

[illegible]

Fw: Item D1

Jennifer Gutierrez <GutierrezJ@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 7:47 AM

To: Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to public comment



Jennifer Gutierrez

(She/Her/Hers)

Office Assistant II

City Clerk's Office

City Clerk (775) 334-2030

Cashiering: (775) 334-2032

Parking Services: (775) 334-2293

Public Records: (775) 334-3932

Gutierrezj@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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

From: D Luscav <d.luscav@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 12:07 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Item D1

Do not change the definition of single family resident

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

Fw: Item D1

Jennifer Gutierrez <GutierrezJ@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 7:48 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to public comment



Jennifer Gutierrez

(She/Her/Hers)

Office Assistant II

City Clerk's Office

City Clerk (775) 334-2030

Cashiering: (775) 334-2032

Parking Services: (775) 334-2293

Public Records: (775) 334-3932

Gutierrezj@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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

From: BRUCE COWEE <b2acowee@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 7:42 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Item D1

SF zoning means SF zoning. I urge you not to make zoning changes that will change the face of Reno.

Thank you,
Bruce Cowee
6510 Mahogany Ridge Drive
Reno 89523

Sent from my iPhone

Case No. TXT24-00001 (Title 18 Affordable Housing Initiatives)

Carmen Gage <carmen.gage@gmail.com>

Mon 5/6/2024 12:55 PM

To: Devon Reese <reeseD@reno.gov>; Hillary Schieve <SchieveH@reno.gov>; Jenny Brekhus <BrekhusJ@reno.gov>; Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>; Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>; Miguel Martinez <MartinezMi@reno.gov>; Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>

Mayor Schieve and all members of the Reno City Council,

I am in opposition to the recommendations of the Reno Planning Commission which state the following:

- Allowing buildings to increase by two stories if the project meets affordability requirements.
- Allowing for duplex, triplex, and fourplex development in all single family zoning districts (SF3, SF5, SF8 and SF11).
- Removing requirements for minor and major deviations to setbacks if the project meets affordability requirements.
- Removing minimum parking requirements if the project meets affordability requirements.

Furthermore, I call your attention to the Questions and Comments section, question 1.

Question: Do any of these text amendments upzone or change zoning on any properties?

Answer: No, the proposed changes will have no impact on anyone's zoning designation, nor will these changes modify anyone's zoning.

This is not being transparent and is a backdoor way to densification. Allowed uses don't count against density on all zoning, consequently it is up-zoning. In conclusion, until this upzoning is transparent, it should not even be considered much less allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen and Lewis Gage

Fw: Item D1 on the upcoming agenda

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 10:18 AM

To: Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to Public Comment.

*****My name and email have recently been changed. Please delete and/or update all saved contact information related to Kraiprai or kraiprai@reno.gov.**

Katelyn Scarlett (Kraiprai)

(She/Her/Hers)

Records System Manager

City Clerk's Office - Record Management

775-348-6916 (o) or 775-531-7218 (c)

Records Main Line: 775-348-3932 (o)

scarlettk@reno.gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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



From: CINDI CHANDLER <cindicha@msn.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 10:24 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Item D1 on the upcoming agenda

I STRONGLY OPPOSE the rezoning of residential single home areas to allow duplexes or ANY MULTI-FAMILY UNITS in our neighborhoods. We purchased our single family homes for a reason. Dayton has built duplexes in a gated community among single family homes and that section of the community LOOKS LIKE RENTALS, which BRINGS DOWN THE VALUE OF THE OTHER SINGLE FAMILY HOMES- just ask any realtor.

STOP DESTROYING WHAT IS ALREADY HERE. IF YOU WANT TO BUILD MULTI-UNIT HOMES, THEN REZONE AREAS THAT ARE NOT ALREADY ESTABLISHED. STOP THIS INSANITY AND GIVING DEVELOPERS FREE REIGN TO DESTROY OUR COMMUNITIES JUST BECAUSE YOU SAY YOU HAVE TO ADHERE TO THE NEW LAW. I READ THE LAW AND YOU DO NOT HAVE TO DO THIS.

Infill does NOT mean destroy or devalue what is already established. WE don't have to follow other cities just because "everyone else is doing it." That doesn't make it right. DARE TO BE DIFFERENT AND KEEP RENO A SPECIAL PLACE THAT DOES NOT LOOK LIKE LAS VEGAS AND DEFINITELY NOT CALIFORNIA. LEARN FROM CALIFORNIA'S MAJOR MISTAKES OR WE WILL QUICKLY BECOME EAST CALIFORNIA.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Zoning Changes

AOL MAIL <conswanson@aol.com>

Sat 5/4/2024 9:57 AM

To:Hillary Schieve <SchieveH@reno.gov>;Jenny Brekhus <BrekhusJ@reno.gov>;durerrn@reno.gov <durerrn@reno.gov>;Miguel Martinez <MartinezMi@reno.gov>;Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>;Kathleen Taylor <TaylorK@reno.gov>;Devon Reese <reesed@reno.gov>;Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

This is just irresponsible! There should be no two or fourplex residences in a single home area. The fact that there will be no parking rules in this is insane. Parking in single home neighborhoods is bad enough without overbuilding in that area with no restrictions on parking.

PLEASE do not pass this!!

Thank You

Connie Swanson

RE: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D1

Jim Umbach <UmbachJ@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 9:32 AM

To: Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>; Public Comment - CC
<PublicComment@reno.gov>

Will do.

From: Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 9:32 AM

To: Jim Umbach <UmbachJ@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>; Public Comment - CC
<PublicComment@reno.gov>

Subject: Re: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D1

Hi Jim,

In the future, please forward these comments to Publiccomment@reno.gov.

Thank you!

Take care,

Mikki Huntsman

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



City Clerk

City Clerk's Office

775-334-2030 (o) or 775-399-4741 (c)

Huntsmanm@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

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

From: Jim Umbach <UmbachJ@reno.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 9:23 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Subject: FW: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D1

From: Jim Umbach
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 7:29 AM
To: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>
Cc: Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>
Subject: RE: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D1

Hi Carter,

We'll log this as General Public Comment for PC. (No PC meeting on May 8—CC hearing the housing initiatives text amendment that day though.)

Thanks!

