5-8-2024 - Reno City Council Meeting - Item # D.1 Title 18 Afforable Housing Initiatives

Written or Voicemail	Name	On Behalf Of	Ward	Email Address	Phone Number	Address	Support	Oppose	Concerned	Total	Date
							10	21	15	46	
Written	Connie Swanson			conswanson@aol.com					1		Sat 5/4/2024 9:57 AM
Written	Karen Porter Valle		Ward 1			643 St Lawrence Ave Reno NV 89509		1			Sat 5/4/2024 11:43 AM
Written	John A. White Jr.			john@lawquest.com	775-322-8000	205 Southridge Drive Reno, NV 89509			1		Sun 5/5/2024 6:55 PM
Written	Justin Haghighi		Unincorporated Washoe County	justin@haghighi.co	310-970-0000	12790 Fellowship Way	1				Sun 5/5/2024 8:27 PM
Written	Susan Entenman		Ward 3	sentenman2012@yahoo.com					1		Sun 5/5/2024 9:22 PM
Written	E. Gers			latenten2@yahoo.com		Reno, NV 89523			1		Saturday, May 4, 2024 8:59 PM
Written	Anonymous			d.luscav@yahoo.com					1		Sunday, May 5, 2024 12:07 AM
Written	Bruce Cowee			b2acowee@aol.com		6510 Mahogany Ridge Drive Reno 89523		1			Sunday, May 5, 2024 7:42 AM
Written	Mary Lee			dragonmommy1234@icloud.com				1			Sunday, May 5, 2024 8:37 AM
Written	Dori Goldman			shpilkas@icloud.com				1			Sunday, May 5, 2024 9:13 AM
Written	Diane Young McCormack			spirit@telis.net	530-559-9600	700 California Avenue Reno, NV 89509		1			Mon 5/6/2024 8:08 AM
Written	Katherine Oakley		Ward 5	snokat.rose@gmail.com		2710 Apollo Way	1				Mon 5/6/2024 9:12 AM
Written	Diane McCormack			Spirit@telis.org	530-559-9600	700 California Avenue		0			Monday, May 6, 2024 7:22 AM
Written	Roberta Decker			rmdecker44@gmail.com					1		Monday, May 6, 2024 8:28 AM
Written	Kris Engstrom			khallengstrom58@gmail.com				1			Sunday, May 5, 2024 6:44 PM
Written	Cindi Chandler			cindicha@msn.com				1			Sunday, May 5, 2024 10:24 AM
Written	Kristie Essa			krisessa@gmail.com				1			Sunday, May 5, 2024 3:24 PM
Written	Jean Johnson			possegirl@rapiddog.net		2295 Putnam Dr Reno 89503			1		Sunday, May 5, 2024 3:29 PM
Written	April Barker			a_barker_2@yahoo.com				1			Monday, May 6, 2024 5:39 AM
Written	Jeff Lage			jefflage@hotmail.com				1			Monday, May 6, 2024 8:17 AM
Written	Laura LaMere			smellandjack@yahoo.com					1		Monday, May 6, 2024 11:23 AM
Written	Carmen Gage			carmen.gage@gmail.com				1			Mon 5/6/2024 12:55 PM
Written	Margo Piscevich			margo.piscevich@gmail.com	775-825-4108	3745 Falcon Way Reno, Nevada 89509			1		Mon 5/6/2024 10:57 PM
Written	Roslyn Zimmerman			renoroz@nvbell.net				1			Tue 5/7/2024 7:20 AM
Written	Catherine Burns			nostatic8@gmail.com				1			Tuesday, May 7, 2024 6:27 AM
Written	Jennifer Lee			jleetahoe1@gmail.com				1			Tuesday, May 7, 2024 5:43 AM
Written	Beth Dory			kevindory@hotmail.com					1		Monday, May 6, 2024 9:10 PM
Written	Marshall Drake			mklmjdrake@gmail.com				1			Monday, May 6, 2024 8:57 PM
Written	Maia Johnson			maia@tsundoku.ne.jp			1				Tuesday, May 7, 2024 at 2:10 PM
Written	Maia Johnson			maia@tsundoku.ne.jp			0				Tuesday, May 7, 2024 at 2:07 PM
Written	William Mantle			Mantleward6@gmail.com			1				Tuesday, May 7, 2024 at 2:25 PM
Written	Tom Tate			misc@tatedesign.com				1			Tuesday, May 7, 2024 at 12:35 PM
Written	Thomas Albright	Truckee Meadows Bicycle Alliance	Ward 1	tpalbright@gmail.com	775-857-8639	2725 Solari Dr	1				Tue 5/7/2024 9:05 AM
Written	Ky Plaskon		Ward 1	Kyplaskon@gmail.com	775-287-0302	702 Hunter Lake Dr	1				Tue 5/7/2024 9:11 AM
Written	Cayman Levonian			Cayman.p.levonian@gmail.com			1				Tue 5/7/2024 9:30 AM
Written	Leah Sanders			leah.sanders14@gmail.com		1880 Coleman Dr.. Reno			1		Tue 5/7/2024 1:46 PM
Written	Wynn Hessler		Ward 1	wynnkhessler@gmail.com	775-412-7714	237 Clay St	1				Tue 5/7/2024 9:46 AM
Written	Dane Hillyard	Greenstreet Development Inc.	Ward 1	daneo@me.com	775-745-3950	9050 Prototype Ct. Reno NV 89521	1				Tue 5/7/2024 10:08 AM
Written	Sally Tate			saltate@gmail.com				1			Tuesday, May 7, 2024 9:55 AM
Written	Damien Cole			cole461@gmail.com	775-301-0774	17 S Virginia Street			1		Tue 5/7/2024 2:47 PM
Written	Kathryn Landreth			kelandreth@gmail.com				1			Tue 5/7/2024 11:28 AM
Written	Douglas Erwin			erwin@edawn.org					1		Tue 5/7/2024 1:53 PM
Written	Zoey Bray			zoebrayart@gmail.com			1				Tue 5/7/2024 3:00 PM
Written	Michael Brussio			mbbussio@gmail.com		625 Skyline Blvd			1		Wednesday, May 1, 2024 4:39:55 PM
Written	Anita Morales			morales775nv@gmail.com		1145 Dartmouth Drive, Reno 89509		1			Tuesday, May 7, 2024 3:11 PM
Written	Robbin Palmer		Unincorporated Washoe County	rpalmer@nnps.reno.nv.us	775-853-8572	4430 Fairvew Road, Reno 89511			1		Tue 5/7/2024 3:52 PM
Written	Sandy Shaff		Ward 2	sanshaff@sbcglobal.net	775-525-0656	4300 Swanson Ln, Reno, NV 89509		1			Tue 5/7/2024 3:57 PM
Written	Rose Mary Bucher Clune			rrickhalo@aol.com				1			Tue 5/7/2024 3:59 PM

Fw: ITEM D1

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 3:30 PM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC.

