY, thus there cannot possibly be designations as "by-right". This looks to me to be an illegitimate and illegal move by a corrupt planning commission that is going directly against the staff's legitimate recommendation.**

You all are asking for legal action against the City and the Planning Commission, and a good deal of investigation into your connections with interested parties, stakeholders such as developers. People are very tired of how you all are allowing the development of Reno with junk apartments and condos.

Speaking of junk, check out the RED apartments sometime. There are chunks of stucco falling off the walls and balconies. You're spreading these low-quality ugly buildings all over the place. It is ruining the feel of Reno, making it look cheap.

How much are you getting paid to sell out Reno neighborhoods? This is not ok and you will be held accountable.

David

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Grace Mackedon** <[MackedonG@reno.gov](mailto:MackedonG@reno.gov)>

Date: Tue, Apr 23, 2024 at 9:08 AM

Subject: City of Reno Housing Initiatives Update

To:

Good Morning,

During the month of April, the City held four community meetings to share updated information on the proposed changes to Title 18 Zoning Code related to housing and affordability. [The slideshow](#) which was reviewed during the meetings is available. In case you missed the virtual meetings, below are links to the videos.

[Thursday April 11th](#)

[Monday April 15th](#)

[Tuesday April 16th](#)

[Wednesday April 17th](#)

**Click here to view the draft redline changes: [Housing and Affordability Redline Document \(ver. 3-7-24\)](#)**

The Reno City Council will be reviewing the draft information and recommending changes or modifications at the May 8, 2024 City Council hearing. Be sure to share your feedback with the City Council prior to the meeting: [City Council Public Feedback Form](#)

Below is a summary of the most commonly asked questions and the staff's responses:

Summary of Questions/Comments from April Stakeholder Meetings	
Question/Comments	Staff Response
Do any of these text amendments upzone or change the zoning on any properties?	No, the proposed changes will have no impact on anyone's zoning designation, nor will these changes modify anyone's zoning.
Will the proposed changes allow apartments to be built in any new zoning districts?	No, the proposed changes do not allow apartments to be built in any new locations or zoning districts. The proposed changes impact where duplex, triplex and fourplex types of development would be allowed.
Why is the city making changes to the Zoning Code that are specific to affordable housing projects?	Last summer, the State legislature passed Assembly Bill 213 which requires that local jurisdictions enact an ordinance that expedites processes for affordable housing and that offers incentives for affordable housing projects. Local jurisdictions are tasked with adopting those new ordinances by July 1, 2024. Separate from the affordable housing changes, the city is also looking for opportunities to increase the housing supply and to provide different housing products. This is in response to the broader national housing crisis that communities across the country are struggling to address.
Several comments were made that residents are not in support of removing parking requirements for apartments.	Staff's recommendations did not include any changes to parking requirements. Planning Commission's recommendation was to allow affordable housing projects that meet the average 60% AMI to move forward with no parking requirements.
How would the proposed changes impact existing developments with HOAs and CC&Rs?	Any developments with CC&Rs/HOAs that restrict apartments or duplex, triplex, fourplex development would not be allowed to construct such development. While the City of Reno does not enforce CC&Rs, those restrictions would still be applicable and would trump the proposed zoning changes.
What is the City's definition of "affordable"?	The area median income (AMI) is defined as the midpoint of a specific area's income distribution. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) calculates the AMI on an annual basis. The city utilizes HUD's definition of affordable.
How does the city ensure that the affordable housing projects will stay affordable and not revert to charging market rate rents?	All projects that receive some form of subsidized funding for affordable housing are required to go through an annual reporting process through the State/Feds/HUD, to confirm rents are consistent with the approved AMI rates. In addition, any affordable housing projects that receive funding or incentives through Reno are required to record a deed restriction that requires the project maintain the approved affordability for at least 20 years. The deed restriction runs with the project and property so even if a property is sold, the deed is still tied to the project.
Would these changes allow for apartments to be built in single-family neighborhoods?	The city has four single family zoning districts. Apartments are currently allowed in the SF-8 and SF-11 zoning districts, with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (Planning Commission approval). The other two single family zoning districts, SF-3 and SF-5 do not allow apartments to be built. No changes are proposed to modify any of these existing regulations.
How does this fit in with the ADU ordinance?	The ADU ordinance is moving forward as a separate text amendment. City Council is scheduled to review and discuss draft language at the May 8 <sup>th</sup> meeting. Following feedback from Council, a series of community meetings will take place for public input. Additional Planning Commission and City Council meetings will take place later this summer, specific to ADUs.
How do these changes impact master planned communities?	Master planned communities, such as Somerset, Caughlin Ranch, South Meadows, Double Diamond, etc. are zoned with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) designation and have their own zoning