Jim

From: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 7:22 AM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D1

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date: 2024-05-08

Agenda Item or Case Number: D1

Comments:

Please do not allow blade of grass left in Reno to be covered with more apartments...namely duplexes and four plexus. We do not need more apartment units...Reno already had a blight of unrented apartments. Thank you.

Email Address: Spirit@telis.org

Phone Number: 530-559-9600

Address: 700 California Avenue

Name of Commentor: Diane McCormack

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

Submitted: 5/6/2024 2:21:32 PM

To: Reno City Council

spirit <spirit@telis.net>

Mon 5/6/2024 8:08 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:Diane Young McCormack <spirit@telis.org>

Good morning,

I am writing to urge you to vote NO on the "cleanup" of the City Zoning Code, Title 18 - City of Reno Land Development Code, which is listed as AGENDA ITEM #D1.

Under the vague plead that we need more affordable housing, we know that this "cleanup" is NOT the answer. Reno citizens saw this as more and motels were torn down to make way for the Neon District, the Jacob's Development that promised a portion of their development on almost 100 parcels, would be developed as "Affordable Housing." What a joke! I attended a part council meeting and voiced my opinion on that agenda item.

I moved to Reno in 2008, and the amount of development in the past 16 years is mind-blowing. Development has changed the landscapes around the once sweet town of Verdi, the area down from Home Depot on McCarran, the area around Longley, the areas on both sides of Mount Rose, on and on...which include many high apartment buildings and houses.

Do you really want to see our beautiful town to be covered with more and more cement? I do NOT.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW 2 PLEXES, 3 PLEXES AND 4 PLEXES TO BE DEVELOPED ON SINGLE FAMILY ZONED SF3 AND SF5.

VOTE NO.

Thank you for adding my opposition.

Diane Young McCormack
700 California Avenue
Reno, NV 89509
530-559-9600
Spirit@telis.org

Fw: Item D1 May 7 meeting. Zoning changes to the “old” neighborhoods

Jennifer Gutierrez <GutierrezJ@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 7:48 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to public comment



Jennifer Gutierrez

(She/Her/Hers)

Office Assistant II

City Clerk's Office

City Clerk (775) 334-2030

Cashiering: (775) 334-2032

Parking Services: (775) 334-2293

Public Records: (775) 334-3932

Gutierrezj@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

Reno.Gov | Connect with us: [!\[\]\(c1168d6a8b365d11e842ece304635fa7_img.jpg\)](#) [!\[\]\(821e2adbc4e694c5a65f45cf90787bff_img.jpg\)](#) [!\[\]\(a379c93c259bb90edf5293abf22f698d_img.jpg\)](#) [!\[\]\(f27aa16edf0262e8c20cc3e88e6863e7_img.jpg\)](#) [!\[\]\(bce1d958053cefcbbc37316797068065_img.jpg\)](#)

From: Dori Goldman <shpilkas@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 9:13 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Re: Item D1 May 7 meeting. Zoning changes to the “old” neighborhoods

I would like to add my voice in opposition to any zoning changes to allow for up to 4-plexes on SF dwelling units. We have seen an increase in traffic, parking, and dangerous “alley driving” in the Newlands Subdivision - all due to increased building of additional units.

Thank you for your attention.

Dori Goldman

Sent from my iPad

Fw: ITEM D1 before 4 pm Tuesday May 7th

Jennifer Gutierrez <GutierrezJ@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 7:47 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to public comment



Jennifer Gutierrez

(She/Her/Hers)

Office Assistant II

City Clerk's Office

City Clerk (775) 334-2030

Cashiering: (775) 334-2032

Parking Services: (775) 334-2293

Public Records: (775) 334-3932

Gutierrezj@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

Reno.Gov | **Connect with us:**     

From: latenten <latentent2@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 4, 2024 8:59 PM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: ITEM D1 before 4 pm Tuesday May 7th

Hello,

SF zoning means Single Family zoning! These changes are too consequential to be voted in so quickly. Passing them will leave an impact FOREVER on our beautiful city!! Thank you,

E Gers

Reno, NV 89523

Fw: Item D1 of Tues, May 7th meeting

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 10:19 AM

To: Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to Public Comment.

*****My name and email have recently been changed. Please delete and/or update all saved contact information related to Kraiprai or kraipraik@reno.gov.**

Katelyn Scarlett (Kraiprai)

(She/Her/Hers)

Records System Manager

City Clerk's Office - Record Management

775-348-6916 (o) or 775-531-7218 (c)

Records Main Line: 775-348-3932 (o)

scarlettk@reno.gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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



From: possegirl rapiddog.net <possegirl@rapiddog.net>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 3:29 PM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Item D1 of Tues, May 7th meeting

I will be out of town for this scheduled meeting but I would like for this email to represent my thoughts on the of upzoning in Reno. I have many grave concerns. We own a home in the old NW and our neighborhood will likely be effected by the building of duplex, four-plex, and storied buildings.

1. Parking is already a problem in neighborhoods with many rental homes. So many people must live in one home that result in several cars on the street. I have witnessed street parked vehicles being totaled by hit and run drivers, including my daughter's and the person next door. The street parking is also impacted by snow

plows. There has been no mention of requiring these new builds to have off-street parking.

2. I have been told that young people don't want cars these days. That may work in larger cities, but not here for most employment, etc.
3. Traffic down Putnam is already like a major artery at many times of day. It will worsen with WSD's plan to roll all the small elementary schools into one on Kings's Row. Additional traffic here will put school kids at risk.
4. Our property values will be shredded. For many of us, our homes are all we have as investments. We do not have HOA's to protect us from noise, traffic, and other intrusions.
5. What is to stop developers from making cash offers on homes in the area and building whatever they please on these properties, causing congestion and blocking views?
6. Those of you in HOA's making decisions for those of us without is not what we expect from our city leaders.
7. Decisions like these will effect the city forever. Haste and quietly pushing things through give your constituents a lack of confidence in leadership. Please take the time that is necessary to look into alternatives. There are so many abandoned spaces downtown that need to be refreshed.

It is my hope that my thoughts will be considered. I know I am not alone in this thinking.

Jean Johnson
2295 Putnam Dr
Reno 89503

Jean Johnson

Fw: Item D1

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 10:21 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to Public Comment.

