



**Washoe County School District**

425 East Ninth Street \* P.O. Box 30425 \* Reno, NV 89520-3425  
Phone (775) 348-0200 \* Fax (775) 348-0304 \* [www.washoeschools.net](http://www.washoeschools.net)

Board of Trustees: Beth Smith, President \* Adam Mayberry, Vice President \* Joe Rodriguez, Clerk  
Jeff Church \* Diane Nicolet \* Colleen Westlake\* Alex Woodley \* Kristen McNeill, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent

Kyle Chisholm, School Property Planning Manager  
14101 Old Virginia Rd.  
Reno, NV 89521-8912  
(775) 789-3810  
[Kyle.Chisholm@WashoeSchools.Net](mailto:Kyle.Chisholm@WashoeSchools.Net)

February 5, 2024

Re: Case No. TXT24-00001 (Title 18 – Affordable Housing Initiative)

Dear Reno City Planning Commissioners,

Washoe County School District (WCSD) greatly appreciates the initiative by the Nevada Legislature with Assembly Bill 213 to require local government agencies to create housing strategies and streamline creation of affordable housing units. WCSD also appreciates Staff’s diligence on this matter and the multiple stakeholder meetings that WCSD attended. WCSD is generally supportive of Staff’s recommendation to this Commission. However, we’d like to point out some possible improvements or additions to these recommendations that we feel would be appropriate and without great consequence.

As one of the region’s largest property owners and employers, WCSD owns many properties in the City of Reno, many of which are zoned Public Facility (PF). The purpose statement of the PF zone noted in Title 18 is as follows:

*“The PF district is intended to provide for public and quasi-public facilities and services. Primary uses include public institutions, cultural centers, religions institutions, government centers, libraries, hospitals, schools, and utility installations. Depending on the scale and impacts of the proposed use, additional mitigation may be appropriate when adjacent to residential districts.”*

Multi-family land use, which is defined in code as a project having “two or more dwelling units”, would include almost all affordable housing projects. Multi-family is currently not allowed in the PF zone. With the recent adoption of the Facilities Modernization Plan (FMP) by the WCSD Board of Trustees, many school sites within the City of Reno may be re-envisioned or converted into different land use(s). WCSD is interested in possibly partnering with affordable housing developers, agency partners, non-profits, or others to contribute to the housing solution. We believe something of this nature aligns within the purpose statement of PF and is further supported by many Master Plan goals and policies.

WCSD respectfully request that you consider adding multi-family as an allowed use in PF, either as allowed by-right or with approval of a conditional use permit (CUP). As you know, the CUP

would allow this same body to review the appropriateness of any multi-family project that could potentially come forward in PF and analyze and mitigate any impacts associated therewith.

Without this change, WCSD will be required to amend the Master Plan and Zoning designations of these school sites before any potential affordable housing could be considered. This process is rigorous and timely and does not meet the intent behind AB 213.

Please contact me if you'd like to discuss this further. Thank you for your consideration and dedicated public service.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kyle Chisholm". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kyle" being more prominent than the last name "Chisholm".

