

Leah Piccotti

From: Cali Shy
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 7:24 AM
To: Leah Piccotti
Cc: Planning Tech
Subject: FW: LDC24-00031 (BVR Phase II PUD Amendment)

Cali Shy
(She/Her/Hers)
Planning Technician
Development Services
775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)
ShyC@Reno.Gov
Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us:

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

From: Bill Hallahan <carbuff76@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 9:57 AM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: LDC24-00031 (BVR Phase II PUD Amendment)

Commissioners,

I am a resident of Bella Vista Ranch and object to the proposed modifications of the Bella Vista Ranch Phase II PUD for the following reasons:

Open space which drew us to the area will be further reduced.

This will further add to the green house gasses and climate change in the an area that is pocketed by mountains.

Several multi-level apartment developments are adding significant traffic to the roads.

Schools are overcrowded.

Shopping, dining out facilities, and services are already very busy.

The developer purchased the land and got the original plan approved, why the sudden need to crowd more homes into a rather in-accessible area, destroying the character of the area and lowering the value of existing homes.

This seems like a repeat of developer tactics; buy the land, get a plan approved based on the current PUD, request a PUD amendment to eliminate open space and crowd more units in, and threaten to sue the city if they don't get their way.

Leah Piccotti

From: Jim Umbach
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 10:04 AM
To: Leah Piccotti
Subject: FW: LDC24-00031 (BVR Phase II PUD Amendment)

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

From: Bill Hallahan <carbuff76@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 9:57 AM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: LDC24-00031 (BVR Phase II PUD Amendment)

Commissioners,

I am a resident of Bella Vista Ranch and object to the proposed modifications of the Bella Vista Ranch Phase II PUD for the following reasons:

Open space which drew us to the area will be further reduced.

This will further add to the green house gasses and climate change in the an area that is pocketed by mountains.

Several multi-level apartment developments are adding significant traffic to the roads.

Schools are overcrowded.

Shopping, dining out facilities, and services are already very busy.

The developer purchased the land and got the original plan approved, why the sudden need to crowd more homes into a rather in-accessible area, destroying the character of the area and lowering the value of existing homes.

This seems like a repeat of developer tactics; buy the land, get a plan approved based on the current PUD, request a PUD amendment to eliminate open space and crowd more units in, and threaten to sue the city if they don't get their way.

Let them live within the current PUD guidelines. The lack of sound financial planning on the developer's part should not be a reason to negatively impact the lives of the current residents of the area.

I look forward to reading the Planning Commission staff report.

W J Hallahan

Section III K: Feral Horse Protection Plan

The Feral Horse Protection Plan is limited to statements about temporary and permanent fences. It does not address access to water in Steamboat Creek, which is the last water supply available to the horses. The horses have been there since Bella Vista Ranch PUD was approved. With this proposal, the horses will be cut off. The road around it on the east will contribute to more animal deaths.

Re: Fencing - The handbook states that temporary fencing will be installed prior to any development, and that installation, monitoring, and maintenance of permanent perimeter fencing will be the responsibility of each village or project developer.

Temporary fencing needs to be inspected and maintained because there is no fixed time-frame for completion of a permanent fence. Additionally, there are no assurances that a permanent fence will be completely installed in a timely manner.

- *A provision for monitoring and maintenance of the temporary fence should be included.*
- *Completion of permanent fencing should be a required condition of approval of this proposal, to ensure that it is installed in a timely manner across the entire area.*

Re: Access to water - The revised language for the Feral Horse Protection plan deletes the following statements that assured access to water by the horses will be preserved:

1. Access to water in Steamboat Creek will be maintained to the north of the project.
 2. Fencing will provide a corridor for horse to access Steamboat Creek.
 3. Alternative locations to replace the water access will be reviewed w/future development approvals for this property.
- *This revision should not be approved unless/until a provision for alternate water sources for the horses is included in the PUD handbook.*

Section IV D: Flexibility

This section provides for up to 10% acreage increase in each land use category. If acreage in any land use category is increased, there will be a corresponding decrease in another land use category.

- *Decreases in the PGOS acreage should be excluded from this provision, given the environmentally sensitive nature of the wetlands and flood basin, and the relatively small open space and park area that surrounds them.*

Section IV C and E: Administration and Modifications

Section IV C states that the PUD shall be administered by the City of Reno ("Administrator"). Section IV E gives the City ("Administrator") the authority to update the PUD to reflect amendments to the RMC that impact the PUD. The Administrator has to notify the Master Developer prior to final approval of the administrative changes, but only minor deviations require written approval from the Master Developer.