From: Anita Morales <morales775nv@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 3:11 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Subject: ITEM D1

I am writing to express my disapproval to changes to SF Zoning. I am not in favor of making these changes to benefit a few landowners who want to build multi family units. I have lived in the old Southwest for 30 years and any changes to the SF Zoning will change the atmosphere of these older neighborhoods and not for the better.

I believed SF meant single family and that was the zoning for a single family dwelling and no changes unless many hoops were gone through along with possible notices. These changes will turn this all upside down in those older neighborhoods left vulnerable such as older SW, Midtown, old NW, etc.. This will NOT help with housing needs it will benefit the person building on these lots, often investors, and these new duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes on SF lots will impact the neighbors and for many, housing prices will go down, noise will increase, landscaping demolished and parking will be more crowded. This change should NOT be made by a handful of people, many of whom do not even live in the neighborhoods which will be affected. They are protected. This UPZONING will change Reno forever and needs a lot more investigation and input.

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

Thank you,

Anita Morales
1145 Dartmouth Drive, Reno 89509

Fw: 5/8 Council Meeting item D.1

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 7:22 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC.

From: Kevin Dory <kevindory@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 9:10 PM
To: Hillary Schieve <SchieveH@reno.gov>; Jenny Brekhus <BrekhusJ@reno.gov>; Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>; Miguel Martinez <MartinezMi@reno.gov>; Kathleen Taylor <TaylorK@reno.gov>; Devon Reese <reesed@reno.gov>; Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Cc: JD Drakulich <DrakulichJ@reno.gov>; Silvia Villanueva <VillanuevaS@reno.gov>; Kerry Rohrmeier <RohrmeierK@reno.gov>; Alex Velto <VeltoA@reno.gov>; Harris Armstrong <ArmstrongA@reno.gov>; Arthur Munoz <MunozA@reno.gov>; Manny Becerra <BecerraM@reno.gov>; Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>
Subject: 5/8 Council Meeting item D.1

Dear Council,
From: Beth Dory

Please take the time to read the "Barber Brief" before the 5/8/24 meeting regarding agenda item D.1
https://thebarberbrief.substack.com/p/proposed-housing-initiatives-back

This "code-cleanup" is as clear as mud. From what I can ascertain there are three separate components to the clean-up that the public does not fully understand.

1. "affordable housing component" which ***is different from:***
2. the upzoning/infill to allow for four-plexes (by right) in single-family neighborhoods which don't have the protections of active CCRs, ***which is different from:***
3. the Acessory Dwelling Unit component of the "clean-up"

FIVE out of seven of your appointed Planning Commissioners voted to serve you this (Title 18) turd-sandwich. The Mayor's appointee, Mr. Velto is running for State Assembly and has received over $60,000 for his campaign, mostly from special interests.***Inquiring minds what to know: who exactly does Mr. Velto serve? the Mayor? the voters? or the special interests/developers who recently donated to his campaign? A couple of other Commissioners have real estate investments and/or are in the Real Estate business for which these land use changes (if ratified) could benefit them significantly, ***in my opinion.****** FIVE of these Commissioners: put ALL of you in a bad place; put your staff in a bad place; and most importantly they have compromised the public's (voters) trust. There may have been some good things in the "clean up" but how are you now going to "sell" this @#$% show to the voters?

- Please notify the public with regard to changing the definition of what a single-family (SF) zoning is. Most assume that (SF) means one house/unit on one lot. The definition was surreptitiously changed by staff/PC to include up to four units. E.G. single-family zoning now means up to four units... Really?

- The Map of the proposed affected properties don't show street names. After it's determined what properties will be upzoned (or whatever you call it) notify the homeowners by mail of this change.

- The staff should review all of the old CCRs from the proposed upzoned neighborhoods to make sure that they are not active. Many older neighborhoods still have active CCRs which prohibit multifamily just like in Mr. Reese's neighborhood. The staff must carve out these neighborhoods for any proposed upzoning to make sure that they are compliant with these CCRs. Planner Angela Fuss in an email to me said, *"Any CC&R's that restrict additional units would trump the City zoning code. If the CC&R's are expired, then they would not apply."*

- Require a recent boundary survey to any improvement that goes outside of the building footprint. Many old neighborhoods have fences that are not on the true boundary. By requiring this will reduce staff time and future neighbor wars/litigation.

- Reduce Short Term Rentals and consider anti-rent gouging laws.

- No parking required? *Enough said.*

- **Please review *your* Planning Commission appointees and if you feel that they are not representing your constituents 100% and instead representing their own agenda or self-interest: *ask them to resign.* Five of them went rogue during the 2/7/24 & 4/17/24 meetings.** https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y2b-gIbcKZ8 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CTEzIe7wKk0

- Please review the numerous Nextdoor posts. Nextdoor has about 20,000 households so perhaps 40,000 of your constituents receive notices. https://nextdoor.com/p/wMq7Qw6HJy4y?utm_source=share&extras=OTQzNTEwMDU%3D&utm_campaign=1715050383906. https://nextdoor.com/p/MDW2kBfw4b4c?utm_source=share&extras=OTQzNTEwMDU%3D&utm_campaign=1715020449129 https://nextdoor.com/p/PDB-NzyJYrFr?utm_source=share&extras=OTQzNTEwMDU%3D&utm_campaign=1715019389470

  https://nextdoor.com/p/BGD-yfqzDJN2?utm_source=share&extras=OTQzNTEwMDU%3D&utm_campaign=1715019893200. https://nextdoor.com/p/t3YNY3CTSf4Q?utm_source=share&extras=OTQzNTEwMDU%3D&utm_campaign=1715050668518

***Mr. Velto's contributors for his run for State Assembly:
https://www.nvsos.gov/SOSCandidateServices/AnonymousAccess/ViewCCEReport.aspx?syn=tAdxG7oxrTQtEeII0MMhaQ%253d%253d
https://www.nvsos.gov/SOSCandidateServices/AnonymousAccess/ViewCCEReport.aspx?syn=RIONPQtMet49X8Pi%252b3TQkA%253d%253d

***I've owned property/rentals in Reno since 1979. My husband and I currently own a bit less than two dozen rentals. If I was on the Planning Commission, I would recuse myself because if this vast land use change occurs, this will definitely benefit me and increase my property values..without a doubt.

