

**01-22-2025- Reno City Council Meeting - Item # I.1 Plumas Redevelopment Case No. LDC2500016**

Written or Voicemail	Name	On Behalf Of	Ward	Email Address	Phone Number	Address	Support	Oppose	Concerned	Total	Date
							0	18	7	25	
Written	Alice Nealis			<a href="mailto:lm223@aol.com">lm223@aol.com</a>	714-381-4226			1			January 06, 2025 at 11:17 am
Written	Rachel Moll			<a href="mailto:rachelmartina81@yahoo.com">rachelmartina81@yahoo.com</a>	858-414-7715			1			January 06, 2025 at 11:18 am
Written	Rosemary Johnson			<a href="mailto:Rosej7@live.com">Rosej7@live.com</a>				1			January 13, 2025 at 10:02 am
Written	John Benjamin		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:jaybenprop@gmail.com">jaybenprop@gmail.com</a>	775-827-4996			1			January 15, 2025 at 6:02 pm
Written	Claudia Pettinari			<a href="mailto:travel13c@gmail.com">travel13c@gmail.com</a>	775-825-3524			1			January 16, 2025 at 1:19 am
Written	No Name			<a href="mailto:renote2@aol.com">renote2@aol.com</a>				1			January 16, 2025 at 9:32 am
Written	Susan Lynn		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:sblynn@sbcglobal.net">sblynn@sbcglobal.net</a>		Lakeridge Ter W, Reno 89509		1			January 16, 2025 at 9:49 am
Written	Lester Ho			<a href="mailto:ob_happy@hotmail.com">ob_happy@hotmail.com</a>				1			January 16, 2025 at 12:47 pm
Written	Maureen Allen			<a href="mailto:nanamonv@sbcglobal.net">nanamonv@sbcglobal.net</a>	775-771-0825			1			January 16, 2025 at 03:32 pm
Written	Patricia Cromer			<a href="mailto:spedatty@gmail.com">spedatty@gmail.com</a>	760-632-1748	4907 Lakeridge Ter. W. , Reno Nevada 89509		1			January 17, 2025 at 2:43 pm
Written	Bill Wymore			<a href="mailto:bijacarriage74@gmail.com">bijacarriage74@gmail.com</a>				1			January 17, 2025 at 3:46 pm
Written	Carole McCann					6016 Kelly Heights Way Reno NV 89519			1		January 19, 2025 at 9:38 am
Written	Herbert Dix		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:hd_94949@yahoo.com">hd_94949@yahoo.com</a>	775-622-3183	4913 Lakeridge Terrace West		1			January 19, 2025 at 11:56 am
Written	Roman and Edie Versch			<a href="mailto:rversch23@gmail.com">rversch23@gmail.com</a>		6083 Carriage House Way, Reno			1		January 20, 2025 at 11:06 am
Written	Margo Piscevich		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:margo.piscevich@gmail.com">margo.piscevich@gmail.com</a>	775-825-4108	3745 Falcon Way		1			January 20, 2025 at 11:37 am
Written	Don and Ranjini Zucker					6124 Carriage House Way Reno NV 89519			1		January 20, 2025 at 7:32 pm
Written	Nancy Jones			<a href="mailto:wanski@icloud.com">wanski@icloud.com</a>					1		January 20, 2025 at 8:57 pm
Written	Brittney Thaler			<a href="mailto:brittneythaler@gmail.com">brittneythaler@gmail.com</a>					1		January 20, 2025 at 8:57 pm
Written	Marianne Merriam					8600 Lakeside Dr, Reno, NV 89511			1		January 21, 2025 at 7:10 am
Written	Mary Ann & Charles Quaglieri					2000 Pheasant Lane		1			January 21, 2025 at 7:11 am
Written	Erica Carroll		Ward 2					1			January 21, 2025 at 9:55 am
Written	Nancy Chontos		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:nanchontos@gmail.com">nanchontos@gmail.com</a>		5042 Lakeridge Terrace East, Reno, NV 89509		1			January 21, 2025 at 10:07 am
Written	Keith Larkin			<a href="mailto:keithlarkin55@gmail.com">keithlarkin55@gmail.com</a>					1		January 21, 2025 at 11:01 am
Written	Jori Benjamin		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:joribenjamin@gmail.com">joribenjamin@gmail.com</a>	916-838-2078	4813 Lakeridge Terrace West Reno, NV 89509		1			January 21, 2025 at 12:56 am
written	Rene Kerr		Ward 2	<a href="mailto:rdixkerr@yahoo.com">rdixkerr@yahoo.com</a>	775-828-1181	4269 Muirwood Circle, Reno, NV 89509			1		1/21/2025 15:16



---

**FW: Feedback for City of Reno**

---

**From** Jennifer Pawliszyn <PawliszynJ@reno.gov>

**Date** Fri 1/17/2025 3:46 PM

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

Good afternoon!

We received this feedback on the website, which appears best suited for public comment. Please see below.

Thank you!



**Jennifer Pawliszyn**  
([She/Her/Hers](#))

*Lead Citizen Service Representative*

City Manager's Office- Innovation & Experience

[PawliszynJ@reno.gov](mailto:PawliszynJ@reno.gov)

1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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

**PUBLIC RECORDS NOTICE:** In accordance with NRS Chapter 239, this email, responses, and all information submitted by you will be entered into the public record, made available for public inspection, and freely disseminated without restriction.