	regulations. They are not impacted by the proposed changes.
Is the City proposing to do anything about rent control?	The proposed changes are specific to the Title 18 Zoning Code. Rent control is not something that the Zoning Code or Zoning Administrator has authority over. The City of Reno has a number of different initiatives that will help with housing and affordability, but nothing specifically tied to rent control.
Why are so many apartments being built in south Reno?	The majority of south Reno is zoned with either Planned Unit Development (PUD) or a Mixed Use zoning. Many of these communities, such as the South Meadows PUD, Damonte PUD and Double Diamond PUD, were all approved back in the late 1990's or early 2000's. All of those developments allow apartments by-right and don't require any additional public review. In addition, much of the S. Virginia corridor is zoned with a Mixed Use designation that allows for unlimited density and allows apartments to be built without requiring a public review process. The proposed zoning code changes will have no impact to the areas zoned with a PUD designation or with a Mixed Use zoning designation. The majority of areas that would be impacted are located in the infill areas or areas that have multi-family or commercial zoning.
In regards to the affordable housing incentives, how do you determine the "average AMI"?	When a project is proposed to be affordable, the applicant is required to show how the total number of units averages 60% AMI. Often times an affordable housing project will provide a mix of affordability ranges, such as 80% AMI for some units and 45% AMI for other units. In order to use the affordable housing incentives, the overall project would need to show the total number of units average 60% AMI.
With these changes, would a duplex be allowed in single family neighborhoods?	The zoning code currently allows duplex, triplex and fourplex development in two single family zoning districts, SF-8 and SF-11, but only after approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Staff's recommendation was to allow duplex, triplex and fourplex development to be allowed in two additional single family zoning districts, SF-3 and SF-5, but only after approval of a Conditional Use Permit, which requires a public hearing process. The Planning Commission's recommendation was to allow duplex, triplex and fourplex development to be allowed in all four of the single-family zoning districts by-right, meaning without any public review process.



















**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:**

This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is also legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender and immediately destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Thank you.

# FW: NAB Development Review Comment Received: LDC24-00050

Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>

Mon 4/22/2024 2:35 PM

To: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>; Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Cc: Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>

📎 1 attachments (75 KB)

NAB Comment - 38 - LDC24-00050.pdf;



**Cali Shy**

([She/Her/Hers](#))

*Planning Technician*

Development Services

775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)

[ShyC@Reno.Gov](mailto:ShyC@Reno.Gov)

Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

[Reno.Gov](http://Reno.Gov) | Connect with us: [f](#) [t](#) [@](#) [in](#) [d](#)

---

**From:** Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>

**Sent:** Monday, April 22, 2024 2:34 PM

**To:** Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>

**Subject:** NAB Development Review Comment Received: LDC24-00050

The public comment form has a new entry from a member of the Ward Two (Naomi Duerr) Neighborhood Advisory Board:

**Case Number:** LDC24-00050

**Compatibility:** Not compatible - Approved PUD is compatible with surrounding traditional single family residential housing. The proposed PUD amendment is not compatible. It changes residential style to cluster development and increases the project density relative to PUD that was approved two years ago.

**Design Enhanced the Area?** It does not enhance the character of the area. The proposed loop road creates a highly visible roadway that changes the visual landscape in a fairly intrusive manner. Cluster development changes the residential style of the area and could make the development appear to be overcrowded, especially with the requested 30% (approximately) increase in density.

**Traffic Impacts and Pedestrian Safety:** The proposed two access roads for the project are very close together. The proposed increase in density will increase local traffic at the access points, which will impact neighboring residents and may have a detrimental affect on adjacent residential streets.

**Environmental Impacts:** There do not appear to be significant environmental impacts. Both the approved and proposed PUD amendment contain many concepts for protecting and enhancing the surrounding undeveloped areas, and for managing the wild horse population.

**Other Comments:**

The currently approved PUD is a good project that was well-vetted prior to approval. I do not support the proposed amendment to the PUD. The point of a PUD (as I understand it) is to solidify a development concept for future growth. It provides a vision of what will happen in the area that is generally acceptable to concerned parties. The increased density, cluster development style, and the loop road in the proposed amendment were not what adjacent residents and other interested parties were told would happen when this was publicly vetted. The scale of these proposed changes is a disservice to the reasonable expectations of surrounding residents. The proposed revised PUD handbook is confusing at best, especially when compared to the approved PUD handbook. The approved handbook provides a fairly clear picture of what will happen where as the development is built out. The proposed revisions to the handbook do not provide the same level of clarity. New sections included in the proposed amended handbook (e.g. increased fire standards, sustainability, trailhead parking open to the public, neighborhood and pocket parks) could and should be incorporated in the existing development plan. Some of these things are already in the approved handbook. Adding more expansive text from the proposed handbook revisions to the approved handbook would make the approved PUD even better than it currently is. I oppose approval of the amendment to the PUD, in spite of the positive things contained in the proposed handbook. I am opposed to the increased density, cluster development, and the highly visible part of the loop road. It seems counter-intuitive that hillside development standards specify density reductions based on development elevations, yet density bonuses can be applied to cluster developments and do not count toward hillside development density standards.

**Name of NAB Member:** Donna Keats

**Email Address:** [dkeats@sbcglobal.net](mailto:dkeats@sbcglobal.net)

**Phone Number:**

*Submitted:* 4/22/2024 9:34:00 PM