Fw: Upzoning

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 7:21 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC

From: Catherine Burns <nostatic8@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 6:27 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Subject: Upzoning

Please don't upzone Reno we love this place just the way it is. Build more units for low income seniors
Sent from my iPhone

City Council Comment received from Cayman Levonian

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 9:30 AM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Cayman Levonian
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Unsure/Other
Email Address:
Cayman.p.levonian@gmail.com
Phone Number:

Address:

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2024-05-07.

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D1.

Position:
In Favor

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
Sprawl is unsustainable and will be a bill Reno needs to pay. Continuing to advance sprawl will leave us in situations similar to many cities in Texas, where workers commute to their jobs, face massive traffic jams on freeways TxDOT seems to expand indefinitely at the expense of their residents, and left a deserted downtown area where no one wants to be. Sprawl does not work and it costs the city dearly in economic terms as well as simple quality of life.

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

By checking the "Yes" below, you understand, acknowledge, and expressly agree that: (1) all information submitted by you will be entered into the public record, made available for public inspection, and freely disseminated without restriction; and, (2) any contact, personal, financial, or medical information

intentionally or inadvertently submitted by you will not be maintained in a confidential manner, or subsequently exempted from public inspection.

Yes

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

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

Yes

City Council Comment received from Damien Cole

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 2:47 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Damien Cole
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Ward 1
Email Address:
cole461@gmail.com
Phone Number:
775-301-0774
Address:
17 S. Virginia St.

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D.1.

Position:
No position stated - Concerned or Neutral

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
I'm skeptical this item will help increase the number of affordable housing units. The way the current ordinances are worded is that density bonuses are dependent on individual units being capped at a certain AMI (30%, 40%, 60%). But the new ordinance will be based off of "Average AMI" for the entire project, whose lower end of the spectrum is 60%. 30% and 40% will be wiped off the books. This means that so long as a developer aims their project at meeting the bare minimum AMI requirement of meeting 60%, they will receive a density bonus, which will raise the target AMI up to 60% for existing developments lower than 60% currently. It could lead to existing low-income housing being demolished in favor of more expensive WORKFORCE units being built in their place. As far as density goes in general, reducing setback and parking requirements to improve the "missing middle" housing issue, this ordinance seems more promising, but to call it an affordable housing one, and to gain my support, I would have to see some straight apples-to-apples charts comparing estimated projections showing that this would increase the total number of actual housing units ranging from 0-60% AMI.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

City Council Comment received from Dane Hillyard

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 10:08 AM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Dane Hillyard
Commenting on behalf of:
Greenstreet Development Inc.
Ward #:
Ward 1
Email Address:
daneo@me.com
Phone Number:
775-745-3950
Address:
9050 Prototype Ct. Reno NV 89521

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D-1.

Position:
In Favor

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
Item D-1 Starting in 1998 with our first affordable housing project in Reno at 5th & Record Street – we have developed over 3,000 units of affordable housing (at 60% or less of AMI) in Reno. We deeply understand the obstacles, challenges, and complexities of what it takes to get quality affordable housing built in our city. The staff recommendations on the Affordable Housing Initiatives are a great step forward to get more badly needed affordable housing developed in our city. We face tremendous obstacles to develop affordable housing in Reno today: • High Land Costs and limited supply • Impact Fees • High Construction Costs • Neighborhood Opposition to Affordable Housing • Delays in planning and Permit Approvals The proposed Affordable Housing Initiatives will immediately address several of these obstacles which will allow more affordable housing to be developed. Neighborhood Opposition is one of the biggest obstacles we face in affordable projects that we do not face on our market rate projects. This is due to misguided fears and misconceptions of what affordable housing is. We have been sued repeatedly to stop affordable projects based on the current approval process we must go through. We have had several project approvals appealed with no basis other than they don't

want affordable housing near them, which costs us substantial time and money and unnecessary delays. The proposed affordable housing changes will allow for more projects to proceed with the increased density, less restrictive requirements, and time savings with streamlined City approval processing. These affordable initiatives do not allow multifamily where it is not currently allowed and does not eliminate existing design standards, setbacks, traffic studies, shadow studies, parking requirements etc. so this is not a free pass to build max density everywhere. If you agree in the need for more affordable housing in our community, we urge you to support these initiatives… Thank You! Dane Hillard & Jim Zaccheo Greenstreet Development Inc.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

Fwd: May 8th - Title 18 item re: Guest Quarters

Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 1:53 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Doug Erwin <erwin@edawn.org>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 9:44:06 AM
To: Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>
Subject: May 8th - Title 18 item re: Guest Quarters

Naomi,
I hope you had a fun birthday and all is going well with your campaign. Do you recall the work you and I did regarding Guest Quarters a few years ago just after the ADU controversy? The basic issue is that Guest Quarters, as defined in Title 18, cannot be rented. The outcome of the last meeting on this was to not enforce this regulation until the broader issue of Short term rentals (STRs) was addressed. In the current revised draft of Title 18 this issue is still unaddressed, and the current language still stands. I know there is going to be a bigger conversation on STRS and ADUs but I was concerned that if the revised title 18 is accepted with the current language on Guest Quarters then it could be open for enforcement again?

