

**EXHIBIT C**

Case # LDC25-00044

From Jim O'Brien <obrienjim66@gmail.com>

Date Sat 3/1/2025 10:53 AM

To Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>

Hi Carter,

I recently received a pink courtesy notice for a proposed project in neighborhood. As a next-door neighbor of the property in question, 1249 Humboldt St. (case# LDC25-00044), I would like to voice my support for the proposed project in question. Due to the lack of garages / parking spaces in the neighborhood, our street is becoming rather congested. I know that adding the proposed driveway / parking pad, would help ease some of the congestion on the street.

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

Regards,

Jim O'Brien
obrienjim66@gmail.com

Carter Williams

From: MICHAEL FRANKS <mikefvernon@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 7:00 PM
To: Carter Williams
Subject: Ref # LDC25-44

This in reference to my neighbor and friend Karla Werninghaus' application to put in a driveway on her property. I feel this would not only benefit Karla but also us as neighbors. Fewer cars will be parked on the street.

Yours ,
Michael Franks
Sent from my iPhone

Allyson and Robb Wong
1243 Humboldt Street
Reno, NV 89509
allysondwong@gmail.com

February 13, 2025

City of Reno
Development Services Department – Planning Division
Attn: Carter Williams, Associate Planner
PO Box 1900
Reno, NV 89505
Via email: WilliamsCA@reno.gov
Re: LDC25-00044 (1249 Humboldt Street) Parking Variance

Dear Mr. Carter,

We are writing to you in regard to the requested parking variance at 1249 Humboldt Street. We are property owners at 1243 Humboldt Street and 1222 Humboldt Street. The location of the proposed variance is our immediate neighbor at our primary residence at 1243 Humboldt Street.

We are strongly opposed to approval of the proposed variance. We have lived at 1243 Humboldt Street for over 25 years. Part of the character of the neighborhood is that the homes do not have large garages facing the street or driveways taking up most of the front yard. The neighborhood is walkable, especially with the recent improvements to the streets and sidewalks. The structure of the neighborhood does not give cars and parking first priority, which is part of what makes this neighborhood great. When you buy a home in this neighborhood, you buy it with the understanding that street parking is likely part of the situation. Allowing parking in front of a home, especially in this neighborhood, takes away from the beauty of the neighborhood and the character of the Old Southwest. This is why there are planning guidelines in this neighborhood and others throughout the City that do not allow for parking in the front yard. It is not attractive and it devalues the property.

The property at 1249 Humboldt is not exceptional in its lack of off-street parking. In fact, it does have one off-street parking space off the alley and an additional functioning parking space between the alley and the rear house. There was no off-street parking for the front home when it was built and there was no off-street parking for the front home when the current owner purchased the property.

Conditions have not changed or in any way become an exception from the previous conditions or the conditions of the rest of the neighborhood. Allowing parking in the front yard does not enhance the urban character of the neighborhood, and in fact it compromises the urban character that we all love so much in the Old Southwest.

While there are examples of homes in the neighborhood that have parking in the front yard, we do not believe these were approved conditions. They are likely things that have happened over time with the conversion of a garage to living space and the driveway not being abandoned or with a homeowner doing work without proper approvals. Just because something has happened before does not mean that the problem should be perpetuated through this variance.

If this project is allowed to move forward as proposed, it is detrimental to our property. First, the proposed parking is so close to our property line that it will look like cars are parked in our front yard. Second, the proposed drawing does not indicate the required apron for the driveway, which would, in fact, be in front of our property. Had the apron been shown, you would see that the driveway apron would actually encroach 5' or 6' in front of our property, reducing our ability to park on the street in front of our house. Additionally, with the way the sidewalk turns ninety degrees at the corner of our property, the apron as shown in the provided detail would not allow for an ADA compliant sidewalk.

With these issues listed above, we would once again say that we are strongly opposed to the proposed variance. However, should it be approved, it would need to be with the condition that the proposed driveway/parking is moved at least 6' to the south from where the current drawing indicates. This would allow for the apron to be appropriately installed and for the proposed driveway to not impede on our ability to park on the street in front of our house. Additionally, it would allow for a landscape buffer between the proposed parking and our property.

We thank you for your time and consideration of these issues.