*****My name and email have recently been changed. Please delete and/or update all saved contact information related to Kraiprai or kraipraik@reno.gov.**



Katelyn Scarlett (Kraiprai)

(She/Her/Hers)

Records System Manager

City Clerk's Office - Record Management

775-348-6916 (o) or 775-531-7218 (c)

Records Main Line: 775-348-3932 (o)

scarlettk@reno.gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

Reno.Gov | **Connect with us:**



From: jeff lage <jefflage@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 8:17 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Item D1

Dear city members.

Don't change Our zoning laws! The impact to our quit neighborhoods will be changed for ever. As a long term resident (SF zoning means SF zoning). We don't have room on the streets for any more cars and our water and sewer has been engineered for SF homes.

We have already over built the area for current infrastructure and are 20 years behind on that.

Regards

Sent from my iPad

Re: Proposed Housing Initiatives, Item D.1. on May 8, 2024 agenda

John White <john@lawquest.com>

Sun 5/5/2024 6:55 PM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:The Barber Brief

<reply+2dxt5&m4tdq&1acb37331e95210339605ebc014ecb19b76d9230ee0a9ee968cad49218fe6614@mg1.substack.com>

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am in favor of responsible growth but generally agree with the concerns expressed by Alicia Barber in her May 5, 2024 "The Barber Brief". (The Barber Brief <thebarberbrief@substack.com>.

The Planning Commission, largely supported by staff, is proposing significant changes to our zoning codes. These changes could radically change Reno and its hard-earned national reputation as a great place to live. I suspect that most of the proposed changes would make Reno a less desirable place to live.

We should be very reluctant to make ANY significant changes. The Planning Commission's suggested changes, including the proposed upscale zoning changes, are so massive that they should probably be first put to a vote of the people by referendum. Or, if not, limited to small sections of the city so we can see how they work out.

Thanks for listening.

John A. White, Jr.,
205 Southridge Drive
Reno, NV 89509
775-322-8000

On Sunday, May 5, 2024 4:56:01 PM PDT The Barber Brief wrote:

- > View this post on the web at
- > <https://thebarberbrief.substack.com/p/proposed-housing-initiatives-back>
- >
- > Happy Cinco de Mayo! Please take a moment to educate yourself about this
- > popular but often misunderstood holiday [https://substack.com/redirect/3e405b04-85ef-47bb-8fc2-a036129856ec?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] and then let's
- > jump right in. Next week's calendar of Current and Upcoming Meetings can be
- > found here [https://substack.com/redirect/51101b37-902e-4c02-9409-68e1b1cc9872?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. In addition to
- > City Council (5/8), they include meetings of the Reno City Charter
- > Committee (5/6); Ward 3 NAB (5/7); Financial Advisory Board (5/9), and
- > Civil Service Commission (5/9). Click on the meetings page [https://substack.com/redirect/51101b37-902e-4c02-9409-68e1b1cc9872?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] to access all

> agendas and materials. A Packed City Council Agenda

> City Council meets on Wed., May 8, and you can view that agenda here [

> https://substack.com/redirect/de62eba7-19fc-4f03-9514-18d4ec892ccd?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. As usual, I

> encourage you to browse through it for issues that interest you. Aside from

> the Housing Initiatives item I'll discuss below, here are some others that

> caught my eye: D. 2 - Presentation, discussion, and potential approval of

> trash cans, animal waste receptacles, paint, and wayfinding projects

> identified along the Truckee River Corridor using \$266,000 in ARPA funds.

> Staff Report here [

> https://substack.com/redirect/b5e5346b-03ae-4053-ad92-937ebb84a5c5?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. D. 3 -

> Presentation, discussion, and potential approval of activation,

> infrastructure, and maintenance at West Street Plaza using \$300,000 in ARPA

> funds. Staff Report here [

> https://substack.com/redirect/ed084546-c986-4f8a-ba56-4f97b882a78d?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. D. 5 -

> Presentation, discussion, and potential direction to staff regarding the

> recruitment process to hire a City Manager. Staff Report here [

> https://substack.com/redirect/9e89eb3a-1358-4808-a725-dc57df2e07bf?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. Item D.1 -

> Initiatives to Promote Affordable Housing and Building Density As I

> mentioned last week [

> https://substack.com/redirect/2cf5bfe5-3657-4285-a8f9-906188dbb764?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], the proposed

> changes to Title 18 (the City's land development code) pertaining to

> housing and affordability initiatives will return at this meeting, under

> item D.1. I feel like this is the big-ticket item this week, because it

> has the potential to impact so many residents, present and future. The

> Staff Report can be viewed here [

> https://substack.com/redirect/cc3785be-71a8-47b7-8f82-5508477de8dd?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], and the

> supplementary materials include the draft (redlined) ordinance; materials

> from the February 7 Planning Commission meeting (Staff Report and Minutes);

> and received public comments. In this meeting, City Council will be

> discussing the rounds of input, presentations, and recommendations that

> have transpired on these topics so far and will likely provide direction to

> City staff to help them formulate language for the ordinances, which would

> then have to come back to City Council twice for formal adoption. Right off

> the bat, I'm skeptical of the many "intensifications" proposed in February

> by the Planning Commission. Those weren't vetted through months of

> discussion with committees or introduced as recommendations from City staff

> or in response to community demand. Rather, they seemed to have been

> introduced out of a general desire on the part of individual commissioners

> to "do more." And in my mind, they could pose more of a detriment than

> benefit. You can read through the Minutes of their February 7 meeting [

> https://substack.com/redirect/06397a25-2f93-42bb-9ccb-cf8a48a84af7?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] yourself, of

> course, and draw your own conclusions. I have been tracking these

> initiatives since they were first brought to public attention last fall. On

> November 1, 2023, a whole slew of proposed changes were brought forward

> under the umbrella of “Zoning Code Clean-Up.” [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/f64bc3a9-21db-4855-a20f-e7ee558f8844?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] Then after some

> Council and resident input, they were separated out into “Zoning Code

> Clean-Up items” on one hand and on the other hand, new initiatives related

> to housing. A potential ordinance governing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

> was proposed separately. But the City has continued to group together the

> proposed initiatives to promote more affordable housing and to promote

> higher density housing. And I think that may have been a mistake. Why?

