



Public Comment <publiccomment@reno.gov>

New form response notification

1 message

Reno City Council Online Public Comment Received <cityclerk@reno.gov>

Tue, Dec 5, 2023 at 2:25 PM

Reply-To: cityclerk@reno.gov

To: publiccomment@reno.gov

Your form has a new entry. Here are all the answers.

Your Name (First and Last)	Andrew Samuelson
Council Meeting Date	Dec 06, 2023
Agenda Item	D.1
Do you wish to speak in person at the meeting?	No, written comment only (please submit your comments in the field below)
Your Comment (if you are speaking, it is not necessary to complete this field)	<p>Item D.1 Title 18 Zoning code updates. Please relax building articulation and other planning driven architectural requirements. Articulation requirements mandate random looking buildings with a smattering of shapes and sizes and styles, rather than a concise architectural vision. Worse, they require buildings that are more prone to water intrusion, are more complicated and expensive to construct, and perform worse from an insulation standpoint. Finally, the way we implement these in Title 18 is to require denser buildings to comply with harder standards. This is a penalty on density, where elsewhere in the code we state our intent to encourage density. These requirements make housing harder and riskier to construct, at a time when housing is in short supply. Please remove entirely or reduce articulation requirements, and add options for alternative compliance.</p>
Which City of Reno Ward do you reside?	Ward 1
Please state if you are in favor or in opposition of the agenda item in which you are commenting:	No position stated - Concerned or Neutral
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	Yes

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

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

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

No



Public Comment <publiccomment@reno.gov>

December 6, 2023 Council Agenda Item D.1., Housing Initiatives & Title 18 Code Update

1 message

Donna Keats <dkeats@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Dec 5, 2023 at 3:57 PM

Reply-To: Donna Keats <dkeats@sbcglobal.net>

To: "\"reesed@reno.gov\">reesed@reno.gov>, "\"schieveh@reno.gov\">schieveh@reno.gov>, "\"brekhusj@reno.gov\">brekhusj@reno.gov>, "\"taylor@reno.gov\">taylor@reno.gov>, "\"ebertm@reno.gov\">ebertm@reno.gov>, "\"martinezmi@reno.gov\">martinezmi@reno.gov>, "\"duerrn@reno.gov\">duerrn@reno.gov>, "\"publiccomment@reno.gov\">publiccomment@reno.gov>

To the Mayor and members of the Reno City Council:

I am writing to express my support for your November 1st direction to staff to separate housing initiative items from the update to Title 18, and to request that you repeat that direction at today's meetings.

Staff told me that the purpose of going to Council this week was to *verify which of the six housing initiative items* need to be removed from the code clean-up, and that they will upload that version online.

Council gave specific direction to staff to pull six housing initiatives from the Code Clean-Up on November 1st. Direction was also given to run the data to help decide whether or not to move forward with some or all of the initiatives and to help prioritize the initiatives.

My impression was that the decision to pull housing initiatives from the code-cleanup was unequivocally given. It was my understanding that the pulled housing initiatives would be considered separately on their own merit after more information was made available.

The staff report for the December 6th meeting states that staff recommends Council provide direction on the proposed housing initiatives.

- I request that you specifically direct staff to pull *all* of the listed items from the code clean-up.

Much was made of the importance of neighborhood outreach and planning at the November 1st special Council meeting. Council expressed concern about going forward with this level of densification in the absence of neighborhood planning and outreach in order to know where the "missing middle" and increased density is appropriate.

I understood that a neighborhood planning process was to be outlined *before* coming back to Council to go through the bullet points and make the decisions.

- I request that Council provide specific direction to staff to initiate a neighborhood planning process that will provide a context for the proposed housing initiatives, and an understanding of the effects of the housing initiatives that increase density without public hearings.

The housing data provided in the December 6th staff report is intended to better inform the decision-making process. If the decision-making process is to determine whether or not any or all of the six items under discussion should be moved forward, more detailed information is needed.

For example:

Proposed Incentives for Affordable Housing lists five affordable housing projects that triggered an entitlement process. What triggered the process? Were there any that did not trigger this process? How much and in what way did the public process change or delay or otherwise impact the original proposal?

Proposed Density Bonus Increases for Market Rate Infill lists projects that have utilized the density bonus allowance. How many of those on the list have been completed and occupied? How much time lapsed between permit and occupancy? Could the number of units added with the existing density bonus have been increased if the higher proposed

density bonus limits were used? What limits this to “targeted infill areas”, given that not all “infill” projects have coincided with the infill areas depicted in the Master Plan?

So many other things need better background information for a fair assessment. More evidence that these are appropriate tools for this City is needed prior to moving forward with any of these initiatives.

Density bonuses, limits on number of units that trigger an entitlement process and adding multifamily uses to additional single family zoning districts were well-vetted during the course of revising Title 18 prior to 2021.

- The staff report states that the proposed density bonus increase and the proposal to allow for more development by right are not expected to make a significant impact on the housing supply.

One might wonder why putting out more of the same is worth the time and effort.

Perhaps it's time to let go of the “easy answers” and try to identify the real problems in order to find real solutions, instead of continuing to tweak things that have already been done while knowing they won't make a significant difference.

Thank you for considering my comments in your direction to staff about Item D.1.

Sincerely,
Donna Keats
Reno Resident