

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 5-1-24

CASE NO. LDC LDC24-00045

Please Print:

NAME: Alice House

ADDRESS: 450 Leventina Canyon Rd. Reno, NV 89523

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: Alice House

Alice House for the record.

A brief history of our family. Our family moved from Sparks to the Belli Ranch Estates in Verdi over 35 years ago. We raised our 2 sons here in Verdi. When we built our home the county and developer promised improvements for the safety of the community. They never fulfilled those commitments.

At that time my husband worked for T.M.F.D. Our youngest son grew up to become a firefighter in Elko county. He was also a negotiator for firefighters in his district. Our family background is rich in the firefighting and EMS profession.

My husband was one of the first T.M.F.D. union officers. He worked very hard to negotiate a "Mutual Aid" contract between TMFD and the Reno Fire Dept. to get the closest Fire Dept to the emergency first. A very important fact to remember is EMS response time SAVES LIVES no department can dispute. The Mutual Aid contract was not achieved then.

Over 30 years later these 2 departments are still trying to get this same situation resolved. Seems as though this crucial working relationship is futile, doomed never to work out.

The existing contract is for "Automatic Aid" for "Fire Emergency" only. It does not include EMS calls. This is not closest station runs on scene first. It is jurisdiction runs first, assesses emergency, then calls other departments if help

is needed. Much slower response time for this area. The City of Reno requires a 6.5 minute response time to scene. Impossible for any Reno Department Station to reach the Verdi area.

Basically the breakdown is over funding. Which department will receive payment for their response and how much. Money over lives saved, does not sit right with the need of the existing and future people of Verdi.

The majority of calls for any Fire Department is for EMS. First in Firefighter/EMS personnel save lives. Period, full stop.

Verdi has no City of Reno Fire/EMS station. There is an influx of thousands of people coming in the near future. The existing community has worked very hard to at least insure there will be a temporary EMS house for medical emergencies. This is only until the City of Reno can build, equip and man a desperately needed permanent fire station.

What the Reno Fire Departments Chief is proposing will leave the residents, present and future in grave danger. The temporary EMS house will save lives.

I implore you to leave the condition for the EMS house in place fore the safety of this community.

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 5-1-2024

CASE NO. LDC 24-00045

Please Print:

NAME: Adrian Argyns

ADDRESS: Verdi

I REPRESENT: —

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

☐ IN FAVOR

☐ IN OPPOSITION

I WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT:

☐ IN FAVOR

☒ IN OPPOSITION

COMMENTS: _____

SIGNATURE: Adrian Argyns

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: May 1, 2024

CASE NO. LDC LDC 24-00085

Please Print:

NAME: Ken McNeil

ADDRESS: 1990 Evergreen Ridge Way

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: Kenneth J. McNeil

★ power point

RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REQUEST TO SPEAK/PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

THE FORM MUST BE FILLED OUT COMPLETELY

DATE: 5/1/2024

CASE NO. LDC 24 - 00045

Please Print:

NAME: Dee Ann Radcliffe

ADDRESS: Reno NV

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: Dradcliffe

LDC24-00045, Request to amend Condition 20 on LDC21-00017

Please make this part of the official, permanent record for LDC24-00045

April 28, 2024

Per the Staff Report:

The intent of Condition No. 20 was to convert a house into a temporary fire station, served by a two-man crew that could respond to medical calls but would not respond to fire calls

Per Staff Recommendations:

The proposed modification will better serve the Fire Department's needs and the combination of fire-related conditions

Condition 20's intent is for EMS – not fire

The condition was not put in for the benefit of Reno Fire or to be converted into a measly amount of cash for use elsewhere

It was put in for the EMS benefit of the Mortensen Garson (MG) properties which now total 3,300 residential units plus a school plus commercial and industrial development

Automatic aid does not cover EMS – it is for fire only - the staff report does not address this

The staff report fails to even address EMS and leads the reader to believe all is ok because there is automatic aid 6 minutes away with Truckee Meadows Fire

Fire sprinklers and landscaping do not help mitigate EMS needs

The response times for EMS have not changed since the MG projects were approved by City Council

The staff report only addresses fire response times and conditions added for fire protection

The staff report is very deceptive

Per the Staff Report:

Application materials request amendment to Condition No. 20 as a temporary residential fire station is no longer the desire of the City.