Kyle Chisholm

TXT24-00001 Housing Initiatives Public Comments

Name	E-mail	Phone	Comments
Darius Fiore			Restrictive zoning laws about affordable housing, transitional housing, and homeless shelters are bad for the community and the city as a whole. Hold the city manager and council accountable for their neglect of the CAC buildings and put money into repairing and updating the facilities to assist our homeless neighbors and the community. The benefits are clear, don't let greed and hate run this city.
Deborah Achtenberg			<p>I support removing restrictive language around homeless services from Title 18.03.303. We need to support houseless people in transition.</p> <p>In addition, allowing the CAC to deteriorate was wrong. We need to clarify Title 18 and stop letting developers' interests trump the need to provide support for all our citizens.</p>
Karen Porter			Against ADU Proposals change to Title 18
Rob			<p>Are you kidding us right now? Parking is crazy the way it is and removing parking mandates will only make things worse. We aren't a big city like those others you are referring to. We live in a small area and are not spread out like LA and those big cities. You are asking us residents to make sacrifices so developers can cash in on this ridiculous idea. We are Reno, the biggest little city in Nevada. Not Las Vegas who has the flat ground and the areas to take on projects like this. Leave Reno alone, we just want to get along with our neighbors. Changing the rules to accommodate these ridiculous ideas are going to cause major anger issues that is going to cause other issues of their own. Take this approach to a different city we are not set up for this. Think of the infrastructure issues it's going to cause that are already present and we are already dealing with multiplied by thousand!. Common, think rationally not with a bank account in mind. The freeways and roads already suck with what we have at the present time.</p>
Andrew Samuelsen			<p>Zoning in Midtown Commercial district from the last round of zoning code updates are overly specific, counterproductive, and often conflicting with themselves.</p> <p>These standards often get harder with denser structures (18.04.1005.d.3.e). This is an arbitrary penalty on dense development, contrary to the stated goals of encouraging density and walkability (18.04.1005.d.2).</p> <p>I request that they are simplified to make development of housing easier, considering our regions housing affordability/scarcity crisis.</p> <p>The zoning code, for example, in this area requires "utilizing dormers." There are numerous small architectural requirements that are difficult to include from a development standpoint and are vastly less important than streamlining housing production. This collection of architectural requirements are ineffective and produce ugly, expensive, random looking buildings with a smattering of styles.</p> <p>Please remove section 18.04.1005.d.3.e entirely, or add an item like "alternative design element(s) as approved by administrator."</p>
Art Rangel AICP			I have a document to submit but I don't see a way to attach the file. As a result I will email it to Grace Mackedon at Mackedon@Reno.gov
Audrey De La Cruz			<p>I am in support of the proposed incentives for affordable housing. Housing cost is negatively effecting so many people in our community. Helping alleviate this should be one of our top priorities.</p> <p>I am opposed to increased residential adjacency requirements and compatibility requirements, as well as additional setback requirements from residential uses. New infill projects should be encouraged, not made less feasible by increased restrictions.</p> <p>Further, I do not think that adding new restrictions in the code matches with the concept of "Zoning Code Clean-up". Many entities who will be affected by these changes will not have this process on their radar as the process is being presented by the City as being about fixing typos or providing clarity rather than adding new restrictions on development.</p>
Robert Lissner			Would it be possible to combine the density and affordable bonuses? Seems like too much.
Ron Bell			Similar to my thoughts on ADU's, any of these new types of units approved need to have a provision for no short term rentals/air b n b et al. Otherwise just a hall pass for Californians to build more units for short term rentals. Short term rentals are a huge part of the rental shortage.
Jake Coming			Jacobs Entertainment needs to get moving with their master plan, they are dragging their feet moving forward and the people of this city continue to suffer for it.
Kristi Twyeffort			I agree with the 4 changes proposed. Let's grease the wheels for more affordable housing and missing middle housing so local Reno folks can stay and thrive in our community. Thanks for the presentation and clarification provided in the discussion!

