

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

SPOKE DURING ITEM 3

DATE: 6/5/2025

CASE NO. LDC 25-00018

Please Print:

NAME: Derek Cromer

ADDRESS: 1600 Plumas St.

I REPRESENT: Me.

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

IN FAVOR

IN OPPOSITION

I WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT:

IN FAVOR

IN OPPOSITION

COMMENTS: _____

SIGNATURE: Derek Cromer

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 10/5/

CASE NO. LDC 25-00018

Please Print:

NAME: Kolby Jesch

ADDRESS: 1639 Watt Street

I REPRESENT: myself

I DO NOT WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT BUT I AM: IN FAVOR IN OPPOSITION

I WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT: IN FAVOR IN OPPOSITION

COMMENTS: _____

SIGNATURE: Kolby Jesch

Concern Regarding Mt. Rose Junction Master Plan/Zoning Map Amendment (LDC25-00018)

From Brian Franco <btfranco@gmail.com>

Date Mon 6/2/2025 12:06 PM

To Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

Cc Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Dear Ms. Piccotti,

I, along with my wife, am the property owner of the home located at 1620 Knox Ave, parcel # 014-223-23. We recently received a *Notice of Public Hearing* in the mail regarding the "Mt. Rose Junction Master Plan Amendment & Zoning Map Amendment (LDC25-00018), which will be held this Thursday, June 5th.

Both my wife and I would like to attend the public hearing to voice our concerns in person but that will likely not be possible due to work and childcare constraints. Therefore, I am writing this email to voice my concerns in advance of the public hearing in the hopes that they will be taken into consideration when the ruling decision is made.

I am concerned about the proposed change to the Master Plan because it will invite high density housing into our neighborhood. It is my understanding that the developer of the one acre lot located southwest of the Mt. Rose and Plumas streets intersection has asked for a zoning change so they can build (37) units and raise the building height to 40'. While I am sympathetic to the need for more affordable housing in our great city, that would be a drastic change to our suburban neighborhood and will negatively impact all of the adjacent residents.

My major concerns are as follows:

- Parking - I am not familiar with the specifics of the proposed site design for the new project but I have to assume that there will not be adequate parking for (37) units provided on the one acre site. That lack of parking will inevitably lead to the rise of overflow parking on all adjacent streets, including in our neighborhood. The adjacent streets and neighborhoods will be more congested.
- Traffic - The intersections of Plumas/Mt. Rose Streets and Plumas Street/Ardmore Drive are already very busy. The addition of (37) units directly across from the Plumas/Ardmore intersection (one of the main entries into our neighborhood) will only add to the congestion and likely lead to more dangerous conditions for drivers and pedestrians alike. One of the main reasons my wife and I purchased our home is the safety that our neighborhood streets currently offer for ourselves and our young child. We are very concerned that the additional parked and moving vehicles from the proposed new development will lead to unsafe conditions on our

street. There will almost certainly be more through traffic on Ardmore, Knox, Glenmanor and all streets in our quiet neighborhood.

- Impact of Zoning Map Amendment to the future of our neighborhood - It is my understanding that, if the Zoning Map Amendment is approved, our neighborhood will also be rezoned, clearing the way for high-density housing projects. Our neighborhood (contained within Plumas St to the west, Mt Rose Street to the north, Lakeside Drive to the east, and Plumb Lane to the south) is currently composed solely of single family homes with small, but nice, individual, private yards. If 40' tall, multi-unit buildings are allowed, it will cause significant change and potentially drive out the families who are currently the backbone of the neighborhood. We and our fellow neighbors absolutely do not want that to happen.

We love our neighborhood the way it is but we are also aware that change is inevitable as our wonderful city continues to grow. We only ask that you take the concerns and wishes of the current residents into consideration when doing the hard work and making the tough decisions to help shape the future of our neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Thank you very much for your time.

Best Regards,

Brian Franco

btfranco@gmail.com

510-612-4721

1620 Knox Ave.

Reno, NV 89509

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	Case No. LDC25-00018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	<p>This is less than an acre and aligned with the neighboring mixed neighborhood. By changing the current zoning map from multi-family Residential 14 units per acre to SPD with a base zoning district of neighborhood Commercial, you will change the entire neighborhood environment. STAY WITH THE CURRENT DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for this community. If rezoned to include SPD, this one acre will NOT be aligned with the current residential community, since the lot is surrounded by residential. It is NOT COMPATIBLE with the neighborhood nor should SPD zoning be allowed on such a small lot among established communities. The height would go to 39 feet which is NOT acceptable for this community with density that is outrageous for this location. Current height limits of 25 feet and a maximum of 2 stories should STAY IN PLACE. Regardless of what standards of the PL overlay and NC zoning district that the developer provides, when are City staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council going to STOP providing the developer “flexibility by allowing a variety of other development options” and start</p>

	actually caring about the residents that pay taxes and live there? Again, this is another maneuver to destroy established residents and quality of life for those currently living there. The perception loud and clear is that Reno government officials, want to destroy established communities. This has nothing to do with a housing shortage since SPD rezoning gives the developer, as the Leah Picatte stated in the staff report, " a variety of other development options" that has nothing to do with what the surrounding communities need. PLEASE VOTE NO.
Email Address	cindi
Name of Commentor	chandler
Address	6184 Carraige House Way
Phone Number	

Submitted: 6/1/2025 11:04:29 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

piccottiL@reno.gov

From Darden Mueller <dardensm@gmail.com>

Date Tue 5/27/2025 2:40 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Hi there,

This email is in regards to the proposed zoning change for the property located near the corner of Mt. Rose and Plumas st.