---

**From:** City of Reno <reno@enotify.visioninternet.com>

**Sent:** Friday, January 17, 2025 3:44 PM

**To:** Webmaster <Webmaster@reno.gov>

**Subject:** Feedback for City of Reno

You have received this feedback from Bill Wymore <[bijacarriage74@gmail.com](mailto:bijacarriage74@gmail.com)> for the following page:

<https://www.reno.gov/government/city-council/city-council-members/ward-2-naomi-duerr>

Re Future of Plumas/Old Lakeridge Tennis Courts: We are concerned with: Density: - 273 single bedroom units. Increased (time of day dependent) traffic on an already heavily traveled Mc Carran, and Plumas streets. -The finished project will in our opinion look like a 24/7 a day parking lot with a very modern 5 story Building in the center. As we do not see any visual barrier walls between the streets and the parking areas. (And it would seem possible that any such barrier walls would not enhance the buildings occupant safety in case of the need to rapidly vacate the area). With an attractive Wells Fargo building immediately to the west, and an attractive historically designed commercial area to the east. We do not think the building compliments the ambiance of the treed suburban community we bought into. -We wonder

where will daytime and overnight guests park, and where will delivery (i.e. grocery/ pizza, package delivery, USPS, unload and where will occupants who are moving in or out park to unload and/or load? It appears to us that Lakeside and Plumas Street parking spots are already full. - Can occupants have more than 1 vehicle? Will there be size restrictions on the vehicles? - With surface lot parking, the buildings, and a large dog walk taking up so much space the streets are narrow; and some street corners appear to be very tight (90'?). Do the proposed streets and corners assure the Reno Fire Dept. prompt timely, and desired access to the 4 or 5 story, project, by its vehicles? -Only 2 vehicle entrances/exits are proposed. The Lakeside one being VERY CLOSE to the McCarran intersection. Vehicles exiting (and entering) the project will encounter oncoming south bound Lakeside traffic, often racing to make the traffic light. AND the West and East bound traffic turning off McCarran onto Lakeside would seemingly present potential hazardous situations, at the speed we regularly see vehicles making those turns. And we see little room to move this project's Lakeside entrance further to the south. -This leaves the Plumas Street entrance which may more safely handle most of the traffic in and out of the project. And we should mention that Plumas already handles significant traffic using Ridgeview Drive to /from Plumas to avoid Lakeside's McCarran Traffic signal. And it would seem that there is very little shopping within reasonable distance that could be walked to for groceries or other shopping. Thusly resulting in increased driving into and out of the project thru the one Plumas entrance by the 273 occupants, as opposed to projects built perhaps in more Commerical areas, which would perhaps encourage walking. -Another concern is what might be the physical capabilities of the occupants be of the 273 - 1 bedroom - units? We would guess that there could be several elderly, and perhaps handicapped, and wheelchair bound people. If so, and there is a need for evacuation, and there is no elevator service, how will this be handled? -If there is an intent to utilize the project for housing of the homeless, we think the public should be so advised. In closing, we Thank You and the Council for allowing us this opportunity to offer our concerns, and recommendation that the project as we understand it, and addressed above, not be approved. Bill Wymore



Outlook

---

**Re: McCarran + Plumas Proposed Apartment Project**

---

**From** Brittney Thaler <brittneythaler@gmail.com>

**Date** Mon 1/20/2025 8:57 PM

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

Reno City Council Members,

I have lived in the Lakeridge area for the last 6 years. We love the neighborhoods and community that we call home here. One of the reasons we put down roots here was that we enjoyed the feel of the area. There are some businesses, but not many. There are some apartments, but not many. I have never been too involved in city politics, but have now found a reason. That reason is the development of 6000 Plumas. The kind of proposed development to this 7.5 acre parcel is excessive and does not conform to our area at all. The adjacent two level apartments to the south, Lakeridge Living, on the corner of lakeside and McCarran are more discrete in nature. For the most part the two levels are hidden among trees and look more like houses than apartments. Residents have limited parking capabilities here causing them to overflow onto Lakeside which adds more traffic to this intersection and snow plowing issues in the winter months.

This proposed new development at 6000 plumas will also have parking challenges and not to mention congestion issues as well. I find that the developers' traffic study is terribly misleading. They used off hours in the middle of the night to justify that it would have hardly any impact on the residents who live in these nearby communities. They are wrong. Try driving in the area at rush hour times and see how an extra 500 cars will maneuver around the area. An actual traffic study at NORMAL hours would show a different story. The fact that they knowingly chose a small sample of time in wayyyyy off hours of the night/morning does not give us as residents the confidence that they are truthful in their proposal. Their attempt to push this through knowing what the community response has been in the past, giving no regard to it, making no changes to their resubmittal is really disappointing. We know the city aims to look at infill projects like this one to fill needs, but we ask that the city council REALLY think about the Lakeridge community as they make this decision. This decision will change the landscape of our area forever. It will not solve any kind of affordability issues either. No one is building \$400k townhomes in the city center. No one is selling \$1000/mo apartment rentals either. Those are wishes, not reality. We have to have a better solution for this area. A retirement home perhaps like those similar to 3201 and 3101 Plumas? Some kind of mixed use storefront, commercial with living? Putting up a 5 story highrise apartment complex is just not what this area needs. There are other options worth waiting for in this corridor.

Concerned citizen,  
Brittney Thaler



---

## LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment)

---

From carole mccann <cmccannak@gmail.com>

Date Sun 1/19/2025 9:38 AM

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

## LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment)

Dear City of Reno Planning Commission,

I am writing to express concern regarding the proposed development of 273-unit multi-family apartment complex in close proximity to an established residential neighborhood. While growth and development are essential for our city, this project poses significant traffic challenges that warrant reconsideration or mitigation efforts. Below, I outline the primary concerns related to traffic congestion.

### 1. Significant Increase in Automobiles

Assuming an average of 1.5-2 vehicles per unit (a conservative estimate for multifamily housing), the 273-unit development would introduce between **410 and 550 additional vehicles** into the neighborhood. This sharp influx of vehicles will lead to:

- Increased traffic volume on residential streets, particularly during peak hours (morning and evening commutes).
- A higher frequency of vehicles stopping and starting at intersections, which will hinder smooth traffic flow.

### 2. Impact on Neighborhood Traffic Movement

The surrounding residential streets were not designed to accommodate this level of increased vehicle traffic. The additional automobiles will:

- Create bottlenecks at key intersections, especially if no infrastructure upgrades are planned.
- Make it more challenging for residents and emergency vehicles to navigate the area safely.
- Increase delays for residents entering and exiting the neighborhood.

### 3. Safety and Quality of Life Concerns

The increase in traffic volume raises concerns about pedestrian and cyclist safety, especially for families with children. The residential neighborhoods include schools, parks, or community amenities where slower-moving, low-traffic environments are critical for safety. Increased congestion will:

- Heighten the risk of accidents involving pedestrians, cyclists, or vehicles.
- Lead to noise pollution from higher traffic levels, which impacts the quality of life for current residents.