<p>Gary Cecil</p>		<p>It's clear that Reno must try something new to deal with the lack of affordable housing. I am in support of the efforts that the Development Department is making to attract more developers to build affordable housing. I have absolutely no problem with more affordable housing being built in Downtown where I live.</p> <p>I also recognize that some City residents in some neighborhoods will be upset by the prospect of affordable housing units being built in their living areas. There will be the usual objections that the nature of the neighborhood will be changed and that property values will go down. I also recognize that, to Development staff and developers, these residents are likely seen as impediments to the development process. Further that the current opportunities entitlement reviews afford such residents to give their public input and to remain informed about potential developments in their neighborhoods are too time-consuming, especially at a time when the Nevada Assembly mandates that the City of Reno take new steps to address the need for affordable housing.</p> <p>However, these same residents have a reasonable expectation that the City of Reno does keep them informed and that they will have opportunities to publicly express their views, no matter that those views may not be appreciated. The administrative code itself is a document that provides protections for existing residents so that unreasonable development is not unbridled. I therefore respectfully ask the Council to allow further public discussions about the proposal to remove ALL the elements of the Entitlement Review process.</p> <p>My opinion is that it would be to the benefit of all stakeholders to consider alternative ways to shorten the time taken by the permitting process, but not remove all the equitable steps to both notify residents of proposed affordable housing development and curtail their opportunity to discuss any concerns publicly. Please don't throw the baby out with the bathwater and totally decimate the Entitlement Review process. Let the City, Developers AND Residents work together to create more affordable housing while retaining some reasonable protections for existing residents. I would freely give of my time to participate positively in such discussions.</p>
<p>Ron M. Aryel</p>		<p>It is important we change our attitude about how to use zoning to help the entire community. We need to get rid of outdated, closed-minded thinking, often based on a misunderstanding of property values and racist policy, which claims that single family home zoning "protects" the neighborhood, or that constructing multifamily housing on a few floors must be disallowed to "protect the character" of the neighborhood.</p> <p>These are false premises. Multifamily housing, even multi-floor housing, built properly, can reflect a neighborhood that otherwise has single-family homes, can uphold property values and does not stress local streets, especially if infrastructure needs are addressed and the city invests in public transit integrated with biking infrastructure. There are many specific neighborhoods in many cities that saw an increase in housing density without any loss of property values. There is also a basic ethical consideration: Buying a home in a neighborhood because you like the view of the mountains does not guarantee that the view will be there 20 years after you buy the home. Putting people in housing outranks your desire for a view, and it is your responsibility to adapt. Without an increase in density, Reno will continue to see more sprawl and more environmentally destructive practices. Another consideration is parking: Cities like Austin TX have eliminated parking requirements entirely. Parking requirements encourage more driving, which defeats the goal of livable, walkable neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Justin Haghghi</p>		<p>I am supportive of all the changes and believe that they will bring Reno's zoning code in line with other jurisdictions, offer flexibility to developers to increase supply, and provide options to renters and homeowners alike.</p> <p>For the City's sake, I hope that these minor changes have an impact in the next several years. The gravity of the housing crisis requires swift and decisive action--leadership--as demonstrated by other places all over the country. If the housing crisis continues to worsen, and the city fails to make a dent in solving the problem, a higher level of government like the state legislature will make the decisions for it. This may involve a loss of discretionary power for the Council.</p>
<p>Catherine</p>		<p>I am opposed to proposed changes to residential zoning and incentives for developers to increase the number of units (which I believe is called "infilling") in established neighborhoods in order to alleviate a city housing issue. I feel this will negatively impact the character and feel of these neighborhoods and undermine property values. Everywhere I drive in town there are multi story buildings in progress. More cars on the road! More draw on our resources. How will we manage drought? Air quality? These are already problems for Reno. New projects must be evaluated more stringently, not the opposite. For example, I live within 2 blocks of a school. My street has issues with extreme congestion during school drop off, pick up and sporting events. Increasing the population density surrounding the school will exacerbate the traffic and change the nature of the community. Multi-family buildings should not be approved for neighborhoods like mine. I chose my neighborhood for the modest, single-family homes occupied by young families as well as seniors. The environment is settled where neighbors know each other. I feel infilling my neighborhood will ultimately deflate my property values and negatively impact my quality of life.</p>
<p>Gail Matyas</p>		<p>Yes people that work in Reno should be able to afford housing. Now many people work 60 or more hours a week to pay for rent. With rent being extremely high the same individual can not save for buying a home. Not everyone wants to live in a small expensive crowded apartment building. Having a place to raise a family, to enjoy and be proud of their accomplishments by having a home is very important to many. The cost of building is high but developers and owners of rentals are making a huge profit at the expense of the working poor. There needs to be a review of landlords as many people are living in substandard conditions due to housing that is cheaply constructed just for the owner to bring in a huge profit.</p>
<p>George A Graham</p>		<p>Parking, parking, parking.....You can't increase density in Reno's urban core (Wells District) so long as overlay districts have parking requirements that limit unit count.</p>