Zoning regulations are in place for a reason. Yet in recent years, developers have gotten away with maximizing profits by cramming excessive structures onto parcels that were never intended for such density. Previous commission approvals have shown little regard for the cumulative impact on residents, as it has gradually eroded the rich history and vibrant culture that define our neighborhood. When will these short-sighted decisions end? Why approve a build that in no way geographically fits within the character of this community?

Please reconsider this zoning change for the sake of those in this community.

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	LDC25-00018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	
Email Address	Debbiebmail@gmail.com
Name of Commentor	Debra Block
Address	4272 Dant Blvd, Reno NV 89509
Phone Number	(775) 342-9993

Submitted: 6/5/2025 9:00:20 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Project Opposition

From D Trakas <denisetrakas@gmail.com>

Date Sun 6/1/2025 8:10 AM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>; Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

Good Morning-

I am a resident that lives near the intersection of Plumas and Mt. Rose. I am in opposition to the zoning development change slated for the less than 1 acre lot on Plumas street near this intersection.

The city approved the Reno Experience District that has many housing vacancies less than a 1/2 mile down the road.

Bringing a 39 unit structure into this neighborhood and so close to an intersection is not justified; especially either the height that is requested.

The traffic impact so close to that intersection can also not be justified.

Please hear our call to maintain our neighborhood and deny the change in zoning, special use and any other submission that will allow this building of so many units on such a small footprint. Do not allow this change.

Best,

Denise Trakas

LDC25-00018

From D Trakas <denisetrakas@gmail.com>

Date Wed 6/4/2025 10:05 AM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>; Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

Good morning-

I am writing to oppose the staff recommendation and motion for case LDC25-00018.

It only will this negate the work of the Neighborhood advisory, it will also open the door to a horrible change to the neighborhood.

This commission has opposed other such projects in the past and I encourage this commission to hold the course on this as well and maintain this lot for single family homes with a design that will fit the neighborhood.

That is what our community needs. As stated in previous communication there are multiple vacancies in multi family housing units within 1/2 to 1 mile.

Additionally, this increased traffic by what the staff reports are "major arteries" will just further negatively impact our community.

Please look at the design and let us neighbors be heard. Do not oppose the current zoning plan and regulations.

Oppose the requested changes and maintain this lot for single family homes less than 14 units per acre.

Best,

Denise Trakas

LDC25-00018

From Emily Montan <teladria@charter.net>

Date Tue 6/3/2025 1:36 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

I am against the amendments to this property. We need more low-cost housing for our residents. I want it to remain for Multi-Family Residential 14 units per acre. As I am a resident of this area, I hope my input is given more weight than from an organization or company.

I tried to submit this on-line but the URL given on the notice is not working. Thanks so much.

Emily Montan She/her
3095 Lakeside Drive, #302
Reno

LDC25-00018

From Emily Reed <sophiereed8761@gmail.com>

Date Tue 6/3/2025 10:31 AM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Good morning,

I would like to express my opposition to this agenda item on the June 5th meeting. I live in the neighborhood across the street from this location and the traffic on Plumas is an issue. People cut through my neighborhood to get around traffic on Plumb and Plumas. This project would make the traffic worse on all streets in this area and make my family less safe from those speeding through my neighborhood.

Please vote no.

Thank you,
Emily Reed

Mt Rose & Plumas master plan

From Haley Breen <haleysbakery75015@gmail.com>

Date Tue 5/27/2025 5:06 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>; Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

Hello to my neighbors at the reno planning commission!

My name is Haley Breen and I live at 1647 Watt St. I am a fifth generation Nevadan, And I have watched Reno change drastically in my life here. I understand people want to live in this beautiful place, And in an effort to keep midtown Reno as nice as it is, i am writing to you to express my dissent regarding the proposed masterplan for the vacant lot on Plumas, near Mt Rose st.

It has come to my attention that there is a plan to change the zoning for a developer to build 37 units at the corner Of Mt Rose and Plumas In 1 acre lot.

This area is already under strong traffic issues, there are a few lights with the left turn lanes, timing, or additional lanes to accommodate the influx that Reno has seen in the last years. There is not space for that many units of occupants while plumas st remains as is. I already experience heinous traffic just trying to leave my home due to the timing of intersections and the poor courtesy of drivers. This has been a growing issue over the last 5 years or so, and will absolutely become an impassable wall of traffic if we add a large housing unit to where it is proposed.

This area is historic, this area has diverse bird wildlife, And this area does not have the space for more people living in it. there are not even sidewalks in most of this area. I wonder how the city expects this neighborhood to manage the influx of potentially 37 units meaning arguably 74 more cars parking coming in and out and living here.

Reno has continued to develop housing in many natural areas and metropolitan areas whether that be the Reno event district out towards Verdi in the double diamond veterans Parkway area, etc.