A PUD isn't retroactively affected by subsequent amendments to Title 18, and changes to the PUD based on future (unknown) RMC amendments may not be desired by occupants of the PUD. The City shouldn't be the designated administrator and shouldn't have discretionary update authority.

- *The purpose and intent of giving the City ("Administrator") authority to administer and alter the PUD should be explained. The roles and responsibilities of the City and the developer should be clarified in order to avoid confusion about the scope of administrative updates to the PUD.*

Leah Piccotti

From: Cali Shy
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 7:09 AM
To: Leah Piccotti
Cc: Planning Tech
Subject: FW: Bella Vista Ranch Phase 2



Cali Shy
(She/Her/Hers)

Planning Technician
Development Services
775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)
ShyC@Reno.Gov
Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

[Reno.Gov](https://www.reno.gov) | Connect with us: [f](#) [t](#) [@](#) [in](#) [d](#)

From: Marcella <marcellagrace1111@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 5:33 PM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: Bella Vista Ranch Phase 2

I received notification in the mail about proposed changes to the Bella Vista development. The proposed changes sound like a bait and switch by the developer (and maybe city planners) to get the city/residents to agree to the project then later apply for lower standards once receiving approval.

As someone who is a fourth generation Nevadan whose family has lived in the Reno/Sparks area for over 100 years, it is incredibly disappointing to see the city planners make so many poor decisions. In conversations with family, friends, and neighbors, this sentiment is echoed over and over again, yet the planners continue to diminish neighborhoods with low quality ideas, often devaluing surrounding properties, especially in this South Meadows area. I hope in this instance the city upholds a high standard for the developers and insists on quality everything. Stick to the original plan which already brings more than enough development into the area. There is no reason to keep trying to cram as many homes as possible in this South Meadows area except for greed, and to ask that the standards be modified is shameful.

Quality of life now and in the future is what makes a strong community/city, providing neighborhoods where residents take pride in where they live and enjoy being. Make the right decision this time and require a quality project that benefits the community and increases value and desirability rather than the opposite.

Thank you,
Marcella

Which Category Describes You

Citizen

Case Number

LDC24-00031

Citizen General Public Comment Form

Full Name

William McLarty

Contact Email

wmclarty@hotmail.com

Contact Phone Number

4157253349

Position

In Opposition

Leave comments on this case here.

I absolutely oppose the request for an increase to the residential units for Bella Vista Ranch Phase II. Unless the developer adds something really big to sweeten the deal. A large park or something similar that wasn't originally planned.

This PDF is generated with the [Google Forms Notification](#) add-on.

To generate customized PDFs from Google Forms, download [Document Studio](#) ([video demo](#)).

These messages are not added in the [premium version](#).

Leah Piccotti

From: Cali Shy
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 7:08 AM
To: Leah Piccotti; Planning Tech
Subject: FW: LDC24-00031 (Bella Vista Ranch Phase Iol PUD Amendment)
Attachments: IMG_2755.png



Cali Shy
(She/Her/Hers)

Planning Technician
Development Services
775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)
ShyC@Reno.Gov
Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

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

From: Vicki Nelson <victorian58@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2024 12:09 PM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: LDC24-00031 (Bella Vista Ranch Phase Iol PUD Amendment)

Dear Commission:

I have questions and concerns about the current amendment to BVR II. I am not against development, however some concerns deserve to be addressed.

Decreasing non-residential from 178,600 to 117,612 - FOR WHAT PURPOSE? Is the intention to reduce the green space and open space? I oppose reducing green space.

Increase dwelling units from 575 to 609 - So does this mean smaller lot sizes, which in turn decreases my property value? More traffic with 30 more homes, I oppose increasing the number of houses.

Modify the allowed land uses, design standards, development standards, and street design standards. So the developer has free rein of the land use? I oppose these modifications.

If this development hinders the use of Steamboat creek to the horse and wildlife population, I oppose the development.

With all the land in northern Nevada, is it necessary to build INTO the foothills?

This development has made several amendments and it's hard to keep track of anything current. Is the attached map (October 2017) the current development plan and could you post a proposed map of the requested changes?