> Because these are very different types of initiatives intended to produce

> different outcomes to benefit very different groups of people. The City

> even acknowledges this. On the Q&A page for these initiatives [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/b88411ff-1e8c-47be-96f4-0a3916415857?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] (which is still

> called “Zoning Code Clean-Up” although most of these initiatives are new)

> is the question, Why is the city making changes to the Zoning Code that are

> specific to affordable housing projects? And the answer (below) is that the

> Affordable Housing initiatives specifically were spurred by the 2023

> passage of a bill by the Nevada Assembly, but the others were not:

> “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.” I’m

> afraid that continuing to group together the much-needed (and legally

> required) Affordable Housing initiatives with the slew of other more

> questionable, contentious (and optional) initiatives intended to increase

> Reno’s housing supply (at all price points) has done a disservice to

> thorough discussion of each one. So let’s go through them again, starting

> with those Affordable Housing Initiatives. Category #1: Affordable Housing

> Initiatives

> As the City’s website explains, Assembly Bill 213 passed in 2023, requiring

> local jurisdictions to complete a number of tasks by July 1, 2024. You can

> read its text here [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/81e9feab-c58d-4c4a-a9a0-57d04e63cec2?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. The bill (and

> now law) is exclusively about Affordable Housing, responding to what no one

> can deny is a dire need in our communities. The state’s requirements

> include a great deal of analysis, planning, and reporting, which I assume

> is well underway. These housing initiatives stem from the section requiring

> cities to adopt at least six of twelve listed measures that include the

> following: Selling City-owned land to developers exclusively for affordable

> housing at not more than 10 percent of the appraised value of the land.

> Donating City-owned land to a nonprofit to be used for affordable housing.

> Leasing City-owned land to be used for affordable housing.

> Establishing a trust fund for affordable housing.

> Expediting the approval of plans and specifications relating to maintaining

> and developing affordable housing. Offering density bonuses to encourage

- > the development of affordable housing. Providing direct financial
- > assistance to qualified applicants for the purchase or rental of affordable
- > housing. You can read the rest of them in the bill. I'm not sure precisely
- > how many the City has already adopted (my sense is quite a few, based on
- > past meetings and discussions, but I've never seen that clarified). These
- > new proposed initiatives to be discussed on Wednesday include several
- > introduced in direct response to that bill, as explained on pages 3-4 of
- > the February 7 Planning Commission Staff Report [
- > https://substack.com/redirect/542517c2-c138-4b68-b56e-ddf86a065dd6?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QlOsNYg7ZaW4]: Exemption from
- > Entitlement Review (minor conditional use permits, conditional use permits,
- > site plan review, and major site plan review application requirements)
- > Expedited Building Permit Processing
- > Increased Density Bonuses
- > These changes could make a big difference in how quickly Affordable Housing
- > can be built and can undoubtedly help provide housing for those with the
- > fewest resources. As I've stated before, I'm not personally in favor of
- > exempting more projects from public review (by eliminating the conditional
- > use permit requirement) because I think that review can help to improve
- > projects, making them better for their inhabitants and the surrounding
- > environment. But I see the advantage in eliminating such review for
- > Affordable Housing, to reduce costs and get it up and running more quickly.
- > However, these Affordable Housing initiatives comprise just a handful of
- > the initiatives currently being proposed in this lump effort. The rest of
- > these initiatives are dedicated to increasing the overall housing supply,
- > at price points ranging all the way up to market-rate housing—and that's
- > where the need and potential benefit (and for whom) is less
- > straightforward, as City staff admit (there's a lot of acknowledgment that
- > most are likely to have minimal if any impact). So let's look at those
- > other three categories.
- > Categories #2 & 3: Density Bonuses for Market Rate Projects and Allowing
- > Multifamily Projects "By Right" The proposed initiatives in these two
- > arenas basically augment policies that already exist in the code but are
- > not focused on Affordable Housing per se. Density Bonuses
- > A density bonus does not refer to giving anyone a financial bonus. As the
- > City explains, "This bonus allows developers to build more units than would
- > ordinarily be allowed on a site by the underlying zoning." It's a "bonus"
- > of additional units. The City already allows a density bonus for infill
- > projects, both officially "Affordable" up to market rate. The proposed new
- > initiatives in this category include measures that would boost the latter
- > considerably. While the greatest boost is still for the smallest units of
- > under 1,000 square feet in size (increasing the "bonus" from 45% to 80%),
- > this proposal would also raise the bonus for units up to 1,800 square feet
- > (from 15% to 35%). Something to consider is whether providing these
- > incentives for larger (i.e. more expensive) units of housing actually
- > reduces the incentive for developers to build housing at lower price
- > points. That, I hope, will be part of the discussion this week. Allowing
- > more Market Rate Multifamily Projects "By Right"
- > This is discussed on page 5 of the February 7 Planning Commission Staff

> Report [
 > https://substack.com/redirect/542517c2-c138-4b68-b56e-ddf86a065dd6?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], and I don't
 > think I need to say much more about it. City staff is proposing that
 > "Multifamily projects with more than 100 units would still require approval
 > of a conditional use permit, but no entitlement would be triggered for less
 > than 100 units." An accompanying chart shows how this change would bring
 > Reno in alignment with many other jurisdictions in Nevada and elsewhere.
 > Category #4: "Missing Middle" Development
 > These last initiatives are clearly inspiring the most impassioned responses,
 > both from residents who feel the City is proposing unwanted changes to
 > their neighborhoods and from those who charge those folks with being NIMBYs
 > (or worse). Before anyone (else) jumps on either of those bandwagons, I'd
 > like us all to take a deep breath, step back, and think about why the City
 > proposes ordinance changes in the first place. The Development Code governs
 > the logistics of land development. If it's working, there's no need to
 > change it. If it's not working, a change might be warranted. This proposal
 > specifically targets two single-family-only zoned districts, known as SF-3
 > and SF-5, and proposes to allow duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes to be
 > constructed there, with the approval of a conditional use permit (i.e. a
 > public hearing by the Planning Commission). City staff state that "This is
 > a minor change that is not anticipated to have significant impacts on the
 > housing supply and still allows for the public review process within the
 > two additional single-family zoning districts" (page 6 of the February 7
 > Planning Commission Staff Report [
 > https://substack.com/redirect/542517c2-c138-4b68-b56e-ddf86a065dd6?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]). The argument
 > here is that enabling higher density development in additional parts of the
 > city will help to increase the housing supply at all price points. Okay. So
 > can we get real for a minute?
 > Reno is and has always been a low-density city. I'm not saying that it
 > should be; I'm just stating a fact. In seeking out some recent stats, I
 > came across this 2013 study of population density of U.S. cities [
 > https://substack.com/redirect/878ffe38-f185-4389-9f7f-ec3027e2241b?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. Ten years ago,
 > Reno had a population density of 2,381 people per square mile. Compare that
 > to cities like Portland, Oregon (4,795 people per square mile), Salem,
 > Oregon (3,495); Spokane, Washington (3,645), Fresno, California (4,663), or
 > Las Vegas (4,660). Another source indicates that Reno's population density
 > was projected to hit 2,511 by 2023 [
 > https://substack.com/redirect/88f41165-2d19-4af2-8027-394abcea5532?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. Reno is a
 > low-lying town with a horizontal, suburban-style growth pattern. That
 > pattern is enabled and perpetuated by housing developments (many built in
 > the 1970s or later) that are governed by Planned Unit Developments (PUDs)
 > protecting them from higher density development. In response, the City of
 > Reno has done a great deal to encourage higher density urban infill. The
 > current Master Plan and zoning code highly promote higher density inside
 > the McCarran loop, in particular. In her presentation about these new