<p>Tucker monticelli</p>		<p>I really enjoyed the meeting held on the 19th, I watched it on YouTube. I had two questions that came up in my mind as I watched. The first is about the missing middle, the graph shows that we have single family zoned housing as well as larger apartment complex high-rise and middle rise housing. But Reno as a city has far less high-rise living space than most other cities around the United States. And I wonder if maybe relooking at height requirements is something that we can look into for affordability? It seems that all new apartment complex buildings are five-over-ones stick built and there's not a lot of actual high-rise housing going up at all. The second thing I saw was about the duplexes which I love the examples given and I thought they were very sleek and look like they could fit right into the Reno aesthetic, but I don't understand how that helps Affordability? It seems to me like developers would sell those units for just as much as a single family dwelling if not more because of the prime location of midtown or downtown. It also seems like these units are usually bought out by people immigrating to Reno from California or elsewhere with higher disposable incomes, then those that can be produced locally. I'm not sure if there's any answers for that, but it seems like the rent or even mortgage prices of housing in Reno doesn't match the ability for Reno residents to make up that kind of salary. I don't know how this will be addressed other than some sort of rent control.</p>
<p>Cindi Chandler</p>		<p>Thank you Angela for your presentation. Your presentation was informative, However, density bonuses and bypassing entitlements favor the developers but nothing supports the current homeowners in these neighborhoods. Why have so many luxury apartments been approved yet the main issue is housing for those that are not on government subsidies. Nothing being proposed helps those Reno residents. Also, just because you have had a small number of projects in the past, once developers have the flexibility you propose giving them, all vacant lots in all neighborhoods are in jeopardy of being bought up and zoned where traffic is currently an issue. Market rate apartments are not subsidized and even though there were 12 projects in the last 3 years that used density bonus created 60 additional units you increase the population and additional vehicles/parking issues. Density bonus is not based on cost of rent but size of unit but you did not mention whether there is a required increase in parking with the smaller units. The City already reduced the parking criteria requirements so developers do not need to have a parking spot per door, yet there are often 2 drivers with additional cars. Also, support services such as fire department, police, and public transit are not accessible to these people. There needs to be a strategic plan throughout the City of Reno so that we do not have mass city blocks of monster apartment complexes such as on South Virginia Ave. I am completely AGAINST ANY rezoning criteria for Zone SF 3 and SF 5. Invading established single family home areas with duplexes, triplexes or fourplexes does NOT address the housing costs for those that are not on government subsidies and can't pay the rent for luxury apartments that have popped up all across the city. It DOES impact the value of the single family homes and increase parking issues in established neighborhoods. I support Workforce housing near commercial and industrial areas and near public transit where people walk to work or have an option of public transit. Reno is a unique city, which I am thankful for. Just because other cities in Nevada is doing it one way doesn't mean it is right for Reno. Las Vegas is living proof of a disaster and another California. Many people I know are NOT happy with what has happened to the city regarding development. Thank you again for the presentation and all of your attempts to get public feedback.</p>

## RE: Affordable Housing Follow-up

Ann Silver <asilver@thechambernv.org>

Thu 1/18/2024 5:29 PM

To: Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

Grace:

I'm sorry I wasn't able to make your call at the last minute but it seems there was productive conversation.

The Chamber is focused on critical challenges such as pricing for homes, housing, gas, utilities, insurance, and childcare costs. We know that building low-income housing is imperative.

We favor new zoning house initiatives to create more affordable housing opportunities, generate income for those who have additional space, and allow for short-term rentals. Free enterprise is the backbone of our economy so if we can allow diversity in housing options, while some property owners will be offended and concerned, we'll be able to house the massive workforce needed to maintain all the companies GOED/EDAWN are bringing to this area.

Regards,  
Ann

*Ann Silver*

*Chief Executive Officer*

*[The Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce](#)*

*4065 S. Virginia St. #101, Reno, NV 89502*

*[asilver@thechambernv.org](mailto:asilver@thechambernv.org) 775.636.9550*

**From:** Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 18, 2024 2:06 PM

**Subject:** Affordable Housing Follow-up

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Housing Stakeholders,

Thank you for participating in our recent affordable housing webinar regarding proposed changes to our zoning code to help support and encourage affordable housing. During the three webinars, some common questions came up regarding data that we did not have readily available. As a follow-up, we wanted to provide some of the resources that were asked about, and that help inform us on a day-to-day basis. Also, we have included a link to the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and short-term rental (STR) survey in case you have not already taken it.

1. How can I provide written feedback to the proposed zoning code housing initiatives?

**Response:** Here is a link to provide public comments: [City of Reno Zoning Code Clean-Up Comment Form \(google.com\)](#).

2. Who determines the area median income?

**Response:** 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. Below is the link to the 2023 area median income data for the Reno area.

[FY 2023 Income Limits Documentation System -- Summary for Washoe County, Nevada \(huduser.gov\)](#)

3. Where are the existing built affordable housing units currently located?

**Response:** The Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) maintains a map of the affordable housing projects. Below is a link to that interactive website. [Truckee Meadows Affordable Housing Tracker \(rtcwashoe.com\)](#)

4. How do I get access to the survey on accessory dwelling units and short-term rentals?

**Response:** Here is a link to the City of Reno Survey on ADU's and STRs. <https://arcg.is/0Of9uD>

5. What is the region's current vacancy rate for both affordable housing and market rate housing?

**Response:** The City of Reno has approximately 7,595 affordable housing units and would need another approximate 21,220 affordable housing units to meet the needs of the community. The Nevada State Apartment Association (NVSAA) provide vacancy data from July 2023 that showed the area has an 8.8% vacancy rate for apartments. The average rent at that time was \$1,540 and the average median home price in the City of Reno was \$600,000.

6. Who do I contact to get more information about rent control, tax incentives and other housing related questions?

**Response:** Here is a link to the City of Reno website on all things related to housing and neighborhood development: [Housing & Neighborhood Development | City of Reno](#)

You can also contact your state legislature to inquire about other Statewide initiatives.

