

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 5/1/2024

CASE NO. LDC 24-00044

Please Print:

NAME: Ronda Theisen

ADDRESS: 1200 Riverside Dr 1258

I REPRESENT: 1200 RSD

I DO NOT WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT BUT I AM:

☐ IN FAVOR

☐ IN OPPOSITION

I WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT:

☐ IN FAVOR

☒ IN OPPOSITION

COMMENTS: _____

SIGNATURE: _____

Ronda Theisen

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 5/1/24

CASE NO. LDC LD224 00044

Please Print:

NAME: DENNIS BLACK

ADDRESS: 1200 RIVERSIDE DR #1251

I REPRESENT: MUKAF

I DO NOT WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT BUT I AM:

☐ IN FAVOR

☒ IN OPPOSITION

I WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT:

☐ IN FAVOR

☐ IN OPPOSITION

COMMENTS: NOT AGAINST BUILDING SOMETHING ON "O RIVERSIDE"
BUT NOT SO MANY ^{UNITS} AND THEY NEED MORE PARKING!
THE AREA IS ALREADY TOO BUSY W LIMITED PARKING.
THANK YOU!

SIGNATURE: Dennis Black

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 5/1/24

CASE NO. LDC 24-00044

Please Print:

NAME: Jodie Black

ADDRESS: 1200 Riverside Dr. #1251

I REPRESENT: myself

I DO NOT WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT BUT I AM:

☐ IN FAVOR

☒ IN OPPOSITION

I WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT:

☐ IN FAVOR

☐ IN OPPOSITION

COMMENTS: I am against having the 1200
Riverside property easement adjusted to
allow the ~~the~~ turnaround or drive through
access to emergency vehicles.

SIGNATURE: Jodie Black

LDC24-00044 (Riverside SPD)

Janet Coombs <jscoombs@yahoo.com>

Mon 4/29/2024 6:26 AM

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

I believe the change in zoning requested for Riverside Dr from Multi-Family 30 units per acre to Specific Plan District should be DENIED.

I feel the high density (122 units) requested is not suitable for this lot. The number of people living there could easily be 2-3 times that number. Each studio unit could accommodate 2 people and more in the one and two bedroom units. The project looks to maximize the financial return to the builder versus enhancing the neighborhood with additional housing and neighbors who are invested in the area. This design density seems more like a college dormitory or a hotel and is likely to have a high turnover of residents. We have also been told these units will be market based priced so they are not adding to affordable housing. Higher density also has the possibility of adding to local crimes of opportunity. Recent news articles are also questioning the number of new apartments coming into the market might well exceed demand. All the existing neighborhood apartments are currently advertising availability.

I believe the current plan submitted is dependent on the owners of adjacent properties to provide access through their private property for Emergency Access Vehicles to the planned project. A recent survey shows this is unlikely to happen so changes to the proposed plan will be required.

Human density is only one consideration for this project that will negatively impact the neighborhood. The proposed project does not provide full vehicle parking for all the tenants. Not providing full parking will negatively impact the Riverside neighborhood which already has full street parking from current buildings and residents in the evenings and overnight. This neighborhood hosts many special events which require the closing of Riverside Drive for running, bicycling and charity events. Idlewild Park is the venue for community events such as Food Truck Fridays, Earth day, Farmers Market etc. which bring in large numbers of out of neighborhood people whom also require parking to participate. Riverside Drive has been developed for safely biking and strolling along the river by adding No Parking zones, and speed bumps to slow down automobile traffic and will not accommodate additional street parking.

The safety of all will be impacted by the vehicles associated with this project. There will be increased congestion leaving and entering the project. The intersection of Booth St and Riverside is not safe for left hand turns into the project or good visible access onto Riverside Drive. This neighborhood is also home to Reno High School with significant pedestrian and vehicle traffic throughout the day that should be considered as well. Entering or leaving the proposed project via Jones Street will require cars to travel down the unnamed alley adjacent to it and likely create problems there as well. The current traffic study was done on a low traffic day, a Wednesday of Thanksgiving week, with school not in session and many people out of town or in holiday mode which is a traditionally slow time for the area so it does not adequately address these issues.

The question of whether or not the current sewer system could handle the project is also suspect as the sewer outlet closest to the lot already gives off noxious smells frequently on warm spring and

summer days. This project will be right on the river which is a precious resource for Reno and any development should take that into account.

I believe this lot should be developed to enhance the existing neighborhood but at the current historical zoning of 30 units per acre (MF-30)

I was disappointed that the Neighborhood Advisory Meeting scheduled for April 8th was cancelled and not rescheduled until after the planning commission meets. This meeting would have allowed local residents to voice their concerns so they could be presented as part of the Neighborhood Advisory Board recommendations.