> initiatives, Angela Fuss showed a map to indicate where duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes are currently allowed and where this new initiative would add them. But it's very small and virtually impossible to make out. A much better resource is the City's own Community Development map [https://substack.com/redirect/b340484c-a0a7-460b-9361-49ef296d440f?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], which indicates zoning district by color and allows you to zoom in to the parcel level. You'll initially reach a landing page that asks you to check a box indicating that you have read and understand the stated announcement. Click OK and it will take you to the map (I highly recommend doing this on a screen larger than your phone). You can see on this map where the SF-3 and SF-5 zones are located, but for now I want you also to look at all the places that are currently zoned Mixed-Use, Multi-Family, or the denser single-family zones of SF-8, SF-9, and SF-12. Consult the key at the right, or zoom in further, click on various parcels, and pull up the box that tells you what each one is zoned (click the little arrow at the top of the box to see the second page of each entry, and if you're having trouble, click on the parcel number). Also note the outlying areas (the peachy color) that are governed by PUDs. Almost all of central Reno is zoned to allow for multifamily apartment buildings, as well as duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes. Those zones are near public transit, grocery stores and other services, and are generally the closest thing Reno has to "walkable neighborhoods." If you can think of a place where you think a duplex, triplex, or fourplex would make sense, they're probably already allowed there, either with or without a Conditional Use Permit, specifically because they are dense, walkable areas. And yet builders still aren't constructing many higher density buildings there. And yes, one reason is that a lot of developers favor building in "greenfield" areas that have never been developed before. But also, as my last Brief discussed [https://substack.com/redirect/59c93f99-d833-4f57-b117-cc877e081b30?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], we're currently in a period where we're not entirely sure what types of new housing Reno residents want and need (we just know they want all of it to be cheaper). I highlighted two planned new developments [https://substack.com/redirect/1330420c-7ccd-42bc-8245-d4c3723ec131?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]—in Rancharra and along Idlewild Drive— where developers have actually REDUCED the previously approved density of their projects, clearly a market-driven decision. I cited a [https://substack.com/redirect/c009a108-d38d-463f-9baa-3cf61193c3bc?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] Reno Gazette-Journal [https://substack.com/redirect/c009a108-d38d-463f-9baa-3cf61193c3bc?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] article [https://substack.com/redirect/c009a108-d38d-463f-9baa-3cf61193c3bc?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] questioning whether the area has too many rental units right now and in the pipeline, citing the high number of vacancies. There are large vacant parcels

> downtown where no construction is occurring, whether it's the sites of the

> projected Kimpton Hotel, the east side of N. Center Street/University Way,

> the riverfront parcel near the ballpark, or the former site of the Masonic

> Building adjacent to Whitney Peak. Some talk about needing to "use every

> tool in the toolbox" as an argument for why we need to do everything

> possible to increase the housing supply. But have we exhausted or even

> implemented all of the tools available to encourage more density in the

> areas where it makes the most sense? I'll give you an example. One of the

> most powerful tools in the City's toolbox is the Development Agreement. The

> City's Master Plan identified all of West 4 [

> https://substack.com/redirect/2667f87b-c8b7-47c2-9ecf-f56b4374d563?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4_jth [

> https://substack.com/redirect/2667f87b-c8b7-47c2-9ecf-f56b4374d563?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4_j Street as an

> "Urban Corridor" [

> https://substack.com/redirect/2667f87b-c8b7-47c2-9ecf-f56b4374d563?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4_j where dense

> development was the most desirable. And how many residential units did the

> City of Reno require Jacobs Entertainment to build on the near-100 parcels

> they have purchased there? Zero. Even the requirement that Jacobs build the

> one new housing project they are constructing (on the corner of Arlington

> and West Second Street) predated that agreement. And need I remind you that

> the City also sold Jacobs a parcel at 290 Keystone Avenue with the

> requirement that they construct a multifamily building there? That sale was

> finalized two years ago. If a builder or developer is interested in

> constructing a duplex, triplex, or fourplex in a desirable central

> location, there are plenty of sites available to do so. So why aren't they

> building denser housing in the areas where it is already allowed? I'm sure

> there are many explanations for that, having to do with economies of scale,

> financing, the high cost of materials, etc., but I guarantee that it's not

> because those builders would rather build duplexes, triplexes, and

> fourplexes in the single-family neighborhoods zoned SF-3 and SF-5. So why

> make these changes? Are residents of those two districts demanding higher

> density? Are these zones especially close to amenities and public transit.

> No. I'm just saying there should be a good reason—and not just so you can

> claim that you ended all single-family-only zoning in the City of Reno

> (without actually saying so). A Few Words about Upzoning

> On the topic of language, it appears to me through the many conversations

> I've had and watched that the "Missing Middle" portions of these

> initiatives are engendering not just the most concern, but the most

> confusion, and partially due to terminology. Now, before anyone gets

> defensive, I want to be very clear that I am not suggesting any deliberate

> intent on the City's part to confuse or obfuscate. But we have to talk

> about the word "upzoning."