### 4. Infrastructure Strain

Unless substantial road improvements or traffic management systems are implemented, the existing infrastructure will be insufficient to handle the added traffic. Key questions include:

- Are nearby roads, intersections, and traffic signals capable of supporting the increased

volume?

- What mitigation measures (e.g., road widening, new traffic lights, or speed control systems) will the city require from the developer to prevent adverse effects?

## 5. Precedent for Thoughtful Development

The City of Reno has a responsibility to balance growth with maintaining livability for current residents. Approving developments without adequate traffic mitigation measures sets a precedent that prioritizes rapid expansion over sustainable, community-focused planning.

### Proposed Recommendations

1. **Traffic Study Requirement:** Before approval, the city should commission a comprehensive traffic impact study to quantify the effects on local roads and intersections. Has this been required of the developer?
2. **Mitigation Plan:** Require the developer to fund necessary infrastructure upgrades or other measures to minimize congestion. If the Dear City of Reno Planning Commission,

### Proposed Recommendations

1. **Traffic Study Requirement:** Before approval, the city should commission a comprehensive traffic impact study to quantify the effects on local roads and intersections.
2. **Mitigation Plan: Require** the developer to fund necessary infrastructure upgrades or other measures to minimize congestion. **As part of the project approval, the roads need to be improved to handle the increase in traffic (i.e. Have the developer pay to have McCarran Blvd increased to three traffic lanes in each direction, and create a traffic round-about at the interception of Plumas St. and McCarran Blvd. at the very least (to handle the increase in traffic!)**
3. **Community Input:** Allow neighborhood residents to voice their concerns and provide suggestions for managing traffic.

I urge the Planning Commission to carefully evaluate the traffic impact of this development and prioritize the needs of the existing community. I wholeheartedly object to this project in its entirety, but the traffic is the most problematic.

Sincerely,

Carole McCann  
6016 Kelly Heights Way  
Reno, NV 89519



Outlook

---

**Re: LDC25-00016(Plumas Redevelopment) appeal - Deny the planning commision's approval**

---

**From** dzcpa@aol.com <dzcpa@aol.com>

**Date** Mon 1/20/2025 7:32 PM

**To** Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>; Hillary Schieve <SchieveH@reno.gov>

**Cc** Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>; Leah Piccotti <PiccottiL@reno.gov>; Kathleen Taylor <TaylorK@reno.gov>; Devon Reese <reeseD@reno.gov>; Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>; Miguel Martinez <MartinezMi@reno.gov>; Brandi Anderson <AndersonB@reno.gov>

Dear Reno Mayor and all Councilmembers,

I respectfully request you to reverse the conditional use approval of the planning commission on LDC25-0016. If councilmember consensus on this cannot be achieved, please add significant additional conditions for approval based not only on my comments but on all comments, both received in writing and presented to you in public at the meeting.

Please read the below email which was previously submitted to the planning commission through Ms. Piccotti. It presented many reasons why this approval should never had been granted. I question whether all residents who emailed, or voice mailed communications were ever submitted by Ms. Piccotti to the planning commission for their consideration.

As you will read below, contrary to Ms. Piccotti's presentation and recommendation at the planning commission meeting which I attended remotely, this project doesn't meet the criteria and never should have been approved. I do want to add some additional comments and emphasize some of my below comments.

Compatibility with the neighborhood. Contrary to Ms. Piccotti's statement that it is compatible, upon questioning by a commission member regarding what are the objective compatibility standards, she acknowledged in the planning commission meeting there were none and therefore her position is essentially a personal opinion or biased by her job position which requires her to support developers and planning commission members who are sympathetic to developers, especially those with connections to the real estate market who benefit from more development regardless of its impact on nearby Reno citizens. A condition prior to denying the appeal should be for an independent study selected by a majority of the councilmembers considering this appeal to consider this project's compatibility, funded by the developer, prior to making a final decision to reject the appeal.

Complete consideration of the traffic impact was not considered, which does not meet the conditions for approval.

The project does not mitigate the traffic impact and will create additional safety concerns, one of the conditions for approval.

After reviewing Ms. Piccotti's written recommendation to approve this conditional use, I noticed that the traffic report wasn't included. Why? Make sure you have access to it and read it.

An additional lane on both Plumas and Lakeside needs to get added. Not all the residents in the Toll Brothers Hilltop development have moved in, and already traffic is backing up on Plumas beyond the golf course/ Hilltop road entrance/exit on Plumas.

I recall when I reviewed the traffic report to write my original response that there is already a time during rush hour rated a 5 which is below the RTC recommended standards. Adding more

vehicles will only make the McCarran problem worse. A few second delay by the addition of hundreds of cars is not creditable.

In addition, I don't think that the traffic study addressed all of the impact on the surrounding streets to the development. Plumas, Lakeside and Ridgeview. The planning commission even ignored a plea from another developer of the Lakeridge community during the meeting that traffic is already terrible and even that day an accident had occurred. How many more injuries or deaths to Reno residents are acceptable? This project as approved will aggravate, not mitigate traffic problems.

The traffic study did not consider the impact on Ridgeview.

Because of the back up of traffic on McCarran many vehicles are using Ridgeview to avoid McCarran. I have witnessed some close accidents. There are no traffic lights or even 4 way stop signs at Ridgeview and Plumas & Ridgeview and Lakeside. An additional condition, if conditionally approved should include another independent traffic study from a traffic engineer independent from the firm used by the planning commission, and the developer should be responsible for not only additional lanes on Lakeside and Plumas, but also any traffic mitigation needed on Ridgeview between those 2 streets, or any other concern raised by an independent traffic engineer. Not Henderson who makes significant income supporting the planning commission positions.

Sufficient fire escape access for upper Ridgeview developments will be lacking.

Councilmembers, please do not ignore this as an important concern that the planning commission didn't think was that important to add additional conditions to address the exit traffic congestion caused by a fire emergency. Their decision risks our lives.

Please remember the tragedy in the Palisades just a few weeks ago in Los Angeles where traffic backed up bumper to bumper and residents had to leave their cars and run for their lives.