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

V. Nelson
Reno, NV

Leah Piccotti

From: Cali Shy
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 10:01 AM
To: Leah Piccotti
Cc: Planning Tech
Subject: FW: Bella Vista II development
Attachments: 20240228_134124.jpg; 20240304_122738.jpg; 20240304_123152.jpg; 20240228_133528.jpg; 20231112_133950.jpg; 20230828_140143.jpg



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

Planning Technician
Development Services
775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)
ShyC@Reno.Gov
Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

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

From: Dawn Ritter <rittplis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 9:58 AM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: Bella Vista II development

I've been walking almost everyday for the past 4 years during rain, snow, or sun, to see the wild horse history of Reno. "Feral" is a cute term to use for cats but all horses that live in the wild are wild.

I know city councils are mainly interested in increasing the tax base, but don't lose sight of the history that makes Reno special. That includes the Mustang that Damonte Ranch and the high school have adopted as logo and mascot.

Don't let them disappear for lack of natural resources. I wonder if Bella Vista I residents know their view of the horses in the meadow will disappear soon.














TO: RENO Planning Commissioners
City Council Members, City manager, and Mayor

From: Sally P. Tate

Date: 3-4-2024

Re: Bella Vista Ranch Developers amendment to the PUD, and plan to cut off 100% of water supply for our wild horses by fencing off the area and not creating any access for survival.

We live in the Great Basin region which is a spectacular area and allows us to enjoy nature year round. We have chosen to live here and appreciate the beauties of nature—our geography-mountains, varied terrain, vegetation, and the habitat where all our animals, insects, reptiles live.

I am not opposed to development in our region, but it must be smart and we MUST protect our ecosystems and sustain our habitat. This not only includes our vegetation, but water supply. A developer must respect our ecosystem and not create destruction for all types of wildlife. It is not just about the horses.

As more development encroaches on undeveloped lands, it is even more important to sustain our habitats and ecosystems.

If developers want to build in Nevada, then show respect for our land and help protect it. We don't want development to look like California. Just look at all the homes built below the San Gabriel Mountains and San Bernardino Mountains, stretching for miles upon miles, and I wonder where all the water is coming from to supply these homes.

We must create and approach developments which factor in all the aspects of our great basin sustainability. If it means allowing water supply access to border developments and allow easements for animal access, then it should and must be provided. It seems simple to me. Why fight it? We are losing more green space and creating more pavements, which has a great affect on our temperature and habitat in which we all live.

Save what makes Nevada and Reno most special!

Leah Piccotti

From: Cali Shy
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 7:05 AM
To: Leah Piccotti
Cc: Planning Tech
Subject: FW: Bella Vista Developers

Cali Shy
(She/Her/Hers)
Planning Technician
Development Services
775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)
ShyC@Reno.Gov
Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us:

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

From: Barbara Wyma <mokena@prodigy.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2024 7:00 AM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: Bella Vista Developers

I want to state unequivocally that I am against the Bella Vista Developers amendment which would create fencing that cuts off water to the wild horse population.
Thank you.

Barbara Wyma
2255 Copper Brand Drive
Reno

Let them live within the current PUD guidelines. The lack of sound financial planning on the developer's part should not be a reason to negatively impact the lives of the current residents of the area.

I look forward to reading the Planning Commission staff report.

W J Hallahan

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 3/6/24

CASE NO. LDC 24-00031

Please Print:

NAME: Tracy Wilson

ADDRESS: 900 Steamboat Pkwy

I REPRESENT: Wild Horse Connection

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

neither

COMMENTS: Request ^{small} changes regarding horse fencing
& delay of full project fencing until ready
to break ground

SIGNATURE: Tracy

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 3-6-24

CASE NO. LDC 24-00031

Please Print:

NAME: Andrey Keller

ADDRESS: 720 Marewood Trl

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: _____

SIGNATURE: 

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 3/6/24

CASE NO. LDC 5.6

Please Print:

NAME: Hellie Hansen

ADDRESS: 15520 Toll Rd

I REPRESENT: wild horses

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: 

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 3/6/2024

CASE NO. LDC 516

Please Print:

NAME: Kelly Ayatt

ADDRESS: 355 Tauros Circle

I REPRESENT: Wild Hores

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: Kelly Ayatt

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 3/6/24

CASE NO. LDC 24-00031

Please Print:

NAME: Tina Brodnick

ADDRESS: 10785 Santa Fe Rd. Reno

I REPRESENT: myself - wild horses

~~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: Tina Brodnick

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 3/6/24

CASE NO. LDC 24-00031

Please Print:

NAME: Michael Margwardt

ADDRESS: _____

I REPRESENT: _____

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: Michael Margwardt