The City no longer desires to provide adequate emergency medical services to 3,300 residential units with a potential of 9,900 plus people, a school, and commercial and industrial development on the Mortensen Garson properties and now desires to replace adequate EMS with a new truck for use elsewhere

Let that sink in

Per the Staff Report:

The Planning Commission heard the project on December 16, 2020, and voted to deny the tentative map and special use permits (refer to summary in the City Council staff report and Planning Commission minutes). The denial was appealed to Council and on March 24, 2021, Council approved the tentative map and special use permits with modifications including the addition of conditions 19-22.

One of the findings for approval requires adequate services - safety – EMS

The condition was added in order for council members to make the findings

The PC denied the TM and SUPs and council members were not going to give approval until additional conditions were added - Condition 20 being one

Residents expect adequate services for the high taxes they pay - the city is required to provide those services

If it is a hardship to man a two-person station for EMS – the findings could not have been made

Imagine the hardship when EMS is desperately needed but too far out to help in time

Additionally, the hardship for funding is moot in that funding was determined at the time of annexation – it is the MG property taxes

The station needs to be built – the MG residents will demand their tax dollars go toward manning the station for their EMS needs

The City needs to put the manning in their budget

To "throw under the bus" is an idiomatic phrase in English meaning to blame or abandon a person for selfish reasons

In his application, Chief Cochran says the staffing and equipment can be put to better use elsewhere and puts a cheap price of \$300,000 on the safety of thousands – \$30 per person - implying the MG residents don't count and abandons them for the selfish reason of a new truck

I'm appalled a fire chief would write such and question what back door discussions preceded this application

The \$300,000 is missing many zeros – it is as cheap as it is insulting

Using the \$300,000 for a new piece of equipment for use elsewhere does nothing for the development taking place in the area

Removing the condition tells the area they are on their own for EMS – they don't count – their tax dollars will be used to protect others first

Have a heart attack - good luck; have a stroke – too bad; fall off a roof – on your own

The condition needs to stand as written, and staffing funded with the tax dollars generated by the massive MG development

Recklessness is disregard for or indifference to the dangers of a situation or for the consequences of one's actions

The community fought hard for EMS for the MG properties and it is reckless to attempt to remove it

Whoever at the City who thought it was a good idea to have the fire chief write a letter such as Chief David Cochran's February 7, 2024 letter, should be fired

Chief Cochran's responsibility is to determine the fire and safety needs of the community

The need for EMS was acknowledged at time of approval by Chief Cochran as was the lack of RFD's ability to provide adequate response resulting in Condition 20

It is not the fire chief's responsibility to find the funding

It is not the city's prerogative to change a condition of approval three years later simply because they now prefer a new truck

There has been no change in the need for EMS to the MG properties, no change in the response times since Condition 20 was added over three years ago

There has been no change in EMS circumstances that justify changing Condition 20

The proposed modification does not better serve the EMS needs of the MG properties

I question the legality of Chief Cochran's standing to file this application

Why isn't the developer the one filing for a condition change

I ask Chief Cochran to withdraw his application to change to Condition 20

Addie Argyris
775-343-2959

Dawgiewalks54@yahoo.com

Note:

The city increased the 3,000 residential dwelling unit hard cap in May 2022
\$30/person is calculated as: 3,300 units, 3 persons average per unit = approximately 9,900 Residents
 $\$300,000 / 9,900 = \30.30 per person, rounded down to \$30

This is the value the City has put on a person's life

FW: Public Development Review Comment Received: LDC21-00017, condition amendment

Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>

Wed 4/24/2024 7:33 AM

To: Jeff Foster <FosterJ@reno.gov>; Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Cc: Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>

📎 1 attachments (73 KB)

Public Comment - 41 - LDC21-00017, condition amendment.pdf;