Just recently the mayor was on television with a councilmember who asked residents to make sure they are aware of their exits in case of a fire. We have had multiple fires over the past few decades impacting upper Ridgeview and Evans Creek. I and others are aware of our limited exits, and I raised this concern before the LA disaster in my email below. There are currently only 2 exits for not only the residents of upper Ridgeview, but also the developments of Evans Creek. Additional traffic from this development on Lakeside, Plumas and McCarran will risk the lives of current residents. Additional lanes at the developers expense need to get added to both Plumas and Lakeside.

Again, please read my original email below which contains more concerns about this project.

Thank you for your consideration,

Don and Ranjini Zucker  
6124 Carriage House Way  
Reno 89519

On Monday, December 2, 2024 at 03:14:29 PM PST, dzcpa@aol.com <dzcpa@aol.com> wrote:

Hello Ms. Piccotti,

I request that you and the Planning Commission deny this development plan as proposed.

Please consider the below as you prepare for the Reno Planning Commission meeting December 5.

I am a Lakeridge/Carriage House resident since 2018.

Please consider that the traffic survey was paid for by the developer's consultant, Wood Rogers.

The new and old traffic surveys are not completely objective as the developer or consultant will not continue to hire the traffic surveyor if the results are not favorable to the proposed development. I read the old traffic survey and as a resident experiencing existing traffic conditions daily at that time believe that traffic study to not reflect actual traffic experience. Headway Transportation LLC's claim in the new October 18, 2024 traffic study that this development will only cause 1 or 2 seconds of delay is not creditable, although it provides the planning commission and the developer with the paper needed to support proceeding with approving this project contrary to what will actually occur with traffic problems caused by approving this development. Neither does 109 AM and 139 PM peak period vehicles make sense considering 273 residences and the associated parking spaces mentioned in the study. Waiting for 2050 RTC McCarran widening mentioned in the new traffic study is not quick enough for current residents. We all know it isn't likely to occur in 2031 or the early 2030's. Wishful RTC planning projections leads to overreliance on these plans to justify developments that don't have the current infrastructure that is needed. Consider the RTC plan for mid-town S. Virginia Street - not enough parking and increased rents resulting in closed businesses that couldn't afford the higher rent has discouraged people from going to Mid-town instead of encouraging people to shop and eat there. We all know that Reno traffic in general, and specifically S. McCarran, Plumas south of S. McCarran, the McCarran and Plumas intersection, and S. McCarran between Lakeside and Plumas are already congested enough without adding a large residential building. So, I do agree with the LOS D&E ratings, which supports my observations. Even the previously approved building for this site would increase traffic flow. The resulting congestion will make this a less desirable neighborhood to live in. Waiting until 2035 to 2050 to widen McCarran doesn't justify developing the property as proposed in 2025.

I understand the Mayor's goal is to increase density to provide more housing, but it won't work in this one space that was formerly a tennis club that served the community, given the surrounding street capacity and road access. This will create more street congestion for the existing nearby renters, condos and residential homes with no significant improvements to the roads adjacent to this development. Approving the current design is going to devalue real estate in the area.

The following are more reasons to reject this development as it is proposed:

1. There is no 5 story building nearby and this will appear out of place in comparison to the surrounding community. A towering monstrosity. Even the commercial building across the street at Plumas where Wells Fargo Advisors is located is only 3 stories, and the businesses east across Lakeside are only 2 stories. All surrounding rental buildings are 2 stories.
2. The design is not compatible with the surrounding buildings. What is currently planned are 2 glass and metal buildings. There are no other predominantly glass and metal structures nearby. Brick, wood, concrete stucco, stone are the prevailing exterior surface materials for both the commercial buildings and nearby rental structures.

3. Even though all the Toll Bros. Hilltop residences are not occupied, there is already too much traffic congestion of vehicles going north from the Ridgeview developments and the Hilltop/golf course road. At certain times of the day, traffic trying to turn left to go west on S. McCarran already backs all the way up beyond the Hilltop/golf course road and the space in the road allocated for cars to turn left (west) onto McCarran. There is no room left to accommodate more traffic. Where is the additional traffic going to go unless the developer widens Plumas?
4. Traffic on S. McCarran going east between Lakeside and Plumas already completely fills the distance between the Lakeside and Plumas and backs up west of Plumas. How is the traffic exiting this development and the other existing residences intending to go right/east on S. McCarran accomplish this when there already is no space during morning and afternoon traffic? The north bound Plumas traffic is going back up at least to the entrance of this new development at certain times of the day.
5. When traffic backs up going east on S. McCarran from Plumas to Lakeside, traffic wanting to go south on Lakeside stopped at the Plumas light will turn right/south onto Plumas go up to Ridgeview and turn left east to get to Lakeside and turn right /south on Lakeside to avoid the back up on McCarran. There is no stop sign or traffic light at Plumas and Ridgeview and I have witnessed some close calls/near accidents from vehicles on Ridgeview going west trying to cross Plumas to continue on Ridgeview, or by cars coming east down the hill on Ridgeway trying to turn left to go north on Plumas. This will be further aggravated by the additional traffic from the development.
6. The developments off Plumas going west on Ridgeview are in an area susceptible to fires. Houses were burnt down in 2011 and the neighborhood evacuated. A fire on November 17, 2020 required evacuation of the residences on or off of upper Ridgeview. This new development becomes a safety concern if there is insufficient road capacity to evacuate everyone.
7. The congestion caused by this development will re-route many residences on upper Ridgeway to avoid Plumas by crossing past Plumas east on Ridgeway, to turn left/north on Lakeside. Traffic going left/south out of the proposed development to turn left/east on Ridgeway to get to Lakeside south of McCarran is going to add to congestion. Going east on Ridgeway to turn left to go north on Lakeside is already difficult without additional traffic added from the development.
8. Even though the development parking meets code, practically there will be more cars than parking spaces. The parking along Plumas is already crowded from existing rental properties that don't have sufficient parking. Where will these cars go? The developer wouldn't care about this so this will become a city problem.
9. How are the Lakeridge Golf employees and golfers and the Hilltop residents trying to exit going left/north going to accomplish this when Plumas is backed up beyond the entrance exit road for Lakeridge Golf/Hilltop and there is no space to exit? Is the developer going to widen Plumas?
10. If there is an exit planned on Lakeside, some of the above points is going to apply to the Lakeside exit for cars wanting to go left/north towards McCarran. Traffic going north during peak periods already backs up to to the driveway of the commercial development across the street on Lakeview where Starbucks and the M-3 restaurant are located, leaving no space for the new development apartment vehicles to turn left.
11. Crash history of 51 accidents will increase with the new Hilltop resident's traffic and the traffic from the proposed development. This is acceptable and should be approved?
12. Closest bus line is .8 miles away, increasing apartment renters need for a vehicle instead of using public transportation This isn't going to be like the new developments at the corner of Longley and S. Virginia, which does have adequate public transit. Those developments are also not 5 stories, and they are in a much bigger commercial area.