These developments while understandable, Have already changed the nature of this small town community. The last thing we need is for a master plan that changes the availability of future development in a historic neighborhood. This is one of the last neighborhoods in Midtown Reno that retains the charm of the 1920s 1930s housing. This is part of our cities history and this is part of why this is a nice neighborhood to live in. Please For the sake of locals who have called this neighborhood home for many years do not make it more congested and more expensive than it already is.

Thank you for your time, A concerned citizen, Haley Breen.

1647 Watt St.

FW: Zoning change

From Leah Piccotti <PiccottIL@reno.gov>
Date Tue 5/27/2025 10:24 AM
To Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>

Can you forward this to the PC, please? I think all the other comments were sent directly to them.



Leah Piccotti
(She/Her/Hers)
Associate Planner
Development Services
775-334-2178 (o) 775-870-5531 (c)
PiccottIL@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us:     

From: Jerome Durkin <jeromedurkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2025 1:09 PM
To: Leah Piccotti <PiccottIL@reno.gov>
Subject: Zoning change

Greetings: my name is Jerome Durkin. I live at 1607 Watt St. I have lived here for 33 years. I want to object to the proposed zoning change for the property near the intersection of Plumas and Mount Rose. I was all right with their original proposal But feel that this new proposal goes way too far. If approved I know it will change the entire ambience of our area. Like I said I was OK with their original proposal but now that they've got their foot in the door they're pushing for drastic change. I'm against it. Thank you.

Plumas St. Development

From Jessie Cartinella <cartinellajl@gmail.com>

Date Sun 6/1/2025 9:31 AM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>; Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

Hello Leah,

I am writing to oppose the zoning change on the corner of Mt. Rose St. and Plumas. Our already busy neighborhood intersection cannot handle more traffic that 39 units would bring. Along with my neighbors, I oppose this change to the Master Plan in our neighborhood.

Thank you,
Jessie

Zoning changes in Ward 1

From Jillian Milke <jillianmilke@gmail.com>

Date Wed 5/28/2025 6:54 PM

To Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>; Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Leah,

This email is in regards to the proposed zoning change for the property located near the corner of Mt. Rose and Plumas st. I live at 1695 Lander Street and I'm VERY concerned about the proposed change to the Master Plan in our neighborhood.

Zoning regulations are in place for a reason. Yet in recent years, big developers have gotten away with maximizing profits by cramming excessive structures onto parcels that were NEVER intended for such density. Previous commission approvals have shown little regard for the cumulative impact on residents, as it has gradually eroded the rich history and vibrant culture that define our neighborhood. When will these short-sighted decisions end? Why approve a build that in no way geographically fits within the character of this community?

I have heard that this proposed change does not include parking spots for the 37 units. where will these people park? In front of our houses?

Please reconsider this zoning change for the sake of those in this community.

Thank you for considering the neighborhoods wants and needs,

Jill Milke

Mt Rose master plan

From julie uren <julieuann@sbcglobal.net>

Date Wed 5/28/2025 1:08 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

I have lived in the subdivision just east of the proposed complex on Mt Rose and Plumas for over 25 years.

This area continues to be targeted for over development. The zoning change that the developer is asking for is a drastic change to the integrity of this neighborhood. I strongly oppose this change which will increase the already overwhelming traffic and noise in the area. This is simply as usual, a way for the developer to squeeze more people into a very small space to increase his bottom line without concern for the quality of life of those nearby.

Thank you,
Julie URen

[Sent from AT&T Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	Ldc25-0018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	Stop you need to focus on cleaning up downtown that you all ruined
Email Address	egap@sbcglobal.net
Name of Commentor	Karen Decker
Address	2035 Marlette
Phone Number	7758424942

Submitted: 6/4/2025 11:48:30 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: No (self if blank)

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	2500018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	<p>This area, old southwest, is one of the last historic single family neighborhoods in Reno city southwest. It was never meant to house the number of people and vehicles that this project would generate. There are so many other areas already inundated with high rise / high occupancy completed projects (with untold number of available open units) that to destroy this family neighborhood with another is unconscionable as well as adverse to all previous and accepted zoning. Please, do NOT destroy this neighborhood.</p>
Email Address	karenlinkarg@sbcglobal.net
Name of Commentor	Karen Karg
Address	444 Glenmanor Dr. Reno, NV 89509

Phone Number	(213) 840-1600
---------------------	----------------

Submitted: 6/4/2025 5:38:17 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	LDC25-00018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	Already densely populated area with plenty of commercial and housing options 1-2 stories high. No need for 3-4 stories or higher to jam in more people on neighborhood-type smaller streets where a lot of people walk with their dogs and kids. This is Midtown not a suburb. If people want suburban living then they need to build/live further out of the core area of Reno.
Email Address	Karens94@hotmail.com
Name of Commentor	Karen Shrock
Address	1648 Watt St
Phone Number	

Submitted: 6/3/2025 5:13:36 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Fw: Changing master plan...bad for our neighborhood

From Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>

Date Mon 6/9/2025 7:38 AM

To Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>; Michelle Fournier <FournierM@reno.gov>

Logged.



