| June 12, 2024 - Reno City Council Meeting - Item #C.6 Case No. LDC24-00044 (Riverside SPD) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Written or Voicemail** | **Name** | **On Behalf Of** | **Ward** | **Email Address** | **Phone Number** | **Address** | **Support** | **Oppose** | **Concerned** | **Total** | **Date** |
| | | | | | | | **0** | **1** | **1** | **2** | |
| Written | Janet Coombs | | | jscoombs@yahoo.com | | 1200 Riverside Dr. Unit 1237 Reno, NV 89503 | | 1 | | | 6/5/2024 10:38 |
| Written | Ronda Theisen | | | oliveme@charter.net | | 1200 Riverside Dr. Unit 1258 Reno, NV 89503 | | | 1 | | 6/10/2024 13:28 |

# LDC24-00044 Riverside Dr from Multi-Family 30 units per acre to Specific Plan District should be DENIED.

Janet Coombs <jscoombs@yahoo.com>

Wed 6/5/2024 10:38 AM

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

I believe the change in zoning requested for LDC24-00044 Riverside Dr from Multi-Family 30 units per acre to Specific Plan District should be DENIED.

I feel the high density (122 units) requested is not suitable for this lot. The number of people living there could easily be 2-3 times that number. Each studio unit could accommodate 2 people and more in the one and two bedroom units. The project looks to maximize the financial return to the builder versus enhancing the neighborhood with additional housing and neighbors who are invested in the area. This design density seems more like a college dormitory or a hotel and is likely to have a high turnover of residents. All other properties in the surrounding area are compliant with the current density of 30 units per acre. We have also been told these units will be "market based" priced so they are not significantly adding to affordable housing. Higher density also has the possibility of adding to local crimes of opportunity. Recent news articles are also questioning the number of new apartments coming into the market might well exceed demand . All the existing neighborhood apartments are currently advertising availability.

I believe the current plan submitted is dependent on the owners of adjacent properties to provide access through their private property for Emergency Access Vehicles to the planned project. A recent survey shows this is unlikely to happen so changes to the proposed plan will be required.

Human density is only one consideration for this project that will negatively impact the neighborhood. The proposed project does not provide full vehicle parking for all the tenants. Not providing full parking will negatively impact the Riverside neighborhood which already has full street parking from current buildings and residents in the evenings and overnight. This neighborhood hosts many special events which require the closing of Riverside Drive for running, bicycling and charity events. Idlewild Park is the venue for community events such as Food Truck Fridays, Earth day, Farmers Market etc. which bring in large numbers of out of neighborhood people whom also require parking to participate and add to vehicle congestion. Riverside Drive has been developed for safely biking and walking and jogging along the river by adding No Parking zones, and speed bumps to slow down automobile traffic and will not accommodate additional street parking.

The safety of all will be impacted by the vehicles associated with this project. There will be increased congestion leaving and entering the project. The intersection of Booth St and Riverside is not safe for left hand turns into the project or good visible access onto Riverside Drive. This neighborhood is also home to Reno High School with significant pedestrian and vehicle traffic throughout the day that should be considered as well. Entering or leaving the proposed project via Jones Street will require cars to travel down the unnamed alley adjacent to it and likely create problems there as well. The current traffic study was done on a low traffic day in November which is traditionally a slow time for pedestrian traffic in the area and does not adequately address these seasonal issues. Where will visitors, maintenance vehicles, move in/move out vehicles be allowed to park and not impede current neighborhood resident traffic patterns?

The question of whether or not the current sewer system could handle the project is also suspect as the sewer outlet closest to the lot already gives off noxious smells frequently on warm spring and summer days. This project will be right on the river which is a precious resource for Reno and any development should take that into account. How will this project add to the already increasing downtown and river corridor heat temperatures?

I believe this lot should be developed to enhance the existing neighborhood but at the current historical zoning of 30 units per acre (MF-30).

I was disappointed that the Neighborhood Advisory Meeting scheduled for April 8th was cancelled and not rescheduled until after the planning commission met. This meeting would have allowed local residents to voice their concerns so they could be presented as part of the Neighborhood Advisory Board recommendations and concerns.

Janet Coombs
1200 Riverside Dr. Unit 1237
Reno, NV 89503

# Fw: Public Comment Item C.6 for 6/12/2024 Council Meeting

Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>
Mon 6/10/2024 1:28 PM
To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Hello,

See below regarding a public comment for an item at the next City Council meeting.