13. From the recent traffic study Table 3 note 2.

As shown in the table, the S. McCarran Boulevard/Plumas Street intersection is expected to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour **without the project**. So the proposed project is likely to put S. McCarran Lakeside to Plumas section off the LOS charts (the study just uses F when considering the development) when the city's standard is higher than that? Per RTC's level of service criteria for the City of Reno noted in the traffic study.

"All regional roadway facilities projected to carry more than 27,000 ADT at the latest RTP horizon – LOS E or better."

To conclude, based on the criteria listed in Woods Rogers conditional use deck, it is questionable whether this project meets the requirements.

\*The proposed land use and project design is compatible with surrounding development - **NO. The proposed characteristics and architecture are not similar to the surrounding area.**

\*The granting of the conditional use permit **will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare**. The factors to be considered in evaluating this application shall include: Property damage or nuisance resulting from noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration, or illumination; and any hazard to persons and property. **See above comments.**

IN ADDITION TO THESE FINDINGS, ALL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS SHALL MEET THE FOLLOWING APPROVAL CRITERIA.

- 3) The project mitigates any anticipated traffic impacts. - **NO**
- 4) The project provides for a safe environment. - **NO**

Current Lakeridge area neighbors don't deserve the negative impacts of this proposed development. If approved, we will remember this with our votes in future elections.

Thank you,  
Donald and Ranjini Zucker  
6124 Carriage House Way

Reno, NV 89519



---

**City Council Comment received from Erica Carroll**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 9:55 AM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Erica Carroll

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Ward 2

Email Address:

Phone Number:

Address:

Tremont Ln

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

C Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment).

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

**If no, enter comments below:**

Hello, I am writing to voice our opposition to the current proposed building plan on the former Reno Tennis club land on So. McCarran Rd. We live directly off of McCarran and Lakeside Dr. It is a mostly residential area of houses, condos, apartments and retail on either side of McCarran that are low in scale and meld together nicely. Approving two multi-level buildings with 200+ apartments is a thoughtless decision. It is our opinion that this plan will negatively impact our established neighborhood by being too tall, too densely populated and visually unattractive. Not to mention the unacceptable level of increased traffic and congestion that will obviously be created. For the sake of responsible city planning please reconsider. We understand that the land will and should be

developed. We would like to see a more judicious consideration in the housing that is built. Perhaps strive to elevate the area with a more conservative number of well-designed condos or townhouses? Reno has plenty of "cell block" looking apartment buildings already marring landscape. If this plan goes through, the only winners will be the outside developers who seem to have been given carte blanche to indiscriminately build anywhere there is an empty lot.

**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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

No



---

**Public Hearing Comments 1.22.25 \_ LDC25-00016**

---

**From** Erica Carroll <detailzmtr@gmail.com>  
**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 10:03 AM  
**To** Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Hello,

Please submit our comments below regarding the current proposed building plan on the former Reno Tennis club land on So. McCarran Rd. (LDC25-00016)

We live directly off of McCarran and Lakeside Dr. It is a mostly residential area of houses, condos, apartments and retail on either side of McCarran that are low in scale and meld together nicely.

Approving two multi-level buildings with 200+ apartments is a thoughtless decision. It is our opinion that this plan will negatively impact our established neighborhood by being too tall, too densely populated and visually unattractive. Not to mention the unacceptable level of increased traffic and congestion that will obviously be created.

For the sake of responsible city planning please reconsider. We understand that the land will and should be developed. We would like to see a more judicious consideration in the housing that is built. Perhaps strive to elevate the area with a more conservative number of well-designed condos or townhouses?

Reno has plenty of "cell block" looking apartment buildings already marring landscape.

If this plan goes through, the only winners will be the outside developers who seem to have been given carte blanche to indiscriminately build anywhere there is an empty lot. Thank you,

Thank you.



---

**City Council Comment received from Herbert Dix**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Sun 1/19/2025 11:56 AM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Herbert Dix

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Ward 2

Email Address:

hd\_94949@yahoo.com

Phone Number:

775-622-3183

Address:

4913 Lakeridge Terrace West

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

C Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment).

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

**If no, enter comments below:**

One of the Plumas Redevelopment drawings dated October 2024 indicates there to be approximately 422 parking spaces around the two proposed buildings and at nearby locations. Vehicles occupying those spaces are to be directed to a single entrance/egress point on Plumas Street about 450 feet south of the Plumas/McCarran intersection. Currently this very busy intersection is frequently blocked or obstructed during daytime hours by eastbound McCarran traffic backed up by the traffic signals at Lakeside. Since vehicular movements in or out of the proposed development will be onto Plumas Street, presumedly, most of this traffic will traverse through the Plumas/McCarran intersection and thus additionally impact this already overcrowded highway feature. Lakeridge Terrace residents now

experience gridlock conditions north of McCarran due to the Plumas/McCarran congestion. With the large number of vehicles planned for the project, similar gridlock conditions south of McCarran will occur unless significant roadway enhancements are included with the redevelopment. McCarran now has three lanes east of Lakeside Drive. There is no indication on the above referenced drawing showing space for accommodating a widening of McCarran to three lanes. Hardly a design oversight. Both the Lakeside Drive and Plumas Street intersections with McCarran Boulevard are now, at times, at or over capacity. The City and State should not be required to resolve the developer's future traffic impacts on our neighborhood.

**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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

Yes



---

**City Council Comment received from Jori Benjamin**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 12:56 PM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Jori Benjamin

Commenting on behalf of:

Lakeridge Homeowners

Ward #:

Ward 2

Email Address:

joribenjamin@gmail.com

Phone Number:

916-838-2078

Address:

4813 Lakeridge Terrace West Reno, NV 89509

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

C Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

I.1.