Thank you,

**Grace Mackedon**

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



*Senior Management Analyst*

Development Services

775-657-4691 (o) or 775-741-3004(c)

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

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

[Reno.Gov](http://Reno.Gov) | Connect with us: 

**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.

## RE: City of Reno Affordable Housing Meetings

Bill Thomas <bthomas@rtcwashoe.com>

Mon 1/8/2024 5:10 PM

To: Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

Thanks for including me Grace. My comments are:

18.03.302 (3) # 4- I think the central playground requirement should be eliminated for projects within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Corridor. Perhaps there could be some qualifying standard like a public park/dog park must be within ¼ mile, etc. The problem with this rule is that it requires a lot of land that may be hard to provide and doesn't make the best use of limited land in these most urban areas. There is also an issue of creating a potential attractive nuisance or non-owned space (appearance at least) that may attract undesirable behavior. I am guessing, just looking at downtown Reno and other communities, the conventional need for playgrounds for kids is being replaced by the need for places for dogs. Not an anti-kid statement, just a realization of who is living in these areas. In my opinion, the quality of such a space is hard to tie to a mathematical formula like 15 sq. ft per unit and I also think 10 units is too small of project to provide a meaningful exterior space.

Same section # 5- I believe 20 units is too small for economically viable on-site management. My experience has been that one needs closer to 150-200 units to justify proper on-site management. Maybe there can be some kind of rule, I think Code Enforcement did something like this for motel owners, that requires an annual training on proper property management or a fine related to excessive calls for service that create a monetary incentive for proper site management. Or, a rule that if there they don't have on-site management they must have a local management company hired to manage the property with a requirement that such ownership be registered with Code Enforcement.

Same section #7- I believe the lighting, trash enclosures, covered mailboxes and laundry rooms should be required at a much smaller unit count. I don't think you will get quality housing if these key items aren't provided. Not sure what the cut-off would be- maybe laundry within individual units *or* a common laundry facility as an owner option? Seems even the smallest units in the market have at least the stacked laundry devices.

Just some thoughts for your use, or not, as you move this forward.

No need to respond to me unless you think I can provide some benefit.

---

**From:** Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 29, 2023 11:04 AM  
**Subject:** City of Reno Affordable Housing Meetings

**WARNING - This email originated from outside the RTC: Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.**

Hello,

Housing affordability continues to be a top priority for the Reno City Council and the Nevada State Legislators. Assembly Bill 213, which passed in the 2023 legislative session, requires that on or before July 1, 2024, the governing body of each jurisdiction shall create an expedited process for affordable housing, and create incentives that encourage affordable housing. As a part of that priority, Planning staff is working on a number of housing strategies tied to the zoning code that includes:

- Providing zoning incentives for affordable housing developments
- Density bonuses targeted for infill areas
- Flexibility for developing different housing products/types, including duplex, triplex and fourplex units
- Allowing for more residential projects to go straight to a building permit (by-right) to expedite the review process

City staff will be holding three stakeholder meetings during the month of January to collect feedback on the proposed changes. Below are the virtual meeting links to register for the meetings. All three meetings will include the same information and have been provided to meet the various schedules of the public.

- January 10, 2024 @ 12 p.m. - <https://links.reno.gov/AffordableHousing1-10-24>
- January 11, 2024 @ 5 p.m. - <https://links.reno.gov/AffordableHousing1-11-24>
- January 16, 2024 @ 9 a.m. - <https://links.reno.gov/AffordableHousing1-16-24>

[Link to redline Zoning Code with proposed housing initiatives](#)

Specific redline housing changes can be found on the following pages: 5, 21-23, 181, 234-235

[Link to Public Feedback Form](#)

Thank you,



**Grace Mackedon**

*(She/Her/Hers)*

*Senior Management Analyst*

Development Services

775-657-4691 (o) or 775-741-3004(c)

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

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

[Reno.Gov](https://www.reno.gov) | Connect with us:

#### **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.

## Re: Affordable Housing Clarification

Gary Cecil <garycecil621@msn.com>

Tue 1/16/2024 10:07 AM

To: Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

Good morning, Grace:

I'm writing to ask how I can retract the online comment I made last week regarding the proposals to jump start contractors' interest in affordable housing.

I still feel very strongly about the rights of existing residents to both be notified about new entitlement applications, and to be able to debate and comment on such applications.