Cali Shy

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

Planning Technician

Development Services

775-393-1039 (O)

ShyC@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us:     

Please be advised that my working hours are as follows:

Mon-Thurs - 7:00 am to 5:30 pm

From: Kelley Mooneyham <kelleymooneyham@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2025 8:01 PM

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

Subject: Changing master plan...bad for our neighborhood

June 5th, 2026

Dear Reno Planning Commission,

Unsettling news has come to our neighborhood of the development wanting to be built in the area of Mt. Rose St. and Plumas, on a 1 acre lot. Our neighborhood is beside ourselves at the reality of what this master plan change would bring/mean to our community. Please consider being in our shoes as we ask if you would like a 39 unit, 40 foot high complex in your neighborhood, bringing more traffic to an already overwhelmed intersection of Plumas and Mt. Rose St. Please help us stop this very unnecessary housing project and help preserve our delightful Midtown neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and care. Kelley Mooneyham

LDC25-00018

From Kelly Jesch <kellyjesch@gmail.com>

Date Fri 5/23/2025 12:55 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Cc Pincolini, Laura <lpincolini@washoeschools.net>

I am writing to express my deep concerns about this proposal.

There are so many reasons this proposal is bad for our neighborhood but I will try to outline them succinctly.

I sat on the Master Planning Committee many years ago because I care about the character and charm of our neighborhood. This is slowly but surely eroding these days and this is a huge jump toward high density housing which will profoundly change this neighborhood. Changing the Master plan to allow for 40 units and 40 feet high doesn't fit anywhere in our Old Southwest Reno neighborhood. The single family homes have been the hallmark of why folks want to buy and live in this closely connected neighborhood. This project changes that forever.

Secondly, parking, noise, lighting and traffic that will ensue from a 39 unit complex will impact our neighborhood substantially. The location just 145 feet from the intersection of Mt. Rose and Plumas will make it even more difficult for entering or exiting traffic for everyone in that area. If you haven't driven down Plumas lately, the traffic density gets increasingly worse every day. Many of us have given up trying to exit Ardmore or Glenmanor onto Plumas as it is often impossible.

The plan to propose a change in the master plan is a plan to increase any other future lot to high density apartments or condos. New housing on Mt. Rose and Forest and between Plumas and Watt have already increased the density.

I am currently canvassing our neighborhood to let them know the changes in the project since last proposed and rallying support to oppose this. I hear no one had submitted any opposition and I sure hope to change that because so far, everyone I've spoken to is upset and doesn't want a change to happen in the Master plan, let alone such a high density project. I look forward to appearing on June 5th to personally state my opposition.

Thank you

Kelly Jesch
1639 Watt Street
Reno, Nevada 89509



PC meeting 6/5 agenda item 5.3 1565 Plumas

From Kevin Dory <kevindory@hotmail.com>

Date Wed 6/4/2025 2:56 PM

To David Giacomini <GiacominiD@reno.gov>; Manny Becerra <BecerraM@reno.gov>; Christina Del Villar <DelVillarC@reno.gov>; Silvia Villanueva <VillanuevaS@reno.gov>; Kerry Rohrmeier <RohrmeierK@reno.gov>; Alex Velto <VeltoA@reno.gov>; Jacob Williams <WilliamsJ@reno.gov>; Michelle Fournier <FournierM@reno.gov>

Cc Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>; Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>

Dear Commissioners,

My family has owned a home at 1632-Watt Street since 1956. Yes, before I was born!

We are opposed to the rezoning of 1565 Plumas (LDC25-00018)

This **LUXURY** proposed infill project/rezoning from a NYC developer is **simply NOT COMPATIBLE** with this vintage era neighborhood and it does not foster a "vibrate community" for the following reasons:

A. The scale and density/land use compatibility of the **LUXURY** 39 units 38' high which would tower over the established neighborhood of one and two-story structures-is not acceptable or appropriate for this established neighborhood. **NOT COMPATIBLE.**

B. There is no specific project in front of you, therefore if you vote to rezone, it will be a leap of faith on your part that this NYC developer of **LUXURY** units will follow through with what he says he'll do. By the examples of what the developer is envisioning in the support document, **the designs, as presented, are certainly NOT COMPATIBLE architecturally with this 60 + old neighborhood.**

C. Street design and connectivity is sup-par for a project of this size. The NYC developer of **LUXURY** units is seeking from this Commission to approve the rezoning which **would allow for three off-site parking spaces** ON NARROW, but heavily travelled, PLUMAS St. **Plumas St at 1565 is only about 37 ft. wide with no turn lane, no sidewalks and no bike lanes.** There is **NO "connectivity"** on this stretch of Plumas, unless you are young, fit, and not disabled, therefore the residents of 1565 will most likely be in a narrow demographic, both socio-economically, within a certain age range and family status. When we talk about a "vibrate community" and this Commission, by approving this rezoning, puts (unintended) barriers to: old people, young families and disabled, you will be effectively limiting "true" diversity and vibrancy within that infill project. Also, during the 6/8/23 meeting, (LDC23-00058) related to this development, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9kN6ZBhZP1Q> Candance Borrego, rightly assumed that the overflow parking for "just" 17 **LUXURY** townhomes (now 39 units) on that lot, would end up parking on her narrow street around the corner on Kohlepp Ave. Kohlepp has only about 30' width, which is 6' too narrow to allow parking on both sides of the street (which the City currently does allow) per City of Reno public works design manual (below.) Although it's been mentioned that a traffic study is not required for 39 units, I think **in the interest of public safety, the City should not allow for the rezoning until they do a proper traffic study.** In 1989 City engineer, Steve Varella stated, **"parking should be prohibited from Plumb Lane to Monroe."** That was true in 1989 and truer today. This rezoning *should be* a positive addition to an established neighborhood and not unfairly, and in a negative way compromise the safety of the current residents.