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

Yes, I will check-in with the City Clerk upon arrival.

**If no, enter comments below:****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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

Yes



Outlook

---

**LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment)**

---

**From** Keith Larkin <keithlarkin55@gmail.com>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 11:01 AM

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

Please confirm your receipt of this.

We recently received a notice and request for public comment regarding the above referenced application/proposed project.

We recently moved into this neighborhood because of the existing and long-established character of the neighborhood, and the proposed project will totally upend and disrupt the long-established character.

The proposed development may actually be within the technical boundaries of the existing zoning; however, I understand that the progression to the existing zoning on this lot/location was actually modified by the City of Reno only a few years ago, but that that application was presented ***without*** the current intended usage or artist's rendering of that intended usage. That being said, a reasonable question to ask is whether that zoning change request would have been allowable, protested or approved had the current proposed plan been presented concurrent with that application for a modification to the zoning? Or, would some other zoning change have been more appropriate that would have limited the design of the proposed usage to resemble the long-established character of the surrounding neighborhood?

The proposed development does not match or even reasonably resemble the surrounding residential neighborhood's architectural and landscape styles in terms of:

1. Above ground building height for residential usages
2. Per address/unit clustering/density
3. Proposed potential population density per land square foot
4. Per address/unit greenscape separation
5. Per address/unit parking separation

In my opinion, the Planning Commission's deliberation process should address the above deviations on a compare and contrast basis to the long-established character of the existing neighborhood before reaching a decision, not merely whether the applicant's proposed project falls within the technical boundaries of the recently modified zoning. ***This is not a new neighborhood where the character has not yet been established.***

To be clear, these comments are not against the applicant's proposed residential usage; rather, the design and character of the proposed residential usage -- it should be required to reasonably resemble the existing character of the surrounding neighborhood's long-established residential usage.

Sincerely,

Keith Larkin



---

**City Council Comment received from Lauryn Kern**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 12:19 PM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Lauryn Kern

Commenting on behalf of:

Reno Sunrise Movement

Ward #:

Ward 5

Email Address:

lauryn.kern@gmail.com

Phone Number:

7022835059

Address:

2612 Rayma Ct Reno, NV 89503

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

C Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

F1, F2 and F6.

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

**If no, enter comments below:**

Our city's hatred of its unhoused population needs to end here. The passing of these ordinances will be LIFE-THREATENING and could result in the deaths of many of our Reno citizens through our harsh winters. We need to focus our attention on housing those who are unfortunate enough to not have a home of their own instead of punishing them for their unfortunate. We need to allow these folks room for rest- undisturbed by the looming threat of being arrested for simply existing.

**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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

No



---

**City Council Comment received from Margo Piscevich**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Mon 1/20/2025 11:37 AM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Margo Piscevich

Commenting on behalf of:

My self

Ward #:

Ward 2

Email Address:

margo.piscevich@gmail.com

Phone Number:

775-825-4108

Address:

3745 Falcon Way

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

I Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

Lakeridge I.1.

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

Yes, I will check-in with the City Clerk upon arrival.

**If no, enter comments below:****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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

Yes



---

**Fw: Case No. LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment) Jan 22, 2025 City Council hearing**

---

**From** Lauren Morris <MorrisL@reno.gov>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 7:10 AM

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

 1 attachment (57 KB)

FD Ladder truck radius.pdf;

---

**From:** Marianne Merriam <mariannemerriam@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 12:03 AM

**To:** Mayor <Mayor@reno.gov>; Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>; Kathleen Taylor <TaylorK@reno.gov>; martinezm@reno.gov <martinezm@reno.gov>; Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>; Devon Reese <reesed@reno.gov>; Brandi Anderson <AndersonB@reno.gov>

**Cc:** City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

**Subject:** Case No. LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment) Jan 22, 2025 City Council hearing

Dear Mayor Schieve and City Council Members,

I am a near neighbor of the Lakeridge Tennis Club site and live 2 miles south of it on Lakeside Drive. My husband and I drive past this site approximately 20 times a week and will be significantly impacted by what gets built there.

I am asking you to **vote "No" on the present configuration and design** of the project that Thompson Thrift is seeking approval to build. The following items must be addressed and changed before anything is allowed to be built on this premier site in our neighborhood:

1. **Lakeside Drive access should be for Emergency-Only entry and exit.** The entry and exit onto Plumas is much further from McCarren Blvd than the driveway on Lakeside. The traffic signal on Plumas can be set up to time traffic smoothly onto and off McCarren Blvd. Traffic is already backed up for people turning from McCarren south onto Lakeside Drive, without the hundreds of new vehicle trips per day because of this project, so neither right nor left turns can ever be allowed in or out of that driveway onto Lakeside! The Lakeside driveway must be for *Emergency access only*. The proposed traffic pattern is a huge safety concern due to the driveway on Lakeside being so close to McCarren.

*Additional Lakeside Drive Access Notes:*

a. **Fire Department Lock Box for emergency access.** During the Washoe County Planning Commission hearing, it was noted that the fire department requires two points of ingress and egress from all projects. The applicant and commissioners said they had to have the entry/exit on Lakeside for this reason. No one in that meeting (after public comments) mentioned that fire departments (FD) very commonly put a gate with a **lock box for FD access only**. In this way, there would always be two points of access/egress. It was negligent that this was not mentioned by the "experts" involved in their discussion that an **FD lock box is a viable alternative to 24/7 full traffic access to and from Lakeside Drive**.

b. **A Fire Department ladder truck can not make the s-turns into the project from the present entry on Lakeside Dr.** Two SUVs could barely meet and make it past each other. The driveway is of minimum width with two s-turns that are very close to each other. This is a huge safety concern because in an emergency,

residents in the **towering apartment buildings can only be reached with a ladder truck**. An ambulance or small fire truck might be able to make the turns (by running over the curbs, especially if oncoming traffic was trying to drive out, but there is *no way* a ladder truck could use that entry/exit in an emergency. (Please take a look at the attached Exhibit A.)

2. **The site plan is misleading and does not show the final buildout of McCarren Blvd**. At the Ward 2 NAB meeting, we were told another lane would be built to widen McCarren Blvd. This will wipe out another 12'-16' of landscaping on the northern side of the site, as well as existing trees and retaining walls within that width. To evaluate their proposal properly, you need an accurate depiction of the site plan and adjacent roadways that show the new retaining walls required and which additional mature trees will be removed due to the widening of McCarren Bl.