That said, after some conversations and further reflection, I do not want to oppose your new ideas to stimulate investment in affordable housing. I try hard not to be an ideolog on anything and, after further reading about the many local people struggling with the cost of housing (even though they are working), I've decided that their needs supersede any concerns I have about removing entitlement controls for affordable developments between 20 and 100 dwellings. As often happens with difficult issues, it comes down to a matter of prioritization.

I still hope that, when you and Angela need a break from your workday, Art and I may grab lunch with both of you and discuss how to strike a mutually acceptable balance between incensing development and protecting the rights of existing residents.

**Kind Regards,**  
**Gary**

---

**From:** Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 11, 2024 3:23 PM

**To:** Gary Cecil <garycecil621@msn.com>

**Subject:** Re: Affordable Housing Clarification

Hi Gary,

Thank you for the explanation. We have heard this concern from other residents, and we will see what Council says about this proposal. Our hope is that by still requiring larger developments (100 or more units) to go through an entitlement review/ public process, that it will allow the smaller development more certainty and they can get to market quicker.

As always, appreciate your participation.

---

**From:** Gary Cecil <garycecil621@msn.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 11, 2024 3:00 PM

**To:** Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Affordable Housing Clarification

Thanks for the follow up, Grace; I appreciate your courtesy. I understood this was being proposed for the 20-100 unit range.

As I hope you have seen and heard in the several past years when our paths have crossed, my main mission is to encourage and be sure that existing residents in general are both adequately informed about City actions, and are given suitable opportunities to express their opinions about those actions. While I am often discouraged and, sometimes, appalled at the rudeness and one-sidedness of public discourse at some City and County level public meetings, I would never want to stifle public input....no matter how much I disagree with that input, and how much of an impediment some of that public input can be to forward progress.

While I hoped I expressed clearly enough my support for trying new ways to stimulate affordable housing, I am concerned whenever I see ideas that potentially stifle the opportunities for public input. To be honest, as a resident advocate, I came away feeling like I was an impediment. I am also concerned when I see ideas that appear to "throw the baby out with the bath water". There are a number of review steps in the entitlement process and, as these steps control the progress towards turning a privilege into a use entitlement that lasts in perpetuity with the property, in my opinion, these steps are very powerful and important. So, when I asked whether any thought had been given to keeping even one opportunity for public input, I was already trying hard to put aside my concerns about losing any of these important controls. I wish there could be more conversations with residents about "striking a balance" between too much, onerous controls that probably curtail development and enough control to offer security to existing residents. I would gladly volunteer my time to discuss this further.

I remain most concerned, however, about the loss of public notifications. In terms of public trust, I think a lot is lost when developments of any size suddenly turn up in neighborhoods "by right" only and with no notice to local residents. Despite the admonitions from one of the Developers that commented about people that just need to adapt to changing needs and land uses in their areas, it's just too easy and outworn an argument to play the NIMBY card. It's a broad-brush stroke that paints everyone as only caring about their own good, without any way of knowing their personal issues and reasons for supporting or not supporting a development.

Grace, I hope you know me enough that you believe that I am not here to "knock down"; I always want to take every opportunity I can to support the City's efforts. I feel very strongly about existing residents having a voice....even if that voice is not always positive. I am always open to discussing issues with anyone, anytime. I hope you understand my concerns and please feel free to contact me if you want to further discuss my concerns, especially because they apply more broadly than the current topic of affordable housing.

**Kind Regards,**  
**Gary**

---

**From:** Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 11, 2024 1:36 PM  
**To:** Gary Cecil <garycecil621@msn.com>  
**Subject:** Affordable Housing Clarification

Hi Gary,

Thank you for coming to our affordable housing webinar yesterday. Turnout was great! I wanted to reach out in hopes of clarifying what you had concerns about yesterday. From my understanding you were concerned about discretionary review or the public process being removed all together. The only thing we are proposing to remove is discretionary review for projects between 20-100 units. This appears to be consistent with other jurisdictions. Projects with more than 100 units would still trigger a discretionary review and have to notice the neighbors. (this requirement varies per zoning district)

Let me know if this helps clear anything up?

Thank you,



**Grace Mackedon**

*(She/Her/Hers)*

*Senior Management Analyst*

Development Services

775-657-4691 (o) or 775-741-3004(c)

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

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

[Reno.Gov](http://Reno.Gov) | Connect with us:     

**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.

**Fwd: City of Reno Affordable Housing Meeting - 01/16/2024.**

Michelle Fournier &lt;FournierM@reno.gov&gt;

Tue 1/16/2024 5:18 PM

To: Angela Fuss &lt;FussA@reno.gov&gt;; Grace Mackedon &lt;MackedonG@reno.gov&gt;

Not sure if this goes to you or Monica's group.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>**Sent:** Tuesday, January 16, 2024 5:15 PM**To:** Michelle Fournier <FournierM@reno.gov>; Jayna Litz <LitzJ@reno.gov>**Cc:** Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>**Subject:** Fw: City of Reno Affordable Housing Meeting - 01/16/2024.

