

06/11/2025 - Reno City Council Meeting - Item J.1 Public Comment

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]



Fw: Agenda item "LDC25-00018 – Mt. Rose Junction Master-Plan & Zoning Map Amendment"

From Ralph "Stephen" Coppola <stephencoppola@aol.com>

Date Tue 6/10/2025 8:11 PM

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

Please add to the public record for Agenda item "LDC25-00018 – Mt. Rose Junction Master-Plan & Zoning Map Amendment"

June 10 2025

Honorable Mayor Hillary Schieve and Members of the Reno City Council

c/o City Clerk, 1 E. First Street, Reno, NV 89501

RE: Agenda item "LDC25-00018 – Mt. Rose Junction Master-Plan & Zoning Map Amendment" (± 0.99 ac on west side of Plumas St., ~145 ft south of Mt. Rose St.)

Dear Mayor Schieve and Councilmembers,

I am writing as a Ward 2 resident to express strong opposition to the proposed Master-Plan Amendment from Mixed Neighborhood (MX) to Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU) and the concurrent rezoning from MF-14 to a Specific Plan District (SPD) for the parcel at the corner of Plumas Street and Mt. Rose Street (Case No. LDC25-00018). Planning staff have recommended approval, and the Planning Commission forwarded the request to you after a 3-3 tie vote on June 5, 2025.

A. Core reasons for opposition.

1. Out-of-scale massing in a single-story neighborhood.

The surrounding blocks are almost entirely one-story detached homes with deep setbacks. An SPD expressly designed to support higher-density mixed use will introduce bulk, height, and shadowing that overwhelm the existing fabric, eroding privacy and neighborhood character.

2. Spot-zoning that undermines the Master Plan.

The City devoted years to creating the 2017 Master Plan to give residents predictability. Allowing a one-off SPD on <1 acre contradicts the Plan's call to "concentrate growth in designated centers and corridors" rather than in stable residential cores. Approving "exceptions by map" invites copycat petitions and erodes confidence in long-range planning.

3. Traffic and safety on a constrained roadway.

Plumas Street is a two-lane collector without dedicated turn pockets at Mt. Rose Street. Added trips from multi-unit housing and commercial uses will increase queuing, cut-throughs on alleys, and collision risk near the Mt. Rose Elementary Safe-Routes-to-School corridor.

4. Cumulative infrastructure impacts.

The Plumas sewer sub-basin already experiences wet-weather inflow surges. Intensifying density here means larger laterals, more impervious cover, and downstream storm-water costs that taxpayers—not developers—ultimately bear.

5. Heat-island and canopy loss.

Mature trees on and adjacent to the site moderate temperatures along an east-west pedestrian route. Redevelopment will remove most canopy and replace it with rooftops and hardscape, conflicting with the City's adopted Urban Forestry Master Plan. Between 1960 and 2024 the average temperature in Reno increased from an average of 67 degrees in 1960 to 79 degrees in 2024, or a total of 12 degrees. People complain about climate change due to pollution, but Reno paved over the marshes in SW Reno, developed all of the agricultural land, and paved it in between. This is due to short-sighted development and zoning. The recent additions of NRS 278.150 and NRS 278.170 are a reaction to that.

6. Precedent for eroding property values.

National appraisal studies find that incompatible height transitions depress resale prices of the immediately adjoining single-family parcels. Short-term construction taxes cannot offset the long-term erosion of the single-family tax base.

7. Better places for density already exist.

Reno's Master Plan identifies Virginia Street BRT, Moana Lane, and Convention Center corridors as priority infill areas with high-frequency transit. Redirecting multifamily supply there meets housing-production goals ****without**** fragmenting stable neighborhoods.

B. Request.

For the sake of long-term, prudent planning and the other reasons stated above, I respectfully urge you to deny LDC25-00018. Should Council wish to pursue additional housing on this site, please consider directing staff to work with the owner on a context-sensitive Planned Unit Development that caps height at two stories and requires deep landscape buffers to protect existing homes.

Thank you for your service and for considering the long-term livability of Reno.

Sincerely,

Ralph "Stephen" Coppola