Quick refresh - A guest quarters is a detached bedroom without a kitchen. People routinely rent bedrooms inside and outside of their homes so the current definition is completely out of alignment with modern reality. Being able to rent these rooms make housing more affordable. Also any rental where the owner is on the same property dramatically reduces the risk of issues (I have had both owner occupied and absent owner Airbnbs). I just wanted to put this on your radar – ideally they would change Title 18 to remove the rental restriction but just keeping it as unenforceable until the broader STR conversation is had would work. I was just concerned that once Title 18 is closed it wouldn't be reopened. I sent this information to Grace as well so she is aware.
Really appreciate your insights and support on this.

Kind regards,
Doug

Douglas Erwin
SVP Entrepreneurial Development
EDAWN
@douglas_erwin
775-745-4726
http://www.linkedin.com/in/DouglasRErwin

Fw: Item D1

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 7:21 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC.

From: Jennifer Lee <jleetahoe1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 5:43 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Subject: Item D1

Single Family Zoning means SINGLE FAMILY!!!! Protect our neighborhoods.
Jennifer Lee
Old Southwest

Comments in Opposition to Proposed Upzoning Item D1

kelandreth@gmail.com <kelandreth@gmail.com>

Tue 5/7/2024 11:28 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:kelandreth@gmail.com <kelandreth@gmail.com>

To the Members of the Reno City Council:

I strongly oppose the upzoning proposal that you are considering that would allow expedited authority to change a single family residence designation to a multi residence designation. Two principal reasons are that it would tend to have a disproportionate impact on homeowners of more modest incomes. For those residents, the consequence would very possibly be a reduction in the value of their homes, not to mention the quality of their living experience. Wealthier residents living in sites that are governed by CCRs would likely be protected from this potentiality. Secondly, not only would the existing residents be likely caught by surprise when a new multiple unit is constructed, with no opportunity to review and possibly oppose, there would have been no process to determine the impact of the new development on neighborhood density. This proposal appears quite deliberately to change the playing field for homeowners of more modest means and smacks of elitism. Owners of single family homes deserve to have their homes remain as such. Please reject this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathryn Landreth
Sent from my iPad

City Council Comment received from Ky Plaskon

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 9:11 AM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Ky Plaskon
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Ward 1
Email Address:
Kyplaskon@gmail.com
Phone Number:
775-287-0302
Address:
702 Hunter Lake Dr

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D1.

Position:
In Favor

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
As a homeowner with plenty of land and extra space, we need an easy way to be able to rent to families without a lot of administrative burden. We must do what we can to increase density to reduce pollution and reduce expenses for our most vulnerable people.

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

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

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

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

Yes

Letter for City Council meeting May 8, 2024

Leah Sanders <leah.sanders14@gmail.com>

Tue 5/7/2024 1:46 PM

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

May 7, 2024

Dear City Council members and Mayor Schieve,

I am still concerned about how the changes to housing…affordable, density, etc. are being lumped together. I appreciated having the opportunity to attend public meetings. However, confusion remains. And the lack of real input from the citizens, especially those inside the McCarran loop who will be most affected remains.

May I suggest

1. That this ***"upzoning"*** phrase be unpacked to let everyone know what will happen, when, where, and to whose advantage. Increased density for all areas except those with agreements seems quite unfair. How much of the density will really fit into a neighborhood, changing the character forever?

2. Perhaps a vote of the people would be warranted. Everything seems to be under the Affordable Housing umbrella as if all the proposed zoning changes would be affordable. That is not true. Different types of outcomes affect people in different ways.

3. A review of the Jacobs Development Agreement which has a lot of property that could be affordable housing, yet nothing is really getting designed or built.

Thank you,

Leah Sanders
Reno Resident
leah.sanders143@gmail.com
1880 Coleman Dr.. Reno

City Council Comment received from Maia Johnson

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 2:07 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Maia Johnson
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Ward 3
Email Address:
maia@tsundoku.ne.jp
Phone Number:

Address:

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
Item D.1 (Affordable Housing Initiatives).

Position:
In Favor

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
Many thanks to City Staff for their informative presentation on the proposed Affordable Housing Initiatives last month. While these are small changes that are not expected to unlock large amounts of housing development, I hope City Council will look upon them favorably as one step toward improving housing diversity and availability in our city. Restrictive zoning and uncertainties introduced into the process by discretionary approval are major obstacles to development. We should take every opportunity to improve this situation and allow Reno to grow organically. Furthermore, I would like to point out that duplexes, rowhouses, and other types of semi-detached or attached housing are considered single family homes in other cities, such as Philadelphia and Baltimore. Whether or not a unit is "attached" is a separate matter from whether it is a single-family or multi-family dwelling. Ultimately, these distinctions are arbitrary, and I would prefer the City refrain as much as possible from prescribing densities and housing types to neighborhoods. We must not let short-sighted concerns about property values, automobile traffic, and parking strangle our growing city. Whether nearby urban density decreases the market value of homes or not (I am skeptical), we need to acknowledge

that Reno is first and foremost a place for all of us to live, not an investment vehicle. That means we need human activity, small retail, and, of course, affordable housing - all of the things that make a place pleasant to live in. Concern for the vitality of our community and our built environment, not for individuals' attempts to bolster asset values, should drive our urban planning decisions. The Master Plan calls for increased density and support for multiple transit modes. If we are to remain true to this vision, we cannot let concerns about the convenience of driving and storing automobiles to dominate our planning decisions, either. In addition to the current proposal, much more needs to be done. We need to find ways to make it easier for small developers and retailers to secure financing. We need to formally discourage large property owners from holding vacant lots and buildings without improving, selling, or leasing them. I hope this will only be the beginning, but for now, the course of action is clear. Please support these initiatives!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

In support of Item D.1 (Affordable Housing Initiatives)

Maia Johnson <maia@tsundoku.ne.jp>

Tue 5/7/2024 2:10 PM

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

Many thanks to City Staff for their informative presentation on the proposed Affordable Housing Initiatives last month.

While these are small changes that are not expected to unlock large amounts of housing development, I hope City Council will look upon them favorably as one step toward improving housing diversity and availability in our city. Restrictive zoning and uncertainties introduced into the process by discretionary approval are major obstacles to development. We should take every opportunity to improve this situation and allow Reno to grow organically.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that duplexes, rowhouses, and other types of semi-detached or attached housing are considered single family homes in other cities, such as Philadelphia and Baltimore. Whether or not a unit is "attached" is a separate matter from whether it is a single-family or multi-family dwelling. Ultimately, these distinctions are arbitrary, and I would prefer the City refrain as much as possible from prescribing densities and housing types to neighborhoods.