Hi,

We received a public comment that we believe was meant for the Stakeholder Unput on Affordable Housing Initiatives Meeting for 1/16/24. We're not sure was managing that meeting so we figured we'd start with you. Let us know if this doesn't go to you.

Thank you!

---

**From:** Jyukon <jyukon@yahoo.com>**Sent:** Monday, January 15, 2024 6:58 AM**To:** Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>**Subject:** City of Reno Affordable Housing Meeting - 01/16/2024.

Please add this comment to the public record for the affordable housing meeting on January 16, 2024.

The city should keep in mind that Reno's beautiful neighborhoods should be maintained and not diminished in order to satisfy the developer's ultimate interest in making a profit.

The city's housing code requires that the characteristics of neighborhoods be improved by new construction and that new buildings complement existing neighborhoods, matching in characteristics such as neighborhood density, building heights, setbacks and current parking. There are plenty of areas of Reno that could use new buildings. Areas in or close to downtown Reno should be the first choice for affordable housing complexes, where new residents can enjoy easy access to public transportation, shopping and recreation. Infrastructure in those areas is largely established and can more easily adopt to increases in population if necessary. Also, available jobs are more easily reached from downtown Reno's central location than in more distant areas of the city. It makes little sense to place large, dense housing developments in locations far from where the majority of new jobs are being provided, where commuting across town and adding to traffic congestion would result.

Please listen to the Reno's citizens and taxpayers, none of whom would likely be in favor of placing large affordable housing in scattered locations around the area. Work done by Reno's staff and council should be aimed to serve the residents first and foremost.

## Fw: Housing Zoning

Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Thu 1/18/2024 9:06 AM

To: Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

Can you add this to the public feedback on the Housing Text Amendment?

--

### Angela Fuss, AICP

*Assistant Director*

Development Services

775-399-3843 (c)

fussa@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501



[Reno.Gov](#) | Connect with us:



**From:** Leah Sanders <leah.sanders14@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 18, 2024 9:04 AM

**To:** Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

**Subject:** Housing Zoning

Hello Angela,

I hope your meetings met your expectations. I forgot one point that resonates with me. The Step-back of the second story should be retained. It provides visual relief and light/privacy for the single story dwelling next to it. The normal setback is not enough. Planting trees won't mitigate that feeling of a high wall. I am trying to accept change that benefits all. Please keep in this important piece. Just driving along the housing on Virginia across from UNR makes that point strong for many.

Thank you and have a good weekend,

leah

1/18/24, 9:51 AM

Mail - Grace Mackedon - Outlook

Leah Sanders  
leah.sanders14@gmail.com

**Re: Reminder: City of Reno Affordable Housing Meeting - 01/11/2024 starts in 1 hour**

Gail Matyas &lt;gmmatyas@gmail.com&gt;

Thu 1/11/2024 6:45 PM

To: Grace Mackedon &lt;MackedonG@reno.gov&gt;

I watched your presentation. I keep hearing that if developers get various discounts on regulations or processes they can build more and more housing will decrease the cost of rent. Supply vs demand... building is growing everywhere and many units are up and none are affordable to a nurse or nursing assistant or an X-ray tech or lab tech or policeman or state patrol...much less those working in jobs under \$20.00/hr even if they work 70 hours a week. It's time to find assistance for those middle income hard working families that are exhausted from working 6, 12-14 hour days per week. The developers are not building safe units. A family member paid \$17.50 per month plus utilities for 2 small rooms...less than 600 square feet and in a few months the floor tile was coming up, the walls were thick with green mold and the cost to heat or cool the terribly built unit was outrageous. I have no idea how these units passed city code. But the more upscale the developers build the more people move here from CA and out price those already struggling that we're raised here, went to college here and had hoped to live here. And I guess a studio apartment is great for a family of 3 or 4 since that's all they could afford?!?! What about individuals that have good jobs and want to buy a home. As a single person as a Respiratory Therapist I could never afford the cost of a home in Reno. Even as a married person whose spouse has a so called "good" job the cost of housing is too high. Even with working lots of overtime or two jobs people are struggling. The only reason I have a home is because my husband and I moved here in 1994. Hospitals and other facilities can't hire enough staff because people can't afford to live in here now. The food banks and other associations for assistance are overwhelmed with people struggling and the developers are destroying the quality of life in this city with causing overcrowded streets, not enough police or fire departments, not enough State Patrols etc. Crime and shootings and pedestrian vs car accidents are rampant. It's time to look at holding developers accountable.