Janet Coombs
1200 Riverside Dr. Unit 1237
Reno, NV

LDC24-00044 (Riverside SPD): Statement of opposition

Karen Howze <howzeka@aol.com>

Wed 5/1/2024 4:07 PM

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

To: Development Services Department

From: Karen Aileen Howze
1200 Riverside Dr. Unit 1276
Reno, NX 89503

Re: LDC24-00044 (Riverside SPD)

I write in opposition to the request for zoning amendment before the Commission. There are a number of concerns regarding this project, however, the greatest is the impact on traffic on the current access road which is part of the property at 1200 Riverside Dr., which is a right of way that currently carries little traffic. I have reviewed the traffic study related to this project and note that the issue of increased traffic on Riverside Dr. onto the right of way even under the current zoning is inadequate for a project of this size.

The developer's proposal does not address the increase in traffic for the project's residents to enter and exit even with the proposed improvements to the right of way (if approved by 1200 Riverside Dr.), access to Riverside Drive crossing Booth or access to Booth. Whether the request for amendment is approved, the developer had not effectively addressed the traffic impact under the current zoning classification nor addressed the impact should the amendment be granted. The traffic study for this project focuses on Jones' street and does not address increased traffic on the alleyway between Jones and Riverside Dr. heading toward the proposed development or the traffic impact on Riverside and Booth. Either access to the proposed development would increase traffic substantially on Jones, the alley and Riverside Drive. The proposed development even without the amendment sought by the developer would effectively make it impossible at times for the residents of 1200 Riverside Dr. and the tenants of the proposed development to traverse the right of way that is the end of Riverside Dr. without considerable delay and congestion. Currently, this area is not used often because left turns onto Riverside from Booth are dangerous. There is no indication that consideration has been given to addressing access from Booth onto the property.

Finally, the developer's request for an amendment if approved would increase the number of units for a development that does not provide enough parking for the current units per acre and approval would exacerbate an already existing neighborhood problem. It is not clear where the additional parking for the residents of the development would be found considering the current parking scarcity on Jones and neighboring streets.

For these reasons, I urge the commission to deny the request for the amendment and also raise questions about the potential impact of the development as it stands for traffic and parking in the area.

Sincerely,

Karen Aileen Howze

Public Comment Received - 2024-05-01 PC Meeting - Agenda Item 5.3

Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>

Mon 4/29/2024 8:51 AM

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

 1 attachments (72 KB)

Public Comment - 14 - 2024-05-01.pdf;

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date: 2024-05-01

Agenda Item or Case Number: Agenda Item 5.3

Comments:

Many public comments have been submitted with concerns over parking and traffic, and those comments do have some merit, however, those aren't concerns that the city can't easily mitigate by doing things that the city should be doing anyway. That location is within a 5 minute bike ride or 20 minute walk of two full service supermarkets, dozens of restaurants, parks, schools, and even a year round farmers' market. If it weren't for a lack of robust public transit and severe gaps in safe cycling networks, this location would be the ideal location for someone to live car free. The city and RTC have already committed to improving pedestrian and cycling safety in this area, a project like this, rather than being denied due to concerns over parking and traffic, should be seen as a catalyst to speed up the process of making these promised improvements. The only thing that hasn't already been at least partially promised by the city is increasing access to public transit in the area, which more projects like this would make more viable to provide. The city should not ignore the concerns of residents in the area, but rather than denying the construction of much needed housing, especially in an area where the vast majority of needed infrastructure is already in place, the city should more aggressively push the already promised infrastructure improvements that will address the concerns of the people in the area. As someone who frequently uses Idlewild Park, I'll add that even if the city does deny this project, they should speed up delivery of the already promised improvements for pedestrian and cyclist safety and provide more robust public transit to the area.

Email Address: mgawthrop1@gmail.com

Phone Number:

Address: 1690 Carlin St

Name of Commentor: Michael Gawthrop-Hutchins

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


Submitted: 4/29/2024 3:51:04 PM

Public Comment Received - 2024-05-01 PC Meeting - LCD24-00044

Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>

Wed 5/1/2024 6:39 AM

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

 1 attachments (73 KB)

Public Comment - 16 - 2024-05-01.pdf;

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date: 2024-05-01**Agenda Item or Case Number:** LCD24-00044**Comments:**

Hello... I will begin by stating I am opposed to this proposed project as planned/designed. I do support infill and responsible use of space within the City limits, however this project as designed/proposed is NOT an example of intelligent design, responsible use. To even consider this project WITHOUT including adequate parking for each unit, any visitor parking or adequate access for EMS/Fire without burdening existing neighbors is the opposite of intelligent, responsible use/leadership. I have lived in this area since 2009 and would defy anyone on the City Council, Planning Commission, to convince a reasonable person that this area could absorb the increased burden of parking as designed. Not to mention is it wise, legal, intelligent to NOT have safe, efficient access from emergency services? Please act responsibly! Sincerely... R. Maser... Citizen/Resident

Email Address: rmaser1@charter.net**Phone Number:** 7758422011**Address:** 1200 Riverside Dr. #1234 Reno, NV. 89503**Name of Commentor:** Richard A Maser*This comment was submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)**Submitted:* 5/1/2024 1:38:10 PM