**Cali Shy**(She/Her/Hers)*Planning Technician*

Development Services

775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)

ShyC@Reno.Gov

Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us:     

From: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>**Sent:** Wednesday, April 24, 2024 7:09 AM**To:** Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>**Subject:** Public Development Review Comment Received: LDC21-00017, condition amendment

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

Case Number: LDC21-00017, condition amendment**Comments:**

Fire Chief David Cochran in his letter dated February 7, 2024 states "the temporary fire station was intended to be for a two-man crew that could respond to medical calls." Chief Cochran also states that a temporary station would "create a hardship" because "new or reallocated fire department staff, equipment and vehicles, may be needed or better served in other areas of the city." By Chief Cochran's own words the temp station was to handle MEDICAL CALLS. City staff have only addressed fire calls in their response. Mutual/automatic aid will not handle the medical calls. The verbiage on "create a hardship" "better needed or served in other areas" throws the future residents under the bus by ignoring their medical needs. The condition for a temp station for MEDICAL CALLS needs to be left in. The City needs to figure it out on how to staff the station for medical emergencies. There is little doubt

the City will never build a permanent fire station in the area and the \$300,000 will simply be used for the new fire station downtown. If this condition is changed, the \$300,000 needs to be set aside, along with the \$1,608 per door contribution , for a fire station to be built in the area in the future. The money needs to stay in the area.

Email Address: dawgiewalks54@yahoo.com

Phone Number: 775-343-2959

Name of Commentor: Addie Argyris

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

Submitted: 4/24/2024 2:08:59 PM

FW: Public Development Review Comment Received: LDC24-00045

Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>

Tue 4/30/2024 4:02 PM

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

Cc: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

📎 1 attachments (71 KB)

Public Comment - 44 - LDC24-00045.pdf;

**Cali Shy**(She/Her/Hers)*Planning Technician*

Development Services

775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)

ShyC@Reno.Gov

Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

Reno.Gov | Connect with us:     

From: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>**Sent:** Tuesday, April 30, 2024 3:59 PM**To:** Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>**Subject:** Public Development Review Comment Received: LDC24-00045

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

Case Number: LDC24-00045**Comments:**

My additional concern, to those expressed by other public comments received, is that this potentially sets a precedent. We (the Verdi Community) spent countless hours at City meetings regarding the future projects in the area, including Santerra Quilici, to ensure safety and "responsible" growth. These conditions of approval were not random, they all had specific reason, purpose and intent. It is very concerning that a developer can attain approval on a project to include conditions and then simply come back to amend or remove once out of the public's eyes.

Email Address: ccborchard@gmail.com**Phone Number:** N/A**Name of Commentor:** Carly Borchard

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

Submitted: 4/30/2024 10:58:31 PM

FW: Public Development Review Comment Received: LDC24-00045

Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>

Wed 4/24/2024 7:34 AM

To: Jeff Foster <FosterJ@reno.gov>; Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Cc: Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>

📎 1 attachments (71 KB)

Public Comment - 40 - LDC24-00045.pdf;

**Cali Shy**[\(She/Her/Hers\)](#)*Planning Technician*

Development Services

775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)

ShyC@Reno.Gov

Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

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

From: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>**Sent:** Tuesday, April 23, 2024 10:36 PM**To:** Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>**Subject:** Public Development Review Comment Received: LDC24-00045

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

Case Number: LDC24-00045**Comments:**

Upon reading the Chief Fire Marshal's reasoning for not wanting a temporary fire station due to problems staffing it sounded like a weak argument. \$300,000.00 for a new truck instead doesn't sound like enough money plus a crew needed for that truck still places a staffing shortage on the department. Either way when the area is regarded as high risk for fire something is definitely required and the issue should be seriously considered. 15 minutes is a long time for a fire department response in what appears to be a densely populated new project. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Email Address: motties2@yahoo.com**Phone Number:** 7753036011

Name of Commentor: Joanne Regan

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

Submitted: 4/24/2024 5:36:04 AM

Santerra Quilici LDC21-00017, Condition of Approval amendment

D'Shawn Kerrins <Kerrd@jbc80.com>

Mon 4/29/2024 9:00 PM

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

Cc: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>; Council <Council@reno.gov>

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am concerned about the Reno Fire Department's plan to change a condition of approval regarding the Santerra-Quilici project.