> In the Q&A on the City's webpage about these initiatives [

> https://substack.com/redirect/b88411ff-1e8c-47be-96f4-0a3916415857?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4_j] is the question,

> "Do any of these text amendments upzone or change the zoning on any

> properties?" And here is the City's official response: "No, the proposed

> changes will have no impact on anyone's zoning designation, nor will these

> changes modify anyone's zoning." Really? While I suppose it's technically

> true that the zoning designations (SF3 and SF5) would not be changed if

> duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes were allowed there, the allowable

> densities within those zones would change. These changes would enable

> higher density. Which is the literal definition of upzoning. Don't just

> take my word for it. That's everyone's understanding of upzoning. Here are

> just a few examples: "From the east and west coasts to the Midwest,

> lawmakers are beating the drum for upzoning, which means changing

> single-family zoning codes to allow taller and denser housing, like

> duplexes, triplexes, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and apartment

> buildings." (curbed.com [

> https://substack.com/redirect/5b9187f2-a41f-4f90-ac49-97e740b2e017?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]) "Upzoning refers

> to the process of increasing the zoning density in a particular

> municipality or neighborhood. Typically, this involves increasing (up)

> zoning on single residential lots to allow for multifamily units such as

> duplexes and triplexes." (Motley Fool [

> https://substack.com/redirect/0df89d0c-5b6a-4e4d-b4e2-1701a78d7504?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]) "The newest tool

> that cities are deploying in the ongoing fight against segregation and

> housing inequality is to let their streets get denser, in what is known as

> upzoning." (Bloomberg.com [

> https://substack.com/redirect/a0649519-56a4-4587-974e-0587cd8693b7?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]) "Upzoning: A

> change in zoning laws that allows for more dense use of an area. An example

> of this is a city changing a residential district's zoning from only

> allowing single-family homes to allowing for multifamily housing as well."

> (Quicken Loans [

> https://substack.com/redirect/8f9f582b-3737-4bf0-9f55-592569165cb2?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]) Is the City

> arguing that these proposed changes don't count as "upzoning" because the

> City is no longer classifying duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as

> "multi-family dwellings" (something else I don't understand [

> https://substack.com/redirect/2cf5bfe5-3657-4285-a8f9-906188dbb764?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4])?) Isn't upzoning

> these parcels the entire point and therefore something to celebrate rather

> than deny? I don't get it. Triplexes and Fourplexes

> The last subject I want to discuss today is the grouping together of

> duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as the forms of "missing middle"

> housing that this final initiative would strive to increase. I think they

> warrant some focused discussion and some actual images to depict and

> clarify what we're talking about. Nationally, triplexes and fourplexes are

> among the "missing middle" housing types that many want to introduce (or

> reintroduce) into urban settings. As the "Missing Middle Housing" website [

> https://substack.com/redirect/53f1db2f-f182-4ba0-8401-26b839becf5e?j=eyJ1lj_oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] explains, "These

> house-scale buildings fit seamlessly into existing residential

> neighborhoods and support walkability, locally-serving retail, and public

> transportation options." Now, Reno has a long history with duplexes,

> stemming not just from its migratory divorce era [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/bc6ec1c9-8641-44ee-8dbc-037081001233?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], but from their

> graceful integration into dense residential neighborhoods. You've probably

> seen a lot of them in our older neighborhoods—along Plumas Street,

> California Avenue, Arlington Avenue. There are some triplexes around, too.

> Speaking again from a factual standpoint, Reno hasn't had a lot of

> fourplexes, which are more common in denser urban environments like

> Portland or Los Angeles. The fourplex, as that site explains, "is

> attractive to developers by generating four units on a typical 50' lot with

> alley access." Although often featuring a small front yard, they are

> usually located toward the front of a lot in a dense environment, like

> those Reno areas categorized as SF-8, SF-11, MF (multifamily) or MU (mixed

> use). Because fourplexes are increasingly popular real estate investments,

> contemporary plans for new fourplexes can be found online on sites like the

> Missing Middle Housing website above; Houseplans.pro [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/43554bcd-0f6f-4261-9aa2-b733d9d30d1a?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]; Mashvisor.com [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/93674839-955c-4a12-84ec-8f845a0d200a?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], and Fig.us [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/bdf6ec2d-985b-4d95-a62d-88ebaa130b94?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. This would be a

> very desirable housing type in a dense area like that shown here. But it's

> critical to understand what kind of setbacks, parking requirements, height

> and lot coverage allowances make them most feasible to build, and match

> those requirements to areas governed by those same standards. Otherwise

> you're enabling the construction of something that can't effectively be

> constructed there. And that's just a pointless act that upsets a lot of

> people for no good reason. There's a lot we can and should do to increase

> Reno's housing supply, encourage more infill, and hopefully lower housing

> costs for all. But it's important when evaluating all the tools in the

> City's toolbox to use the appropriate tools for the task at hand and not

> let upzoning be the hammer that treats everything as if it were a nail.

> What do you think?

> Remember, you can always reach out to your representatives individually via

> the emails listed in my Citizen Guide [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/40b9c910-f311-49c7-9268-5a3c74ec500a?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4]. You can attend

> Wednesday's City Council meeting in person or via Zoom or comment via the

> following options: submit an online public comment form

> at [Reno.Gov/PublicComment](https://reno.gov/PublicComment) [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/3368de5d-c358-4798-9ddc-9bbff26481dd?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] send an email