We must not let short-sighted concerns about property values, automobile traffic, and parking strangle our growing city. Whether nearby urban density decreases the market value of homes or not (I am skeptical), we need to acknowledge that Reno is first and foremost a place for all of us to live, not an investment vehicle. That means we need human activity, small retail, and, of course, affordable housing - all of the things that make a place pleasant to live in. Concern for the vitality of our community and our built environment, not for individuals' attempts to bolster asset values, should drive our urban planning decisions.

The Master Plan calls for increased density and support for multiple transit modes. If we are to remain true to this vision, we cannot let concerns about the convenience of driving and storing automobiles to dominate our planning decisions, either.

In addition to the current proposal, much more needs to be done. We need to find ways to make it easier for small developers and retailers to secure financing. We need to formally discourage large property owners from holding vacant lots and buildings without improving, selling, or leasing them. I hope this will only be the beginning, but for now, the course of action is clear.

Please support these initiatives!

Best Regards,

--
Maia Johnson

May 8th Public Comment, Agenda Item D1

Margo Piscevich <margo.piscevich@gmail.com>

Mon 5/6/2024 10:57 PM

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

1 attachments (52 KB)

zoning for single family dwellings .pdf;

Please enter the attached PDF into the public comment regarding agenda item D1 for the May 8th City Council meeting.

Thank you,
Margo Piscevich - Ward 1

Margo Piscevich

3745 Falcon Way ● Reno, Nevada 89509 ● Phone 775-825-4108
E-Mail: margo.piscevich@gmail.com

Monday, May 6, 2024

Re: agenda item D.1 as it effects single family dwellings on the May 8, 2024 agenda

Dear Mayor Schieve and members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the recent recommendation by the City Planning Commission to permit duplex, triplex, and fourplex developments in single-family zoning units AF-8, AF-11, SF-3, and AF-5 without any public review process. Additionally, the proposal to allow Conditional Use Permits on all single-family dwellings without adequate notice to neighborhood residents is troubling.

Firstly, there has been a glaring lack of notice regarding these proposed changes. Despite the City's claim of notification, neither I nor any of my neighbors were made aware of these significant issues. This lack of communication undermines trust in the decision-making process and prevents affected residents from providing meaningful input.

Secondly, any move towards affordable housing should involve comprehensive neighborhood involvement and planning, along with transparent processes. By eliminating the public review process, the City risks overlooking crucial insights and perspectives from the community.

Moreover, it appears that the City has not adhered to the Master Plan, neglecting to consider the long-term vision for our city's development. This oversight raises questions about the compatibility of proposed changes with existing neighborhoods and infrastructure.

Furthermore, while larger cities may be pursuing similar initiatives, it's essential to recognize that what works elsewhere

may not be suitable for our area. Potential impacts on housing costs, neighborhood character, and infrastructure must be carefully evaluated to ensure responsible development.

Additionally, the proposed up-zoning and increased density could have significant implications for our community, including water, sewer, and parking requirements. It's crucial to prioritize the preservation of neighborhood character and quality of life for all residents.

Lastly, legal restrictions, such as those outlined in the Declaration of Restrictions for areas like Skyline Crest Unit No.1, must be respected and enforced. These restrictions serve to protect the integrity of our neighborhoods and should not be disregarded.

In light of these concerns, I respectfully request that the City Council veto the plan put forth by the Planning Commission. Instead, I urge you to prioritize voter and neighborhood input by facilitating transparent discussions and providing adequate notice to all affected residents.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your prompt action in addressing these issues and ensuring that the voices of our community are heard.

Thank you

Margo Piscevich

SchieveH@reno.gov; MartinezM@reno.gov; BrekhusJ@reno.gov; EbertM@reno.gov; TaylorK@reno.gov; ReeseD@reno.gov; DuerrN@reno.gov

Fw: Item D1

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 7:23 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC.

From: Marshall Drake <mklmjdrake@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 8:57 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Subject: Item D1

To Whom It May Concern:
Please do not act on Item D1. SF zoning means SF zoning! Our city infrastructure cannot reasonably support any more building. This action will mean more overcrowding, more noise, decrease in housing prices, ruining more views and demolishing landscaping. This should not be voted on without more important from actual affected residents. This is not how the government of a federal republic should behave.

Thank you!

Marshall
Sent from my iPad

Fwd: UPZONING

Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 1:53 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Michael Bussio <mbbussio@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2024 4:39:55 PM
To: Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>
Subject: UPZONING

Hello Naomi,
I believe with the recent rezoning changes you are now my city council member as I live at 625 Skyline Blvd. I am aware of the attention of the city Council and the planning commission to “up zone“ SF – 3 and SF – 5. How do I find if my address is in these areas?
I understand there will be a meeting on May 8 at 6 PM. I plan to attend as this is obviously a great concern to us.
Thank you thank you for your help in this matter.
sincerely,
Michael Bussio
Sent from my iPhone

City Council Comment received from Robbin Palmer

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 3:52 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Robbin Palmer
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Unincorporated Washoe County
Email Address:
rpalmer@nnps.reno.nv.us
Phone Number:
775-853-8572
Address:
4430 Fairvew Road, Reno 89511

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

Section:
General Opening Session Comment (unassociated to an agenda item)

Item:
D1.

Position:
No position stated - Concerned or Neutral

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
I am a climate advocate and concerned with the burning of fossil fuels for energy, greenhouse gas emissions, and sustainability of Reno. Reno is the fastest warming city in the US. You are considering housing and affordability iniatives in your meeting May 8. Though not directly related to agenda item D1, the City needs to promote a decrease in burning of fossil fuels, decrease in GHG emissions, and increase in sustainability by changes in the zoning codes, changes in building codes, ordinances, or resolutions, as appropriate. Reno is also one of the cities with the most sunny days. With grants, tax credits, and other incentives, including those available from the Federal government, some of which are specific to affordable housing, all housing constuction should employ solar electrification, or be constructed to be 'solar-ready'. Palo Alto has made adjustments to their municipal code to include setbacks for heat pumps and batteries. I provide the following resources: Low Income Communities Bonus Credit Program, HUD's $1B Green and Resilient Retrofit Program can also be applied to new construction, and 45L New Energy Efficient Homes Tax Credit which incentivizes the construction of new (or significantly rehabilitated) efficient SF/MF/manufactured homes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

No

ITEM D1

Rose Mary Clune <rrickhalo@aol.com>

Tue 5/7/2024 3:59 PM

To:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

These changes are too consequential to be voted in so quickly! Passing them will leave an impact forever on our beautiful city.