3. **This proposal does not address future residents' access to mass transit**. Isn't one of the goals of building higher-density housing to encourage people to use buses and bike lanes? To promote this, several sidewalks should be built from within the project to the peripheral streets to make it conducive for future residents to access bus stops and bike lanes.

4. **Water runoff from the covered parking and building roofs, parking areas, and drive aisles should be put back in the ground to recharge groundwater** through bioswales and detention basins. Also, the dog park should be designed to flood and absorb runoff to recharge the region's groundwater supplies. We live in a desert and must use water wisely! We need to **make wise water use a requirement of this and all future projects!**

5. **The architecture is horribly monolithic** and incompatible with the adjacent neighborhood. More than a two-toned color scheme is needed for architectural relief. There should be stepped-floor setbacks to transition from the ground floor to the upper levels, changes in materials, usable balconies for more than a BBQ, and bicycle storage with access to the sun. Architecturally, it may as well be a tilt-up warehouse! The applicant wants to build an enormous, solid, rectangular box with some windows and a two-tone color scheme. Thank you, but we already have enough warehouses in this city!

6. **Green Architectural Standards**. Reno must make developers responsible for building with environmentally sustainable materials and methods. **US Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®)** is a series of rating systems to increase the environmental and health performance of buildings, sites, structures, and neighborhoods. LEED® covers the design, construction, and operation of all types of buildings. This includes mandating standards in construction for: Sustainable sites, Energy efficiency, Water efficiency, Materials and resource use, Indoor environmental quality, Emissions, Operations and Maintenance. **No wonder out-of-state developers want to build in Reno - we will seemingly allow anything to be built!**

7. We need to learn from the recent fires in southern California. **Along with requiring buildings to be built with sustainable materials, we need to implement building standards for fire safety, including materials, setbacks, and the ability to evacuate whole buildings and neighborhoods efficiently - which will save lives!** This includes mandating non-flammable construction materials and backup generators to run elevators when (*not if!*) the electric power is cut due to high winds.

8. **This proposed project is entirely incompatible height-wise with the adjacent neighborhood**. The builder proposes raising the existing grade by more than 10' before the construction of the apartments. I realize part of that is to fill in where the swimming pool was. Still, I am sure the civil engineer will raise the adjacent grade and, thus, the finish floor elevation to the highest point possible to accommodate the slope inherent on

McCarren Bl. This will make the proposed 4- and 5-story buildings on this site even taller than they otherwise would be! They will not only tower over everything within a significant radius of the site but also block views of the mountains, which is one of the very special reasons anyone lives in this part of Reno. **If you let this project be built, it will take away views of the mountains because of its height, and thus lessen the quality of life for all Reno residents.** The builder says this is a changing neighborhood, but this should not be the first and only mid-rise apartment complex in this neighborhood that will be taller than everything for miles except those near to and including the Peppermill and Atlantis Casinos!

**9. This is a neighborhood of homeowners. We want to see "For Sale" condominiums built, not rental apartments.** Reno is overbuilt with the existing apartments already, with thousands still under construction and yet to come on the market. Per a Reno Gazette Journal article published Jan. 13, 2025, Reno has only 3.6% of home purchase loans for young homeowners, vs. 5% national average. Building more condominiums will help young adults reach the housing market. The adjacent neighborhood homeowners deserve your respect and acknowledgment about this. It is a sound planning principle to put like uses with like uses (and buildings of similar height next to each other).

**10. This project is technically outside the McCarren ring,** within which higher-density housing is planned. Please do not approve their request for a conditional use permit and grading variation that would allow them to raise the ground level before the building heights are even measured. To knit this project into the existing neighborhood fabric, I urge you to **limit this project to three-story buildings** (which would already be taller than their neighbors). The new Villas at Rancharra are three stories tall and tower over everything in the neighborhood. Even though they display a frenetic hodge podge of roof lines, at least they have 10', 15', and 20' setbacks between floors and are something other than a rectangular monolithic box with a flat roof and facade.

**11. Thompson Thrift is a developer who has built thousands of cookie-cutter rental units from three simple designs across 23 states.** Per their own PR piece linked below, this developer has achieved "a 34.5% internal rate of return and a 2.16 equity multiple" on one of their latest projects. *They can afford to develop a design reflective of this neighborhood before they flip it to another owner (which is their modus operandi).* Also, per their PR piece, "Their portfolio offers three primary standard designs, providing construction efficiency, cost predictability and an end-product that has been tried and tested...". Allowing mediocre designs leads to mediocre cities. **Make Thompson Thrift challenge their architects to design something worthy of this neighborhood!**

**Let's be clear—this builder does not care about our community—they care about their investment partners! Have them design something site-specific and reflective of this part of Reno, not another strip mall or cookie-cutter apartment complex you can find anywhere and everywhere.**

**It's your job to stand up for our community! Don't let this four—and five-story monolith be built on this site.**

**Please vote "No" on this project!**

Sincerely,  
Marianne Merriam  
8600 Lakeside Dr, Reno, NV 89511

P.S. Link to the article referenced in #11 above: <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/thompson-thrift-sells-last-apartment-development-in-multifamily-development-fund-delivers-strong-full-cycle-results-for-investors-302312076.html>



---

**Fw: Lakeridge Tennis Club Site Plumas and McCarran**

---

**From** Lauren Morris <MorrisL@reno.gov>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 7:11 AM

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

---

**From:** Mary Ann Quaglieri <maryanngatto@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, January 19, 2025 1:22 PM

**To:** City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

**Subject:** Lakeridge Tennis Club Site Plumas and McCarran

Attention: Sandy Shaff,

We object to the proposed apartment complex at the Lakeridge Tennis Club site.

Our reasons:

1. The density of the project is over the top. It is not in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.
2. The design of the project is more appropriate for inner city. It has no redeeming quality. It is almost institutional.
3. One would expect two cars per unit but parking can only handle one car per unit.
4. Traffic on McCarran is almost gridlocked as it is. Even with widening of McCarran the traffic burden will be overwhelming.