> to Publiccomment@reno.gov [<mailto:Publiccomment@reno.gov>] leave a

> voicemail at (775) 393-4499

> participate via Zoom by registering at <https://links.reno.gov/Council05-08> [

> <https://substack.com/redirect/0a82a894-aed1-4c75-9f7c-95537fe5d808?j=eyJ1lj>

> oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], which will

- > provide the Webinar ID and call-in phone number. Be sure to check out
- > my Citizen Guide [
- > <https://substack.com/redirect/d07f7370-d58c-4f34-8055-52bf21dcaa76?j=eyJ1lj>
- > oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] for helpful
- > resources and links for anyone hoping to become more informed and engaged
- > in issues related to urban development (& more) in Reno. As always, you can
- > view this and prior newsletters on my Substack site [
- > <https://substack.com/redirect/93bd39e1-48fb-4636-bedb-583677227c95?j=eyJ1lj>
- > oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4], subscribe to
- > receive each new edition in your email inbox, and follow the Brief (and
- > contribute to the ongoing conversation) on X, Facebook & Instagram. If you
- > feel inspired to support my writing and research with a financial
- > contribution, you can sign up for a paid subscription through my Substack
- > site [
- > <https://substack.com/redirect/d21a37f6-4ea9-454f-982a-0a242c109e1d?j=eyJ1lj>
- > oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] or contribute to
- > my Venmo [
- > <https://substack.com/redirect/4d627abd-b8b7-4bcb-85cf-f836150bb653?j=eyJ1lj>
- > oibTR0ZHEifQ.D5VBWEpYNNvtDFd_MeGF_T_4FQOLfiW3QIOsNYg7ZaW4] account at
- > @Dr-Alicia-Barber or via check to Alicia Barber at P.O. Box 11955, Reno, NV
- > 89510. Thanks so much for reading, and have a great week.
- >
- > Unsubscribe
- > <https://substack.com/redirect/2/eyJ1ljjoiaHR0cHM6Ly90aGVhYXJiZXJicmlIi5zdWJ>
- > zdGFjay5jb20vYWN0aW9uL2Rpc2FibGVfZW1haWw_dG9rZW49ZXIKMWMYVnlYMMxrSWpvek56RTN
- >
- OakkxTkN3aWNHOXpkRjIwWkNjNk1UUTBNeiExTURZMUxDSnBZWFFpT2pFM01UUTVOVE16TnpNc0I
- > tVjRjQ0k2TVRjeE56VTBOVE0zTXI3aWFYTnpJam9pY0hWaUxUSXpPVFV4TINJc0luTjFZaUk2SW1
- > ScGMyRmliR1ZmWlcxaGFxd2ImUS5RYIB6M0oySDlialloSDZoM3ZWQ0d0XzFRaUo4aGVrd09NN2J
- > ONGVWZXhFjMvV4cGlyZXM9MzY1ZCIsInAiOjE0NDM0NTA2NSwicyl6MjM5NTE1LCJmIjp0cnVILCJ
- > 1IjozNzE3NjI1NCwiaWF0IjoxNzE0OTUzMzcwLjE0eHAI0jE3MTc1NDUzNzMsImIzcyI6InB1Yi0
- > wliwic3ViljoibGluay1yZWVpYjVjZCJ9ARRQ_34IC0SnPmgf56BrmfaynK7R1z86PwQ1aqDjhW
- > I?

City Council Comment received from Justin Haghighi

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

Sun 5/5/2024 8:27 PM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:

Name:

Justin Haghighi

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Unincorporated Washoe County

Email Address:

justin@haghighi.co

Phone Number:

3109700000

Address:

12790 Fellowship Way

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2024-05-08.

Section:

D Items - Department Items

Item:

D.1.

Position:

In Favor

Are they speaking in person?

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:

Thank you to the Council and city staff for their consideration of this item. I am supportive of all the Title 18 changes, including and especially those additions made by the Reno City Planning Commission. These changes are necessary to address a serious and growing housing affordability concern that will only grow worse. There is very little land left to develop upon that will allow Reno to grow its way outward; therefore, it is of utmost importance that the City encourage more and a greater diversity of units on its remaining land. The only concern I have regarding these reforms is that they are too weak. This is an urgent problem. Should the local government fail to make progress on affordability, further reforms may be dictated from a higher level government (e.g. the Legislature) in response to the City's continued inaction. Cities across North America are banning parking minimums, instituting parking maximums, and allowing multiplex housing by-right in former single family zoning neighborhoods. While these proposed changes take Reno in the right direction, I think removing parking minimums would do far more for density than even the density bonuses, for example. Thus far, according to city staff, the existing bonuses have seen little use by builders. I recommend the

Council consider the urgency of the problem and the potential consequences of inaction, such as future threats to the City's self-determined zoning code by higher levels of government. Please take bold action to address housing affordability and efficient land use, at least to the standards of other municipalities nationwide.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

By checking the "Yes" below, you agree that all the information above is true and accurate. For additional information, please refer to the agenda for today's meeting.

Yes

By checking the "Yes" below, you understand, acknowledge, and expressly agree that: (1) all information submitted by you will be entered into the public record, made available for public inspection, and freely disseminated without restriction; and, (2) any contact, personal, financial, or medical information intentionally or inadvertently submitted by you will not be maintained in a confidential manner, or subsequently exempted from public inspection.

Yes

Do you wish to sign-up for Reno Connect e-newsletters?

Reno Connect is the best way to stay informed about the latest news and updates from the City of Reno. We'll never share your email address with third-party persons, companies or organizations. Visit www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect to view all newsletter topic lists.

Yes

City Council Comment received from Karen Porter Valle

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

Sat 5/4/2024 11:43 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:

Name:

Karen Porter Valle

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Ward 1

Email Address:

Phone Number:

Address:

643 St Lawrence Ave Reno NV 89509

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2024-05-08.

Section:

D Items - Department Items

Item:

D1.

Position:

In opposition

Are they speaking in person?

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:

Against increased density and ADU's.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

By checking the "Yes" below, you agree that all the information above is true and accurate. For additional information, please refer to the agenda for today's meeting.

Yes

By checking the "Yes" below, you understand, acknowledge, and expressly agree that: (1) all information submitted by you will be entered into the public record, made available for public inspection, and freely disseminated without restriction; and, (2) any contact, personal, financial, or medical information intentionally or inadvertently submitted by you will not be maintained in a confidential manner, or subsequently exempted from public inspection.

Yes

Do you wish to sign-up for Reno Connect e-newsletters?

Reno Connect is the best way to stay informed about the latest news and updates from the City of Reno. We'll never share your email address with third-party persons, companies or organizations. Visit www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect to view all newsletter topic lists.

No

City Council Comment received from Katherine Oakley

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 9:12 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:

Name:

Katherine Oakley

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Ward 5

Email Address:

snokat.rose@gmail.com

Phone Number:

Address:

2710 Apollo Way

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2024-05-08.

Section:

D Items - Department Items

Item:

D.1.

Position:

In Favor

Are they speaking in person?