Please hold off on passing these changes until more investigation and input can be done.

Reno has already missed the opportunity to make the city look great in allowing the affordable apartments to pop up everywhere that look **ugly.**..3 stories blocking neighbors view of Mt Rose. Paint colors and design that look ugly....

Let's not have more of this. Please vote NO. Keep Single family Zoning.

Sincerely,

Rose Mary Bucher Clune

Naomi Duerrer District

Fw: From Roslyn Zimmerman regarding D1 Up-zoning

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 7:20 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Forwarded to PC.

From: Roslyn Zimmerman <renoroz@nvbell.net>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 4:47 PM
To: Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>; City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Cc: Jenny Brekhus <BrekhusJ@reno.gov>; Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>; Miguel Martinez <MartinezMi@reno.gov>; Meghan Ebert <EbertM@reno.gov>; Kathleen Taylor <TaylorK@reno.gov>; Devon Reese <reesed@reno.gov>; Hillary Schieve <SchieveH@reno.gov>
Subject: From Roslyn Zimmerman regarding D1 Up-zoning

Hello!! I would like to add my NO vote to the proposed Up-zoning. LEAVE SF ZONING AS IT IS!! I am 80 years old, lived in Reno for over 54 years and was a NV Realtor for over 30 years and this issue scares me more than any other I have seen proposed in the last many years. This will not even affect many residents who live in neighborhoods with certain CCR's and/or HOA's so they can rest easy and feel protected which we do not. When I was in real estate one of the pressing questions or issues my buyers would be concerned about would be what was the zoning for the surrounding properties. For all the years I worked in this field I felt confident that what showed up on the assessor's roles was the zoning and I believed that to change this designation would require special use permits, notifications, etc. What you are seemingly proposing now is relaxing SF zoning so that it is possible people who are buying or already residing in homes thinking they are adjoined to SF properties may wake up to multiplex units being built next to them and have no real say or input in what is happening near them. This is just wrong that a handful of people, many of whom may not even live in these affected neighborhoods, can make this change which will leave residents feeling powerless and anxious. This Up-zoning will NOT help with housing issues. It will help the owner or investor make money or possibly increase the value of his own property BUT I am sure that the homes surrounding this newly developed multiplex property will possibly go down in value and there will be increased noise, destruction of landscaping, the parking will be more crowded, etc. There are NO positives for those SF adjoining homes which are not turning into duplexes, etc. I have spoken to many neighbors, friends and family in several of these older housing developments and NONE of them knew anything about this possible change and were stunned and so upset wondering how this did not get huge notices via postcards, etc. Many of these residents are older, like I am, and some do not have computers or see local updates regularly. We have enough uncertainty in this world today and this change is so consequential and needs a lot more research, discussion and input. PLEASE do not do anything that will change some of Reno's neighborhoods forever without a lot more work and discussion from affected neighborhoods!! THANK YOU!! Roslyn Zimmerman and family

Fw: Zoning code proposals update

Barbara Aufiero <AufieroB@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 10:11 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>
Cc:City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

1 attachments (71 KB)
zoning code issues.pdf;

Forwarded to PC.

From: Sally Tate <saltate@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 9:55 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>
Cc: saltate@gmail.com <saltate@gmail.com>
Subject: Zoning code proposals update

Please add this as public comment for Wednesday meeting , may 8, 2024. Thank you.

To: City Council Members, Mayor Schieve, City Manager,
From: Sally P. Tate
Date: 5/7/2024
Re: All Proposed zoning issues

Code “cleanup” has turned into a massive overhaul, resembling the likes of so many failed cities: Seattle, Portland, LA, Minneapolis. It appears the city staffers want to create a model after these, which will make Reno, unrecognizable, void our uniqueness and value on nature and the beautiful Great Basin region. Based on data, many of these changes have failed or provided little to no effective transition to housing. We don't want you to lose sight of our geographic region, respect it, don't destroy it. Of course, many of you live in the “safe zones”, so you don't care.

Let's outline the issues:

1. **The city staffers are targeting all the older parts of Reno**, not the later developments which include Somerset, Caughlin Ranch, South Meadows, Double Diamond. These development are all considered protected”, “safe” zones, and part of an INCLUSIVE grouping of housing. I guess you could say the new “privileged” society in our city, only because the location of their residence has HOA/CC&Rs!.

Targeting the historic area, the old southwest, the old northwest, midtown, Powning district as well as midtown in single family housing regions must be untouched and remain as SF zoning. If you are serious about erasing all SF regions, then, implement a new policy that for any new building developments, there will be no exclusive SF zoning regions, but more of planned communities which include SF, town houses, row houses, apartments/plexes. Your approach is grossly unfair, unjustified, inequitable, only because these developments built in the early days did not have HOAs or CC& R's for the most part at the time they were established. Should this make all these homeowners less entitled to a fair treatment by the city? I don't think so.

2. **NO plexes of any sort should be permitted in the SF zoned regions**.
When Reno was initially planned with the Newlands tracts, which was a planned community in its day, the Marker Tract (between Gordon and Arlington and California and Monroe) was identified for multifamily and built for the working core and remains as such today. And here we are, almost 100 years later, still trying to get something built for the working core without much success.

Allowing plexes/apartments of various sizes will destroy the character of long established neighborhoods. It will reduce more green space and eliminate trees which make Reno special. Many of the lots are small and the land would be swallowed up by structures. This will contribute to further global warming issues due to increased concrete covering our land surface and further impact our temperatures. We are already noticing such a change. Parking would also create a major problem on these streets.