Regards,



Allyson and Robb Wong
1243 Humboldt Street and 1222 Humboldt Street

From: karla werninghaus
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 9:02 AM
To: Carter Williams
Cc: Christian Jones
Subject: LDC25-00044

Carter Williams, Reno Planning Commission

Mr. Williams and Commission,

I am writing regarding our application to build a parking pad in front of our home at 1249 Humboldt Street. Christian Jones with Firesky is presenting the details of the plan and the justification for our request. We have spent a good deal of time and money on this proposal, including \$3300 just to submit our request. As a former Ward 1 NAB member, I witnessed a few presentations requesting variances. I assumed they all received considerate, open-minded consideration from the Planning Commission, and I hope we will as well.

First, I believe it necessary to respond to the letter from our neighbor, Allyson Wong. It is my understanding this was the only letter in opposition. This is unsurprising given that these neighbors have been unwelcoming towards us since the moment we moved in, and would likely strongly oppose anything we proposed.

Her points are spurious.

She claims that installing a parking pad would ruin the precious Old Southwest aesthetics of the neighborhood. We know that many of the dozens of parking pads in the area were already in place when they moved in 25 years ago, yet this did not discourage them from buying here. If modifications are undesirable, why did they substantially modify their home, and build a large green rental property in their backyard? This is not Newlands Manor. There are even multifamily structures—with parking lots—constructed over the years here.

She writes that the parking pad as proposed would look like we are parking in their yard. What? When we purchased our home in 2019, they still had a remnant of an old driveway *immediately adjacent to our property line, over the sidewalk, which they parked on*. That was eliminated only when the City worked on the streets and sidewalks a couple of years ago. Most driveways in the area are along property lines. Vehicles park on them; no one complains or cares so long as they don't block pedestrians. If we were to dig out our crawlspace to convert to a garage similar to other houses on the street—a rather extreme and impractical alternative—that would entail placing a concrete driveway along the fence. They would probably dislike that, too. A tasteful paver parking pad, such as that across the street or diagonal across the intersection, looks better than most concrete or gravel driveways.

She states we should have had an understanding that street parking is the situation when we purchased. Actually, given the number of parking pads in the neighborhood, I assumed we would be able to install one as part of our initial landscape improvement project. I was astonished and disappointed when our original plan in 2020 was rejected. They built a tall garage and upper rental apartment in their backyard a few years ago as their fleet of vehicles became too large to accommodate on the street. Their tenants also park 1-2 vehicles in their alley carport, just as our 2 spaces by the alley are for use by our casita tenants. The Wongs are well aware of the limited street parking.

She argues that the proposed pad would impede their ability to park on the street. This is difficult to understand. We could not build anything across the property line, nor in violation of City curb requirements.

Of course we know that we have a carport off the alley, but also *another house* back there, as is common in this neighborhood. The alley parking is for that unit.

In short, her arguments are disingenuous and, I believe, unrepresentative of the opinions of other residents. I, and some other neighbors, don't like some of what they have built on their property (huge green garage, overshadowing yards), but must accept it. If the Planning Commission believes there is a valid reason to move the proposed pad to

the south side of our front yard instead of the north--for pedestrian flow or such--we can entertain that option, but it should have nothing to do with the Wong's complaints.

Why do we wish to install a parking pad in front of our home? There are many reasons; here are the main ones:

Like most Reno residents, we would hope to arrive home after work, a long trip, grocery shopping, etc, and *park at our own home*. This is not guaranteed with street parking, as others sometimes park at our curb, displacing us.

We would like to be able to service our camper, or do minor auto maintenance, in the safety of our yard rather than on the street.

I rarely drive to work, preferring to walk instead. This means that my car may remain static on the street for several days at a time. In Reno, a vehicle may be *towed after 72 hours without moving*, should anyone complain. Additionally, the parked car impedes street cleaning.

My vehicle needs to be *charged* in order to run on the (cheaper, quieter, less polluting) electric motor. I cannot do that on the street without running a long extension cord across the fence and sidewalk—infeasible and unsafe. Operating a fully electric vehicle would be impossible without access to an *electric charger on our property*.

Rules can be beneficial, but should not be static. They should bend or change when they no longer serve to benefit the citizens. We have seen how terrible, discriminatory CC&Rs written decades ago lingered way too long. Old regulations don't keep up with split lots, ADUs, the development of electric cars and scooters, nor how people use their properties. So many parking pads exist around Midtown and Plumas—as I have noticed and photographed—because *the homeowners want them*. I doubt that their neighbors object.

Thank you for considering our request.

Karla Werninghaus
1249 Humboldt Street, Reno, NV 89509