D. According to his LinkedIn https://www.linkedin.com/in/george-graham-35b98b180?original_referer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F the NYC developer, **George Graham specializes in LUXURY units-not affordable.** He appears confident that you all will approve this rezoning as he states on his LinkedIn, **"1565 Plumas Street - one acre infill site in MidTown currently seeking zoning change."** Although legal, he's priming the pump and contributing to certain council members. Pay to Play.

E. Public Trust is important. When the ADU ordinance was presented in 2018, there was a Planning Commissioner who did not disclose or recuse, until forced to, that she had an illegal ADU in her backyard. Related to this development is this article.

<https://www.piconpress.com/documents/plumas-street-townhomes-ethics-oversight-or-just-business-as-usual> If true, this is not acceptable. Would the attorneys on this Commission look into this?

Best Regards,

Kevin and Beth Dory

Chapter 1 - Streets

WITHOUT PARKWAY STRIPS

TYPE	FIRE SPRINKLER LESS	WIDTH (1) (FEET)			CURB HEIGHT	MAX. CUL. DE-SAC LENGTH (FEET)	BULB DIAMETER (FEET)		MAX. MIN. LOTS SERVED	MAX. MIN. ADT	BIKE LANE (8)	SIDEWALK SEES (FEET) (10)	ROW WIDTH (FEET)			PUE EACH SIDE (FEET) (12)
		WD PARKING (A)	WITH PARKING ONE SIDE (B)	WITH PARKING BOTH SIDES (C)			W/O PARKING	WITH PARKING					WITH PARKING ONE SIDE (B)	WITH PARKING BOTH SIDES (C)		
Shared Driveway, Alley, and Permanent Emergency Access	Yes	23	26	34	Optional	1000	Harrowhead or 88	100	12	N/A	No	Optional	26	28	36	7.5 or as required
Shared Driveway, Alley, and Permanent Emergency Access	No	23	28	34	Optional	800	Harrowhead or 100	100	8	N/A	No	Optional	22	30	38	7.5 or as required
Local Street	Yes	N/A	26	34	V	1000	80	100	100	1000	No	4	N/A	36	44	7.5
Local Street	No	N/A	28	36	V	800	100	100	100	1000	No	4	N/A	38	46	7.5
Collector Street	N/A	28	32	40	V	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8000 (2)	Optional	4	38	42	50	7.5

WITH PARKWAY STRIPS

TYPE	FIRE SPRINKLER LESS	WIDTH (1) (FEET)			CURB HEIGHT	MAX. CUL. DE-SAC LENGTH (FEET)	BULB DIAMETER (FEET)		MAX. MIN. LOTS SERVED	MAX. MIN. ADT	BIKE LANE (8)	SIDEWALK SEES (FEET) (10)	ROW WIDTH (FEET)			PUE EACH SIDE (FEET) (12)
		WD PARKING (A)	WITH PARKING ONE SIDE (B)	WITH PARKING BOTH SIDES (C)			W/O PARKING	WITH PARKING					WITH PARKING ONE SIDE (B)	WITH PARKING BOTH SIDES (C)		
Local Street	Yes	N/A	26	34	R or V	1000	80	100	100	1000	No	4	N/A	56	64	7.5
Local Street	No	N/A	28	36	R or V	800	100	100	100	1000	No	4	N/A	58	66	7.5
Collector Street	N/A	28	30	38	V	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8000 (2)	Optional	4 or 8 SIDEWALK	56	60	68	7.5 (4)

(1) All widths measured from front face of curb to front face of curb (or gutter for the far-sided curbs, or EOP without curb).
(2) 4000 maximum ADT with side facing access.
(3) Utility stubs and services must extend beyond right-of-way, sidewalk, or PUE, whichever is greater.
(4) If path option is exercised, set 4' on one side and offset 4' from opposite side.
(5) Lay-down curbs may be permitted in inside horse paths.
(6) Additional right-of-way or easement may be required for parallel roadway drainage.
(7) PUE shall be public utility assessment/public use easement (sidewalks).
(8) Blue lines require additional R of government and right-of-way per line in accordance with the Master Plan and/or Bikeway Plan.
(9) Deviations from above standards for addition of medians or other planting strips in commercial areas shall require prior approval of the City Engineer.
(10) ADA requires a paving space or alternate not to exceed 20" or sidewalk must be 3' wide.
(11) All street widths shall be 20' or greater as required by Fire Code.
(12) Right-of-Way requirements may be impacted by LUG/OWM features.

City of Reno Public Works Design Manual
Last Revised: January 2009

18.04.502 - Sidewalks, Curbs, and Gutters

(a) Applicability

- (1) General Sidewalks, curbs, and gutters shall be required on all lots or parcels of land that are improved or upon which any building or construction shall take place, unless excepted in Subsection (2), below. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all streets, public and private, unless another means of pedestrian access is approved, or if the sidewalk is impractical or is unnecessary for pedestrian access purposes as determined by the Administrator.