Adding various plexes in the SF zones would provide insignificant benefit in the overall market. Yet, it would be more costly and detrimental to these old quaint neighborhoods with tree lined streets and change the overall character of these established communities. It would actually be the destruction of these areas.

3. **Any Parking regulations must continue to be implemented in any construction.** Affordable housing that meet average 60% AMI should not omit the parking requirement. Our city does not have

a very extensive metro system and it is dangerous to ride a bike, as confirmed by the Netherlands consultant who assessed our city, and stated that it was unsafe. We are hilly and experience 4 seasons. Street parking is NOT a solution. A huge percentage of our city residents must drive to work. Maintain parking regulations for all builds! Regardless of affordable housing. That is a cope out to eliminate parking criteria. Builders must commit to provide parking in every situation with no flexibility or compromise by the city staffers.

4. **No multifamily/plexes in SF zoned regions should be** permitted "**BY RIGHT**". We must continue to have transparency and be provided input to such matters. WE need to continue the public process and be allowed input. I can't even conceive of someone building on a property next to me practically on my property line without any transparency and input as appropriate. That does not lend itself to good neighborly sharing.

5. **NO building in SF zones should have requirements eliminated for minor and major deviation to set backs, especially for affordable housing. This can lend itself to major territorial disputes.**

6. If the city is serious about "eliminating SF" designation, then enact a new policy. Don't change existing zones, but state that there will be no new SF zoning. For any new housing, require community of SF houses, apartments/plexes, rowhouses, small retail with green space, trees, parking, and trails. This community has worked quite well in the Netherlands and would serve us well to continue to create a quality of life in our special environment. Naomi Duerr had mentioned one time that the apartment complex on Moana/Plumas had too much density without providing enough green space for the residents and this did not provide as good a quality of life for them in our geographic region. This must be addressed in each development. We can not just build structures to fill the lot to gain maximum density.

7. **Work on more effective infill in downtown region**. WE have way too many empty lots. This is where we need to focus as it will have a much greater impact on providing housing for our population. Give rigid time lines for affordable housing completion, consequences for delays, and incentives for adhering to a faster time line on completion. This area is better served by our transit system. Question is...what percent of these lots are owned by Jacobs Entertainment? And, what are their time lines...I had heard that some structures would not be done for 10 years!! How accurate is this?

Toll Brothers seems to get what they want and complete projects timely. But, none of these are affordable housing and technically do not solve our immediate problem. They are all luxury homes! Our constant saga...with not much of a solution .

Instead, we have city staff recommending an ineffective approach instituting various duplexes, triplexes etc, permitted "by right"(no public process or input), in our current SF designated regions as previously noted. This obviously is a poor substitute, has no major impact on the problem and is unfair to all our older communities previously established in Reno.

As noted, Institute a policy of no new SF zones, and keep the existing ones. For any new housing, require a community of SF houses, apartments, plexes, row houses, small retail with green space, trees, parking, trails, and parks. That will better suit everyone's quality of life instead of destroying what people currently have.

City Council Comment received from Sandy Shaff

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 3:57 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Sandy Shaff
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Ward 2
Email Address:
sanshaff@sbcglobal.net
Phone Number:
775-525-0656
Address:
4300 Swanson Ln, Reno, NV 89509

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D1.

Position:
In opposition

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
I am in agreement that there are Housing and Affordability issues that need to be addressed in the City of Reno. I want to thank the Reno City Council staff that answered my questions. My comments on the workshop presentation are as follows: Specific to Affordable Housing to satisfy SB 213: Incentives for Affordable Housing and expedite review of Affordable Housing: • I am in favor with the recommendation to assign a staff liaison to all affordable housing projects during building permit review. The changes that the Reno City Council made three years ago to modernize and streamline the code and allow Density Bonus was proactive in addressing the incentive part of SB 213 and adding a staff liaison to help navigate the process would certainly expedite the review process. I would add that commercial land development should include a percentage of affordable housing be built as part of the project, especially, if they want to attract future employees (i.e. Damonte Downtown). The designated MF areas of the project can be By-Right as well. Affordable Housing should be incorporated in the development of large apartment units as a percentage of the project. This will not alter the nature of the neighborhood. o Staff proposed to increase density bonus to incentivize

developers to use it. However, the examples that were given, Motel 6 conversion project and the Wells Ave. project both met their objectives with the current density bonus in place. I think that the current economy and high interest rates should also be factored in the analysis of whether current Density Bonus has been successful. How many more projects would have come online if the financing and economic climate was more favorable? • Allow More Development By-Right I am not in favor of allowing more Development By-Right. This is where the staff liaison will be beneficial in expediting and streamlining the process, but at the same time get community onboard with the project. • Allow More "Missing Middle" Development Council Staff recommends expand where we allow duplex, triplex and fourplex (DTF) units in SF-3 and SF-5 zoning districts with a Conditional Use Permit. o Planning Commission recommendations for Missing Middle Allow this all by-right in all single-family zoning districts, with no input from the public. Go straight to building permit. I am not in favor of this recommendation. Driving through the SF-3 and SF-5 neighborhoods, it is very obvious that there are many custom and semi-custom homes and custom developments in these zoning areas. These homeowners made the biggest purchase of their life on a 30-year investment and, if they are like my husband and I, they relied on the Reno Master Plan map to make their purchase decision. We actually had a lot come up for sale in Hidden Valley that we were very interested in, but the on Reno Master Plan, it showed what in now Veteran Parkway, planned to be built in back of the lot in the future. It made our decision easy to back out of the purchase. To make a change to these neighborhoods would be a breach of trust with the homeowners. They most likely purchased during a time before PUDs were the norm and the Reno Planning Map was the PUD. One of the unintended consequences of allowing DTFs in these zones would be to incentivize Developers to outbid single family homeowners on homes and redevelop the lot into DTF units. This would change the nature of the neighborhood drastically for the worse and prompt some questions: • Would homeowner insurance in the area increase as a result of the mixing of MF and SF zones? • Would there be an increase in property tax rates? • Would neighbors be able to band together and create CCRs for their neighborhood to exempt them from allowing DTFs? As I am out of space in the comment section, the full version of this comment will be emailed to you. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

City Council Comment received from Thomas Albright

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 9:05 AM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Thomas Albright
Commenting on behalf of:
Truckee Meadows Bicycle Alliance
Ward #:
Ward 1
Email Address:
tpalbright@gmail.com
Phone Number:
775-857-8639
Address:
2725 Solari Dr

A new comment has been submitted for the Reno City Council Meeting held on: 2024-05-07.