The proposal to change the condition of approval for a temporary fire station requirement to a request for \$300,000 for a fire ambulance does not make sense. Why would the Reno Fire Department not want a two-person medical response unit in Verdi when it will take a long time for closest fire station to respond to a call for help in Verdi?

I would think public safety would be more important to the Planning Commission and the City of Reno Fire Department. The City needs to find a way to fund and staff a medical response unit in Verdi. Reno needs to be creative and think of new ways to provide funding for emergency services to the Verdi area.

Other cities across America are faced with similar funding constraints and are able to find ways to fund public safety expenses.

Respectfully,

Ms. Kerrins

2241 Cold Creek Trail

Reno, NV 89523

Re: Santerra Quilici LDC21-00017, Condition of Approval amendment

Katelyn Scarlett <ScarlettK@reno.gov>

Mon 4/29/2024 10:38 AM

To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>; Council <Council@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Cc: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>; Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

This was 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](https://www.reno.gov) | **Connect with us:**



From: Pam <pmcneil49@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, April 26, 2024 3:53 PM

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

Cc: Council <Council@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>; Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Subject: Santerra Quilici LDC21-00017, Condition of Approval amendment

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Councilwoman Kathleen Taylor (Ward 5) has written my public comment for me.

Recently, a citizen appealed the Planning Commission approval of a CUP for the Reno Axe Bar. Kathleen Taylor said it wouldn't be fair to deny the business, Reno Axe Bar, a permit due to the failure of the city. (This failure is referencing the lack of Reno Police response to non-emergency calls about street-level disturbances.)

"I don't want to punish the business for the things that we need to be doing as a city to help keep our city clean and safe," she said. "What do you (Nance) need from us to make everybody live in peace?"

Perhaps we need to ask Fire Chief Cochran, what do you need from us to make the future residents safe? Aren't our future residents as important as a business? It is stated in the application that various other conditions of approval (#5, #6, #7, and #19) all address the fire safety. However, if a resident has a heart attack, it is not the landscaping or the required fire sprinklers that will mitigate the longer response time. The Condition of Approval provides for a public safety crew - ambulance, police and EMS equipment. Further, the automatic aid upon which Chief Cochran relies is not only on the opposite side of the freeway adding to the response time, but he also states, "is required to respond to fire calls for service. The added protection of automatic aid provides temporary fire protection until such time as a permanent City of Reno fire station is constructed." There is no mention or provision for a public safety crew - ambulance, police, and EMS as approved in the Condition of Approval.

The Reno Fire Department has had over three years, since 2021, when the Toll Bros. Santeria Quilici project was approved, to figure out how to financially meet the Condition of Approval. The 1225 home project was approved BASED on this Condition of Approval. It is stated in the application, "The requirement for the temporary residential fire station is no longer the desire of the City of Reno Fire Department." What about the "desire" of future City of Reno residents to have emergency personnel.

This is only one of many reasons that Condition #21 needs to remain as it was approved: *Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the 25th residence within the Project, Developer shall provide for the temporary use of an appropriately modified single family home or commercial building (the "Residential Station") for **PURPOSES OF HOUSING A TWO-PERSON PUBLIC SAFETY CREW AND COLLOCATED AMBULANCE, POLICE, FIRE AND/OR EMS EQUIPMENT.** The Residential Station shall provide direct access to a collector or an arterial road at a specific location to be mutually agreed upon by Developer and the City prior to approval of the first final map and shall be available for use until the City acquires or constructs a fire station with a six-minute response time to the Project.* (Emphasis added.)

If City of Reno cannot provide similar services for all residents, we should not be approving more projects, especially in the urban sprawl area.

Respectfully submitted,

Pam McNeil
1990 Evergreen Ridge Way
Reno, Nevada 89523
775-787-9855 landline