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:

I am writing in support of all of the proposed changes. Affordable and attainable housing are significant problems in Reno, and the proposed changes make efforts to address that problem on many fronts. In particular, it is important that the missing-middle housing types (duplex, triplex, fourplex) remain allowed-by-right and with potential for flexibility in parking requirements for affordability, because it is clear from zoning reforms across the county that these elements are helpful and even essential for the success of middle housing development. I personally live in an SF-8 zoned area that would be impacted by these changes, and it could absolutely accommodate more and more diverse forms of housing that would be a benefit to all. Density bonuses and regulatory incentives are also essential to spurring the development of deed-restricted affordable housing, and so I'm pleased to see that those will be increased and that there will be relief on some parking requirements. I also support increasing allowances for ADU's, as they have minor impacts on surrounding property owners and support diverse housing types, aging in place, and diversity in neighborhoods and communities. I know that people love Reno, as do I, and are always worried about change. The reality is the housing

stock must be increased to accommodate existing and future regional housing needs. We can grow up or we can grow out. Favoring sprawled development leads to all sorts of well-documented negative impacts, including an increased carbon footprint, increased traffic, decreased open space, and more. Supporting infill through these proposed amendments is the right path forward for a sustainable future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

By checking the "Yes" below, you agree that all the information above is true and accurate. For additional information, please refer to the agenda for today's meeting.

Yes

By checking the "Yes" below, you understand, acknowledge, and expressly agree that: (1) all information submitted by you will be entered into the public record, made available for public inspection, and freely disseminated without restriction; and, (2) any contact, personal, financial, or medical information intentionally or inadvertently submitted by you will not be maintained in a confidential manner, or subsequently exempted from public inspection.

Yes

Do you wish to sign-up for Reno Connect e-newsletters?

Reno Connect is the best way to stay informed about the latest news and updates from the City of Reno. We'll never share your email address with third-party persons, companies or organizations. Visit www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect to view all newsletter topic lists.

Yes

Fw: ITEM D1

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 10:15 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

*****My name and email have recently been changed. Please delete and/or update all saved contact information related to Kraiprai or kraipraik@reno.gov.**



Katelyn Scarlett (Kraiprai)

(She/Her/Hers)

Records System Manager

City Clerk's Office - Record Management

775-348-6916 (o) or 775-531-7218 (c)

Records Main Line: 775-348-3932 (o)

scarlettk@reno.gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

Reno.Gov | **Connect with us:**



From: Kris Engstrom <khallengstrom58@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 6:44 PM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: ITEM D1

SF means SINGLE FAMILY!! Stop the madness.

Fw: Item D1

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 10:18 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to Public Comment.

*****My name and email have recently been changed. Please delete and/or update all saved contact information related to Kraiprai or kraipraik@reno.gov.**

Katelyn Scarlett (Kraiprai)

(She/Her/Hers)

Records System Manager

City Clerk's Office - Record Management

775-348-6916 (o) or 775-531-7218 (c)

Records Main Line: 775-348-3932 (o)

scarlettk@reno.gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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



From: Kristie Essa <krisessa@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 3:24 PM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Item D1

I do NOT think the SF lots in old southwest/ midtown should be changed to allow multi family units
Kristie

Fw: No to Item D1

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 11:50 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC

*****My name and email have recently been changed. Please delete and/or update all saved contact information related to Kraiprai or kraipraik@reno.gov.**

Katelyn Scarlett (Kraiprai)

(She/Her/Hers)

Records System Manager

City Clerk's Office - Record Management

775-348-6916 (o) or 775-531-7218 (c)

Records Main Line: 775-348-3932 (o)

scarlettk@reno.gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

Reno.Gov | **Connect with us:**



From: Laura LaMere <smellandjack@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 11:23 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: No to Item D1

Good afternoon. My family and I live in the Old Southwest and I learned yesterday of the D1 proposal. We bought this property knowing it was a single family unit and appreciated knowing what we were to expect with single family zoning. Once again, we are learning our zoning could change without much input from the residents.

I believe more research and information needs to go into these decisions. It's frustrating to listen to others who don't live here in this neighborhood (and experience the traffic, noise, parking issues, etc that we already have) comment on what *needs* or *should* be done here.

Please consider more research, more input, and keeping single family zoning for single family units.

Thank you for your time,

Laura (and Bernard) LaMere

Fw: Zone laws

Jennifer Gutierrez <GutierrezJ@reno.gov>

Mon 5/6/2024 7:48 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarding to public comment



Jennifer Gutierrez

(She/Her/Hers)

Office Assistant II

City Clerk's Office

City Clerk (775) 334-2030

Cashiering: (775) 334-2032

Parking Services: (775) 334-2293

Public Records: (775) 334-3932

Gutierrezj@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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

From: MARY LEE <dragonmommy1234@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, May 5, 2024 8:37 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Zone laws

Reno,Nevada is NOT California! YOU, the city, are responsible to me! Do not pass or change present zone boundaries and/or law!

As per Roz Zimmerman.

Sent from my iPhone

City of Reno Zoning Code Clean-Up Comment Form

Please provide comments regarding the Reno Title 18 Zoning Code Clean-Up/

Favor de proporcionar comentarios sobre la limpieza del código de zonificación del Título 18 de Reno.

Full Name/ *Nombre Completo*

Roberta Decker

Contact Email/ *Correo electrónico*

rmdecker44@gmail.com

Contact Phone Number/ *Teléfono de contacto*

Project Comments/ *Comentarios del proyecto*

I'm a native of Reno, NV and my family and I are very disappointed in the "way" Reno is growing. We realize that cities grow but Reno is not the same nice city it used to be because of so many apartments etc. The homeless situation is terrible, crime is increasing, traffic is a problem, etc. The main thing we hate to keep seeing is apartments being built all over the areas. Also, our highways are littered terribly, it's disgusting that our city doesn't monitor our roads and highways and clean the litter.

This form was created inside of City of Reno.

Google Forms

Possible Zoning changes

sentenman2012@yahoo.com <sentenman2012@yahoo.com>

Sun 5/5/2024 9:22 PM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Please, please, please do not increase the zoning to allow 4-plex buildings in single home zoned areas. I love Reno, and she is losing her ability to support seniors and families. It makes me sad to see so many ugly apartment buildings going up all over town!

Can you please try to restrain new development? As a Council please create a city-wide plan. Get input from the citizens. What makes a good housing community? Think about good city planning; walkability, affordability, low income, disabled and senior one- level buildings, adequate parking, etc.

In the Council's effort to quickly create mass housing developments, people are gonna think your decision is based only on money.

Thank you,
Susan Entenman
Ward 3