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D.1.

Position:
In Favor

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
While there's no silver bullet, these are important measures to address affordable housing and help guide the development of Reno in ways that are more financially, socially, and environmentally sustainable moving forward. We have seen perhaps nowhere more so than in neighboring California how "NIMBYism", often under the guise of protecting "neighborhood character" only ends up making cities unaffordable and unsustainable. Denser cities with more options across the financial spectrom, when accompanied with thoughtful planning and transportation options are more livable for its residents and help give residents more choices and freedom in their living and transportation choices. Thank you.

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

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

Yes

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

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

No

Fwd: Comment for May 8 meeting, item D1

Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>

Tue 5/7/2024 1:52 PM

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

Get Outlook for iOS

From: Tom Tate <misc@tatedesign.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 7, 2024 12:35:42 PM
To: Naomi Duerr <DuerrN@reno.gov>
Subject: Comment for May 8 meeting, item D1

I live in the Newlands Historic District in Ward 1, soon to be Ward 2. I am writing to oppose allowing duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes in single family zoned areas.

I believe that single family zoning is the best place for families to raise their children. Many people seem to agree because in large cities, they will endure brutal, lengthy commutes from the suburbs in order to provide this environment for their families. When a city zones an area single family, it has promised that the essential nature of the area will be preserved. The current proposal breaks that promise and violates the trust of the residents.

The proposal is also misleading, bordering on fraudulent, because it does not change the zoning name but allows more density. If fourplexes are built in a SF-8 area, it effectively becomes MF-32. I understand it is not identical to a a real MF-32 because it doesn't have buildings with more than four families, but the density is the same. How can 32 families per acre be called an 8 family per acre zone?

There are obvious issues with utilities and infrastructure when the number of people in an area is quadrupled. This is especially true in the older parts of town where the infrastructure is marginal to begin with. The idea of upzoning only works if a negligible number of new residences is added, in which case housing is not really improved. Why take the risk of destroying established neighborhoods for tiny housing gains?

The proposal is grossly unfair because it only applies to the old parts of town and not the newer areas. Very few properties prior to the late 1920s have CC&Rs while most properties in single family areas after that time have restrictions that prevent multi-family dwellings. Sommerset, Caughlin Ranch, Damonte Ranch, and many other areas will not be upzoned. Because the construction is "by right", the first time neighbors will find out about it is when the heavy equipment shows up and they start cutting down trees. This is wrong.

Perhaps the most concerning is that it shows no imagination and does not account for the unique characteristics of Reno. It's just a rehash of the report by Shane Phillips from six months ago. Most great cities have a dense core that supports transit and services but the proposed plan could be called dispersed density. Not only is this an oxymoron, it is also bad planning. Reno deserves better.

City Council Comment received from William Mantle

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 2:25 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
William Mantle
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Ward 3
Email Address:
Mantleward6@gmail.com
Phone Number:
7754320788
Address:
2040 Angel Ridge Drive

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
1.

Position:
No position stated - Concerned or Neutral

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
I am in favor of densification, but incentives need to be kept at smaller unit levels like 800-1100 sqft or less, densification mustn't overload infrastructure, and we can't release our rights to public review. I would also like to see tangible requirements for heat island abatement.

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

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

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

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

No

City Council Comment received from Wynn Hessler

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 9:46 AM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Contact Info:
Name:
Wynn Hessler
Commenting on behalf of:

Ward #:
Ward 1
Email Address:
wynnkhessler@gmail.com
Phone Number:
7754127714
Address:
237 Clay St

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

Section:
D Items - Department Items

Item:
D1.

Position:
In Favor

Are they speaking in person?
No, I am submitting a written comment only.

If no, enter comments below:
I am in support of proposed changes to Title 18 of the Reno Municipal Code pertaining to housing and affordability initiative. I have not heard a good argument against moving forward with the changes and think that the overall benefits of increasing affordable housing and the housing supple in general far outweigh the benefits of ample parking and increased property values for some. The lack of affordable housing has forced many in our community into homelessness which results in despair and poor well-being of these people and public spaces that seem unclean and unsafe. Stable housing is a basic human need and we, as a society, have the ability to ensure it is available for all our citizens. Everyone benefits from this in the form of safer, cleaner cities and happier, healthier, and more productive citizens. Duplexes and triplexes and other forms of dense housing exist all over the city. Further, they have existed for a long time, there are plenty of these structure types in our historic neighborhoods. Therefore it does not make sense to suggest adding these housing-types would change the character of our area. Even if it does, changes occur everyday and they will occur whether we accept them or not. We can choose the direction of the changes, to an extent. In this case, we can

choose to adapt and meet the needs of additional housing or we can choose to keep housing the same and continue to see an increase in poverty, homelessness, and desperation, and the decline of our public spaces. To not adapt means we, as a society will fail. As the saying goes, if you don't bend you will break.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

FW: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D.1

Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>
Tue 5/7/2024 3:00 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

1 attachments (69 KB)
Public Comment - 26 - 2024-05-08.pdf;

Good afternoon,

Please see the public comment below for Item D.1.

Best,

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, May 7, 2024 2:59 PM
To: Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
Subject: Public Comment Received - 2024-05-08 PC Meeting - D.1

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

Planning Commission Meeting Date: 2024-05-08

Agenda Item or Case Number: D.1

Comments:

I am in support of item D.1 We must make sure to find alternatives to urban sprawl that is negatively affecting our city -financially, environmentally, and socially. Measures in D.1 will be an important step in addressing our current predicament. Our city must remain cohesive, affordable and bike-friendly, to be more resilient as Reno becomes an even hotter place with climate warming. Please work on these sustainable solutions now for the future.

Email Address: zoebrayart@gmail.com

Phone Number:

Address: 652 arbutus street, reno, nv 89509

Name of Commentor: zoe bray

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

Submitted: 5/7/2024 9:59:16 PM