Mary Ann & Charles Quaglieri

2000 Pheasant Lane

Reno, Nevada 89509

Sent from my iPhone



---

**City Council Comment received from Nancy Chontos**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Tue 1/21/2025 10:07 AM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Nancy Chontos

Commenting on behalf of:

n/a

Ward #:

Ward 2

Email Address:

nancychontos@gmail.com

Phone Number:

949.357.8700

Address:

5042 Lakeridge Terrace East, Reno, NV 89509

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

I Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

I.1.

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

Yes, I will check-in with the City Clerk upon arrival.

**If no, enter comments below:****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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

Yes



---

**Project LDC25-00016 (Plumas Redevelopment)**

---

**From** Nancy Jones <wanaski@icloud.com>

**Date** Mon 1/20/2025 8:57 PM

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

Dear City Council of the City of Reno:

My name is Nancy Jones, I live in Lakeridge Terrace West.

I live on the corner of West Plumas and McCarran and have direct impact from the traffic on that corner. It's not just daytime or commute time being the busiest, the ambulances and sirens and car racing going up McCarran in the evening and middle of night should also be taken into consideration. McCarran has become a raceway & A New 273 complex will bring in more emergency vehicles and less safety. It's also the noise impact. It's my understanding McCarran is an NDOT project, Lakeridge Terrace West did not receive a noise reducing fence, like my neighbors up the hill or on Lakeridge Terrace East. Any accidents could easily go through the wooden fence on McCarran/Plumas corner, which is the community pool &/or into my house!

Has the 5-10 year McCarran project (NDOT) mentioned in the December meeting been verified by the City? 10 years wait for traffic relief?

Where on my corner can McCarran be widened?

Also, the same corner, The driveway going into my complex by our pool is right on top of the turn lanes going onto McCarran. More traffic would render that entryway impossible to use.

I won't repeat the other concerns already stated in the prior meeting.

I'm not opposed to the development of the property, but please keep it in the aesthetics of our Lakeridge community. To compare this proposed project to some developed in the North Valleys is being "out of touch" with a different community structure.

Thank You For Your consideration

Nancy Jones

Sent from my iPad



---

**City Council Comment received from Patricia Cromer**

---

**From** Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

**Date** Fri 1/17/2025 2:43 PM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Patricia Cromer

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Unsure/Other

Email Address:

spedatty@gmail.com

Phone Number:

760-632-1748

Address:

4907 Lakeridge Ter. W. , Reno Nevada 89509

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

I Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

Lakeridge Tennis Club developement.

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

**If no, enter comments below:**

The area of South McCarran and Plumas/Lakeside is a community of single- and two-story homes, condominiums, and apartments. With just these properties, Plumas already looks like a parking lot, with cars parked all along the street. The Lakeridge Terrace Tennis Club property does not have any egress for cars to park on the street, where are all these residences going to park? Are you going to limit the number of cars they can have per unit only leaving them to find a spot on the street where there are NONE left. Now, you want to change the landscape and allow a 4-5 story apartment building on the Lakeridge Terrace Tennis Club site with insufficient parking for the number of units that are being proposed. Additionally, apartments 4-5 stories will dwarf the existing properties and stand out

like an eye sore. The traffic at the corner of S. McCarran and Plumas is already an issue and now this! This is ridiculous.

**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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

No

## City Council Comment received from Rene Kerr

---

From Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

Date Tue 1/21/2025 3:16 PM

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

**Contact Info:**

Name:

Rene Kerr

Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:

Ward 2

Email Address:

rdixkerr@yahoo.com

Phone Number:

775-828-1181

Address:

4269 Muirwood Circle, Reno, NV 89509

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2025-01-22.

**Section:**

I Items - Public Hearing Items

**Item:**

LDC25-00016.

**Position:**

In opposition

**Are they speaking in person?**

No, I am submitting a written comment only.

**If no, enter comments below:**

I have been a homeowner in the neighborhood of Plumas and McCarran for 22 years. I am in opposition to the revised development plans accommodating two 5-story block/box high-rise apartment buildings. The nature and magnitude of that building type would be completely out of character for its surroundings. The plan for that area (business and residential) has always been low-rise buildings. The first plan for the redeveloped Lakeridge Tennis Club plot was a 3-story condo complex, much more suited for that neighborhood. Although wary of the increased traffic, a 3-story condo complex was something I did not completely oppose. However, the main concern is the infrastructure of that block not being able to handle the increased traffic. I drive that intersection at

least two times a day and the bottleneck at at Plumas and McCarran is grim and sometimes dangerous. Even before any redevelopment was on the agenda, my issue was that there were not 3 lanes of traffic on that block. If the 5-story building is the direction the planning committee wishes to pursue and ends up approving, then first, before any construction, the infrastructure needs to be fixed. A third lane of traffic MUST be added using the berm (previous grass berm from the Lakeridge Tennis Club) and make an additional traffic lane. I am not opposed to new housing on that lot. I am opposed the the number of units and the height of the project. Thank you for your consideration..

**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](http://www.Reno.Gov/RenoConnect) to view all newsletter topic lists.*

No



---

**Project number was LDC25-00016} – Plumas Redevelopment – Former site of the Lakeridge Tennis Club**

---

**From** Roman Versch <rversch23@gmail.com>

**Date** Mon 1/20/2025 11:06 AM

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

Dear City Council,

The core project to develop high density living is a noble use for the property; however 5 stories is an invitation to historically proven social failure planning by city council members of those cities - This development would be like the failed "projects" for low income families that still exist in many cities throughout the United States;

Often, working and low income families have no choice but to live with the high crime that comes with overcrowded housing. These high density housing units breed high crime and misery for its occupants and crater the economic and quality of life value of the neighborhood. There are hundreds of examples of failed good intentioned housing plans like this one.

Please do not fall for greedy developer returns and instead adopt a common sense density limit that preserves the quality of life for all citizens that live in the neighborhood. These people will be forced to live with your decision for decades to come.

A common sense density limit for those living on land equal to the size of 2 football fields would be a 2 story building like those that exist in the neighborhood.

Reno is a beautiful city with meaningful planning that has produced the quality of life we appreciate; Please continue on the path your previous council members adopted and reject this project as is.

Thank you,

--

Roman and Edie Versch  
6083 Carriage House Way, Reno