RGJ 1/31/89

Residents protest plan to widen Plumas

By Mark Lundahl/Gazette-Journal

Plans to widen a tree-lined section of Plumas Street brought out about 50 protesting residents Monday who asked the Reno City Council to consider alternatives to making it a four-lane street.

The council took no action during its workshop session but promised to put the matter to a vote Feb. 13.

The residents complained that widening Plumas Street from Plumb Lane to California Avenue will increase traffic, eliminate their ability to park on the street and change the neighborhood's character.

City Engineer Steve Varella agreed that widening the street would change the neighborhood, but he said increasing traffic congestion makes it inevitable.

"Keep in mind that Plumas has been master-planned as an arterial street since 1960," Varella told the residents. "The traffic is going to increase. In five years there is going to be a need for a four-lane street there, anyway."

In addition to widening the street, Varella wants to put a traffic signal at the Mount Rose Street intersection. He said

“The traffic (on Plumas) is going to increase. In five years there is going to be a need for a four-lane street there, anyway.”

Steve Varella/Reno city engineer

parking should be prohibited from Plumb Lane to Monroe Street. Parking bays could be created north of Monroe Street at locations where there are no trees.

The project would cost about \$1 million and would require the city to take control of its entire 55-foot right-of-way, much of which creeps into the front yards of homes.

Varella said most of the tall trees which line the older Reno street can be saved, though 12 of the street's 208 trees must be removed for the project.

Residents wondered if the increased traffic couldn't be handled by making

one-way streets out of Plumas Street and another parallel road.

But Varella argued the cost of turning Plumas Street into a one-way street would be about \$3.2 million.

Council member Jud Allen suggested a traffic signal at Mount Rose Street alone might be sufficient to help the traffic flow.

Varella said he plans to go ahead with the project this summer unless he is told differently by the council.

In a related matter, the council was given the results of a \$100,000 Regional Transportation Commission study on other ways to help move traffic and beautify Virginia Street.

The study outlines a number of options to transform Reno's cluttered main street into a wide, pleasant boulevard. They range from relatively inexpensive tactics — a \$215,000 street restriping project would create four lanes from Liberty to Mount Rose Street — to more ambitious plans that include a \$14 million widening project from Plumb Lane to Patriot Boulevard.

1565 PLUMAS REZONING

To allow for 39 units 38' high
Will allow 3 parking spaces on
PLUMAS STREET



Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	5.3 LDC25-00018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	<p>The plumas project at the Lakeridge golf course is a very bad idea. Traffic on McCarren and Plumas is already backed up during morning and afternoon commute. The open space at the driving range as well as the golf course is a beautiful area and nesting sites for a variety of birds and mammals that would be decimated by the proposed hotel. Plus the noise and lights at their events that go on until 11pm will be incredibly disruptive and loud affecting all the homes that surround the driving range.</p>
Email Address	lxgreen@gmail.com
Name of Commentor	Laurence Green
Address	6037 Kelly Heights Way
Phone Number	8053902160

Submitted: 5/30/2025 12:48:08 AM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	LDC25-00018
Position	In Opposition
Comments	<p>I vehemently oppose this amendment. Do not allow our beautiful neighborhood to further be turned into apartmentville. The people who live in our neighborhood are starting families, raising families, and living in multi-generational households because it remains one of the few walkable, single-family areas in this area of Reno. Walkable to Virginia Lake, Midtown businesses, and Plumas Park. Notwithstanding the traffic on Plumas, it is a lovely place to walk your dog, jog, stroll to the Coffee Bar, and just admire all the pride people take in our homes and yards. Adding apartments to this corner will further degrade our cherished neighborhood feel and safety, particularly related to traffic. People speed through the intersections at Plumas and Plumb to get to Plumas and Mt. Rose on their way toward downtown. Traffic sometimes backs ups from Plumb to Mt. Rose during "rush hours." Crossing at these intersections means taking your life in your hands because cars whip around vehicles waiting to turn left or right. I know, my dog and I were hit in that very intersection a few years ago. Adding additional ingress and egress</p>

	for an apartment complex will make it even worse.
Email Address	jones.leahlin@yahoo.com
Name of Commentor	Leah Jones
Address	444 Glenmanor Drive, Reno, NV 89509
Phone Number	(775) 813-4625

Submitted: 6/4/2025 6:12:10 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Plumas street development LDC25-00018

From leahsalazar3@gmail.com <leahsalazar3@gmail.com>

Date Sat 5/24/2025 1:10 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

To whom it may concern:

I own live at and own 1580 plumas street. Myself, along with my family and neighbors are against the proposed development across the street: LDC25-00018.

There is already so much traffic in the area, backing up from Plumb lane to Mt. Rose street traffic lights and Vice versa. There are many car accidents at Mt. Rose street intersection. We feel that this proposed development will add to the traffic on an already very busy residential street.

People buy and move into this area to appreciate the older, quaint homes and this development will very much change the area, and not for the better.

Please consider the people who already live here, some being here for many years.

Thank you for your time.

Leah S.

Concerning the Master Plan for the corner of Mt. Rose and Plumas

From Luke Drymalski <lukeadry@gmail.com>

Date Wed 5/28/2025 9:49 AM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

My name is Luke Drymalski and I live at 1647 Watt St. I have lived in Reno and within the zip code of 89509 for 20+ years and I have watched Reno change drastically in my life here. I understand people want to live in this beautiful place, And in an effort to keep midtown Reno as nice as it is, i am writing to you to express my dissent regarding the proposed masterplan for the vacant lot on Plumas, near Mt Rose st.