Thank you,

Gail and Mike Matyas and family

On Thu, Jan 11, 2024 at 4:55 PM Grace Mackedon <[no-reply@zoom.us](mailto:no-reply@zoom.us)> wrote:

Hi Gail Matyas,

This is a reminder that your webinar will begin in 1 hour:

**City of Reno Affordable Housing Meeting - 01/11/2024**

Date & Time Jan 11, 2024 05:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Webinar ID 835 9207 1809

Add to: [Google Calendar](#) [Outlook Calendar\(.ICS\)](#) [Yahoo Calendar](#)

No action may be taken on a matter raised under general public comment until the matter is included on a subsequent agenda as an action item.

Pursuant to NRS 241.023, those wishing to submit public comment may do so through the online public comment form found at [Reno.Gov/PublicComment](#), by sending an email to [publiccomment@reno.gov](mailto:publiccomment@reno.gov) by leaving a voicemail at 775-393-4499 or at the meeting during virtual public comment. Public comment is limited to three (3) minutes per person. Comments received prior to 4:00 p.m. on the day preceding the meeting will be transcribed, provided to the Committee for review, and entered into the record. Comments received after 4:00 pm on the day preceding the meeting will be provided to the Committee for review prior to adjournment, and entered into the record.

The City of Reno will make every effort to accommodate public comment; however, we are not responsible for technical problems

You can [cancel](#) your registration at any time.

Please submit any questions to: [mackedong@reno.gov](mailto:mackedong@reno.gov)

Thank you!

WAYS TO JOIN THIS WEBINAR

• **Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android**

[Join Webinar](#)

If the button above does not work, paste this into your browser:

[https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83592071809?tk=LRD\\_zXqVsfjLlcRN4vbN-n9AonEhlmjnDhrYSwOFDZ8.DQYAAAATdnnKgRZ3MHc1WIE3SFFBQ1hKZG96b29NX09RAAAAAA&uuiid=WN\\_6u4QBNNASiapH85YszHr-g](https://us06web.zoom.us/j/83592071809?tk=LRD_zXqVsfjLlcRN4vbN-n9AonEhlmjnDhrYSwOFDZ8.DQYAAAATdnnKgRZ3MHc1WIE3SFFBQ1hKZG96b29NX09RAAAAAA&uuiid=WN_6u4QBNNASiapH85YszHr-g)

**To keep this webinar secure, do not share this link publicly.**

• **Join via audio**

**Or, dial:** US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 360 209 5623 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 507 473 4847 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 669 444 9171 or +1 689 278 1000 or +1 719 359 4580 or +1 720 707 2699 or +1 253 205 0468 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 305 224 1968 or +1 309 205 3325 or +1 312 626 6799

[More International numbers](#)

Webinar ID: 835 9207 1809



+1.888.799.9666

Copyright ©2024 Zoom Video Communications, Inc.

Visit [Zoom.us](https://zoom.us)  
55 Almaden Blvd  
San Jose, CA 95113



## Questions regarding affordable housing presentation

Sue Smith <sue@argentnevada.com>

Fri 1/12/2024 1:57 PM

To: Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>

I would like to be able to contact Angela too; may I have her contact info?

The presentation webinar I attended earlier this week was interesting and Angela is a wealth of knowledge.

How many units were built over the past 3 years? How many were "affordable"?

When the dust settles, perhaps we have solved our issues.

I attended a market presentation by the Appraisal Institute, and was told we grew by 30%, is this true?

We certainly have upgraded our apartment housing stock.

I also learned that rents are coming down due to a large supply of housing. Landlords are offering incentives to occupy.

I am concerned that we are looking at affordable housing out of context. It seems like affordable transportation should be part of the discussion. Also public amenities; with an increase of density we need to be mindful of parks, museums etc.

I find myself very concerned that we will eliminate some of "who we are" in the name of "affordable" housing. We need to protect our history and heritage.

Also, since this was mandated by the NV Legislature, perhaps they could also mandate that Storey County build some housing for their employment center at TAhoe Reno Industrial Center.

Thank you

Sue Smith

NV Real Estate License # B028370

Argent Commercial Real Estate

775-323-5000

Sent via mobile-