---

**From:** Jim Umbach <UmbachJ@reno.gov>
**Sent:** Monday, June 10, 2024 12:58 PM
**To:** Grace Mackedon <MackedonG@reno.gov>
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment Item C.6 for 6/12/2024 Council Meeting

---

**From:** Ronda <oliveme@charter.net>
**Sent:** Monday, June 10, 2024 7:35 AM
**To:** Reno Planning Commission <RenoPlanningCommission@reno.gov>
**Subject:** Public Comment Item C.6 for 6/12/2024 Council Meeting

Re: LDC24-00044

On December 12, 2010, Washoe County ordered ownership of the parcels collectively known as 0 Riverside Drive to be transferred to the City of Reno on condition the lot be used for open space purposes, a fact that never makes it into the Background section when the history of this lot is discussed. The open space restriction remains on the March 31, 2011 quitclaim deed despite Reno's attempt to circumvent the requirement and defeat the legislative intent of the transfer by voluntarily paying Washoe County $105,000.00.

Is it possible that the failure to disclose the open space requirement in discussing the history of the parcel is to mask the desire to build 180 units on a lot with approximately 1 acre of buildable space, even exempting the developer from the requirement to devote 20% of the lot to landscaping? The pending zone change is wildly incompatible with the reason Reno even owns the land.

While I can grieve that the City Council is treating a unique parcel that could have enhanced access to the Truckee River and revitalized Riverside Drive as just another infill project, there is no doubt it will do so. The City has the exclusive right to change the zoning, while being the seller of the lot who accepted the zoning change as a condition of the sale!

Even though the financial self interest of the City is implicated in this deal, the Council can strive for an appearance of propriety by ensuring the developer presents complete and accurate facts for your consideration. There are several obvious "fails" that the Planning Commission and Cit staff refused to consider.

1. The site plan relies on creating an Emergency Access thoroughfare through private property owned by the Owners of 1200 Riverside Drive, and by moving an existing judicially created easement through the subject property so the developer can build to all four corners of the lot. Despite the applicant telling the Planning Commission that there was no issue, the site plan being proffered now is identical. As long as the developer refuses to listen to the concerns of 1200 Riverside Drive, the owners have no desire to solve his problems for him. We have no seat at the table, and, therefore, no incentive to let him use our land for his benefit.

Before granting the zoning change, the Reno City Council should do its due diligence and determine whether the project can even be built without usurping 1200 Riverside property and property rights.

2. The determination that the project will have no significant impact on the surrounding streets and will support an additional 802 vehicle trips per day relies on a traffic study done in the middle of November. It didn't even analyze a time when the intersection of Booth and Riverside is flooded with Reno High School students. No one in the City has answered what happens to traffic, including bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles, in April when Riverside Drive is shut down completely for the day because no one has assessed the impact on traffic and pedestrian safety during April – or May, June, July, August, September or October. Despite it being self evident to anyone aware of the existence of Idlewild Park, the Planning Commission and city staff refused to acknowledge that a Wednesday in November isn't the same as a Sunday in June during Farmers Markets, or a Friday in July during Food Truck Fridays, or a Saturday in April that saw not only two Riverside closures, but also Earth Day.

   The Council's packet includes a survey showing people might have found parking during Earth Day in 8% of the parking spaces in an area encompassing Reno High School, Vine Street, and West 2nd Street. This is not an argument that parking won't be impacted when nearly half the tenants, their visitors and vendors, of the proposed apartment complex will be without parking spaces! Due diligence requires an honest assessment of whether displacing visitors to Idlewild in favor of apartment dwellers protects the existing neighborhood.

3. One of the most curious things about the staff report is the recommendation to reduce the landscape to 10% because of the specious argument that some day a flood wall will be built along the Truckee River. Since a flood wall won't be built on the buildable land, this is a transparent attempt to enable to developer to overbuild on the lot, rather than have him pull back the concrete footprint so he can plant trees. Come on over to 1200 Riverside to see how it can be done.

The need for the developer and the City to push for these three things is because the rezoning is not commensurate with the physical limitations of the land. In fact, the apartment building, as designed, cannot be built.

Ironically, the Council will hear this recommendation on a June day when temperatures may reach record highs and in a time when Reno has been named as the city getting the hottest the fastest. Where are the tree canopies the Council used to say it wanted? Where are the concerns about urban heat indexes and climate change? Has this vision of Reno been replaced with a desire to become another San Francisco?

If the City forces too many people into too tight a space with insufficient parking and without consideration for the true traffic patterns in this neighborhood, you will have created a recipe for neighborhood discord and road rage. The City is not only practicing the worst kind of planning by defeating neighborhood density limits, it is practicing a social experiment favored by big city enthusiasts. You are trying to force people out of their cars by making parking and driving miserable experiences.

All you will do is make Reno a less desirable place to live. So long, open space. Hello, congestion.

Ronda Theisen
1200 Riverside Drive Unit 1258
209-815-6474