It has come to my attention that there is a plan to change the zoning for a developer to build 37 units at the corner Of Mt Rose and Plumas In 1 acre lot.

This area is already under strong traffic issues, there are a few lights with the left turn lanes, timing, or additional lanes to accommodate the influx that Reno has seen in the last years. There is not space for that many units of occupants while plumas st remains as is. I already experience heinous traffic just trying to leave my home due to the timing of intersections and the poor courtesy of drivers. This has been a growing issue over the last 5 years or so, and will absolutely become an impassable wall of traffic if we add a large housing unit to where it is proposed.

This area is historic, this area has diverse bird wildlife, And this area does not have the space for more people living in it. there are not even sidewalks in most of this area. I wonder how the city expects this neighborhood to manage the influx of potentially 37 units meaning arguably 74 more cars parking coming in and out and living here.

Reno has continued to develop housing in many natural areas and metropolitan areas whether that be the Reno event district out towards Verdi in the double diamond veterans Parkway area, etc.

These developments while understandable, Have already changed the nature of this small town community. The last thing we need is for a master plan that changes the availability of future development in a historic neighborhood. This is one of the last neighborhoods in Midtown Reno that retains the charm of the 1920s 1930s housing. This is part of our cities history and this is part of why this is a nice neighborhood to live in. Please For the sake of locals who have called this neighborhood home for many years do not make it more congested and more expensive than it already is.

Thank you for your time, A concerned citizen, Luke Drymalski.
1647 Watt St.

FW: DON'T Change Master Plan !!

From Leah Piccotti <Piccottil@reno.gov>

Date Wed 6/4/2025 12:44 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>



Leah Piccotti

(She/Her/Hers)

Associate Planner

Development Services

775-870-5531

Piccottil@Reno.Gov

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us: 

From: Lynn Devine <lynndevinern@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 12:14 PM

To: RenoPlannongCommission@reno.gov; Leah Piccotti <Piccottil@reno.gov>

Subject: DON'T Change Master Plan !!

Dear Planning Commission [et.al.](#) :

As a homeowner & resident of 1687 Watt St. for 34 years, let it be known I am TOTALLY & Strongly opposed to a Master Plan Change !!

We have enough fast traffic on our block of Watt St. now. Not to mention my dogs, & dogs to either side of me & two toddlers directly across the street from me.

39 units at Mt.Rose & Plumas would FLOOD our area with traffic & pose a DANGER to all of us in the immediate vicinity !! Please consider our safety & long term residency & DO NOT change plan to allow this monstrosity.

Sincerely,
Lynn DeVine RN
(707)287-5411

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Fwd: Do NOT change planning !!

From Lynn Devine <lynndevinern@gmail.com>

Date Wed 6/4/2025 1:35 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

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

From: **Lynn Devine** <lynndevinern@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Jun 4, 2025 at 13:27

Subject: Do NOT change planning !!

To: duerrn@reno.gov <duerrn@reno.gov>

And , concerning the change to allow an unsafe behemoth at Plumas & Mount Rose St.

Should the present commissioners approve this dangerous plan , be assured I & my neighbors will place you all on an unfavorable & DO NOT VOTE FOR list.

Please consider our safety & the terrible traffic this would create. This block of Watt St. has many long term residents & lovely young families. All of us would be in danger from the ridiculous change.

Sincerely,

Lynn A. DeVine RN

1687 Watt St. Reno 89509

(707)287-5411

Objection to Proposed Zoning Change at Mount Rose & Plumas

From Madison Heydon <madison@sandstonementalhealth.net>

Date Sat 5/24/2025 12:08 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

Cc Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

To the Reno Planning Commission,

My name is [Your Name], and I am a resident of 1632 Watt Street, part of a small, close-knit neighborhood tucked into one of Midtown Reno's quietest corners. Our block is home to young families, children playing outside, and neighbors who know and care for one another. One of the things that makes our area so special is its safety, walkability, and peaceful atmosphere—qualities that would be significantly impacted by the proposed development at the corner of Mount Rose and Plumas.

We understand that change is inevitable and that our city is growing. However, the proposed zoning change to allow a 39-unit complex with a height of up to 40 feet is a **drastic departure** from the character of our neighborhood. This is not a minor adjustment—it would represent a fundamental shift in the density, traffic, and visual profile of our area.

One of our most pressing concerns is **parking and congestion**. With 39 units—and the high likelihood that most residents will own more than one vehicle—where are all these cars supposed to go? The surrounding streets, including Watt, are narrow and already serve as parking for current residents. Overflow parking from a development of this size would not only crowd our streets but pose safety risks for children and pedestrians, and increase traffic in an area that was never designed for this scale of use.

Beyond logistics, the project threatens to **erode the character of our neighborhood**. Our community is defined by modest homes, tall trees, and a slower pace. Dropping a large, high-density building into this landscape would drastically alter that identity and diminish the suburban feel that makes Midtown such a desirable place to live.

We urge you to **deny the requested zoning change** and consider the long-term consequences of allowing such dense development in a residential pocket that was never intended to absorb it. We are not against responsible growth—but we believe that growth should be thoughtful, measured, and respectful of existing neighborhoods and their residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kind regards,



Madison Heydon, MSW, LCSW

- Sandstone Mental Health

Office: 775.854.2655

6225 Neil Rd Suite 205 / Reno / Nevada / 89511

www.sandstonementalhealth.net

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution of this information is prohibited, and may be punishable by law. If this was sent to you in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	LDC25-000181565
Position	In Opposition
Comments	This is another ridiculous project. High Density area that doesn't fit in with all the other homes and businesses.
Email Address	Seacella@hotmail.com
Name of Commentor	Marcella Ross
Address	3671 Warren Way
Phone Number	7753036534

Submitted: 6/4/2025 4:00:19 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: Self (self if blank)

Planning Commission Public Comment

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date	2025-06-05
Agenda Item or Case Number	5.3 rezone
Position	In Opposition
Comments	The project is Redundant, already too many apartments owned by corporations being built in this area. Enough. This project will destroy the neighborhood. I personally believe graft and corruption is responsible.
Email Address	Dragonmommy1234@icloud.com
Name of Commentor	Mary Ann Lee
Address	2455 W. Plumb Lane
Phone Number	7758307562

Submitted: 6/4/2025 4:54:15 PM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: Self (self if blank)

Mount Rose and Plumas Street Development

From Robert Mueller <rdmueller54@gmail.com>

Date Sun 6/1/2025 12:16 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>

This message in review of the above proposed change to the Master Plan Change for the subject property. My name is Robert Mueller, I own a property at 747 Humboldt Str. In Reno, which I have owned since 1980. The house is a craftsmen structure built in 1923, where I presently reside. In 1986, I constructed, a 4 unit 1 bedroom apartment building. The apartment building complied with zoning requirements, for setbacks and off-street parking for the development, and was constructed to architecturally support my historic residence. This property has been a successful, supporting continuous occupancy.

Over the last few years I observed, the modification of the subject parcel on Plumas Street, with the demolition of an enclave of (3) Virginia City era dwelling units which were a symbol of early Reno settlement. I recall receiving a Public Notice for a change of setback for this parcel, to support the proposed development. The loss of the three nostalgic structures was only made worse by cutting down, an estimated 150 year old pine tree, which could compliment the future development. Now, if the records support my memory, the development is requesting further effort to modify building requirements. The modification of building standards to support economic feasibility in development, should not be supported.

Supportedly

Robert Mueller

Proposed Zoning Change - Mt. Rose and Plumas

From Sophia Qualle <asophia013@icloud.com>

Date Sat 5/24/2025 12:36 PM

To Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>; Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>

Cc Jordan Fredericksen:) Fredericksen:) <jordanf2156@gmail.com>

Dear Planning Commissioner,

I am writing as a deeply concerned homeowner in the Mt. Rose and Plumas area of Reno. It has come to our attention that a developer has proposed a zoning change for the approximately one-acre lot on the west side of the street in order to construct 39 residential units and increase the building height to 40 feet.

This proposed change is extremely troubling for several reasons. First and foremost, it represents a drastic departure from the character of our small, suburban neighborhood. Our area is defined by its family values, quiet streets, and clear views of the surrounding mountains—qualities that would be severely diminished by such a dense and tall development.

Additionally, the significant increase in housing units would lead to a noticeable rise in traffic and congestion, impacting not only the quality of life for current residents but also the safety of our streets. The infrastructure in our neighborhood was not designed to support this level of density, and we are concerned about the long-term effects on our community.

We strongly urge the Planning Commission to reject this zoning change and preserve the integrity and charm of our neighborhood. We believe that responsible development should complement existing communities, not fundamentally alter them.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We hope our voices will be heard in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Sophia Qualle and Jordan Fredericksen
Homeowners
1624 Watt St.
Reno NV



Webinar Registration City of Reno - City of Reno Planning Commission Meeting - 6/5/25

From Michelle Fournier <no-reply@zoom.us>
Date Thu 6/5/2025 6:05 PM
To Michelle Fournier <FournierM@reno.gov>



Hi Michelle Fournier,

Donna Keats (dkeats@sbcglobal.net) has registered for "City of Reno - City of Reno Planning Commission Meeting - 6/5/25" on: Jun 5, 2025 06:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Keats

Email: dkeats@sbcglobal.net

Address: 2265 Sunrise Drive

City: Reno

Zip/Postal Code: 89509

State/Province: NV

Phone: 7758254495

Questions & Comments: I oppose this proposal, personally as Chair of the Ward 2 NAB. Objections noted at the 12/27/24 NAB are summarized in the staff report. Staff "is unable to evaluate..impacts". Does not meet expectations of what's required of

SPD process.

Do you wish to provide public comment for this Planning Commission Meeting?: Yes
If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please provide your public comment in the Question & Comments box below.: LDC25-00018 Mt. Rose Junction Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment.

Are you attending the meeting as a: Member of the public

Which Ward you live in?: Ward 2

Webinar Detail Link: <https://us06web.zoom.us/webinar/83456523587>

Thank you!



Zoom.com
55 Almaden Blvd
San Jose, CA 95113

+1.888.799.9666

©2025 Zoom Communications, Inc.