

Exhibit G - NAB Member Comments

Which Category Describes You	NAB Member
Case Number	LDC23-00031
Do you wish to opt-in to receive Reno Connect Development Project email newsletters?	Yes
NAB Member Comment Form	
Ward Number	Ward Two (Naomi Duerr)
Full Name	Donna Keats
Contact Email	dkeats@sbcglobal.net
Contact Phone Number	7758254495
Compatibility of proposal with surrounding area.	<p>not so much - five stories across the street from single family residential seems like a rather abrupt change</p> <p>Apparently minimal traffic impact - BUT - pedestrian safety probably needs mitigation.</p>
Traffic impacts & pedestrian safety.	<p>The written narrative states that residents can walk one block to access goods and services. Although this is true, before you take it at face value, you should try to cross Redfield Parkway as an old and slow person would walk. My observations, based on my semi-regular use of this street, are: It's a wide street and would take some time to get across if you walk slowly or with aids. Although it isn't always heavily traveled, vehicles tend to speed and often drive carelessly. I question the safety of seniors attempting to cross Redfield Parkway at Baker Lane. I suggest considering improvements to the crossing with pedestrian signal crossing lights or a speed bump to slow traffic.</p>
Does the proposed design contribute to and enhance the character of the area.	<p>Golly. The streets and back sides of businesses like Sam's Club don't care what goes there. However, the building height is out of scale with adjacent residential uses the nearby commercial buildings.</p>
Environmental impacts.	no idea
Leave other comments on this case here.	<p>This should be my first comment. I think this would be a great project. My comments are not intended to be in opposition of approval - although I do think the pedestrian crossing for residents needs to be improved and I do think the building height and mass is out of scale and lacks transition to</p>

surrounding uses.

I'm submitting the following comments because I'm bothered by a process issue. My impression from reading the "Major Deviation Written Narrative" is that the project was intentionally designed under the assumption that a major deviation would be granted. I'd like to know who made the front-end decisions to design a project that is intentionally out of compliance with Title 18, and who gave the advanced nod for a major deviation approval.

From the point of view of process and public hearings:

The narrative states that 1) the project will lose up to 20 units if the deviation isn't granted, 2) operations will suffer financially over the lifetime of the project if the 20 units are lost, 3) the design will be negatively affected by loss of the units, and 4) the delivery of units will be delayed if the deviation isn't granted.

Yet - the project was deliberately designed with 20 additional units that would require approval of a major deviation. The applicant has always known that there would be a public hearing for the major deviation. Theoretically it has always been possible that the deviation wouldn't be granted.

Therefore -

The narrative is basically pressuring the decision-making body into approving the major deviation because the design requires it. The pressure to approve comes from the nature of the project - who would vote against an affordable senior housing complex? My point is that there is a process problem in here somewhere. The project was designed assuming that a major deviation would be approved. Why and by whom was that assumption made and validated? Would this project have been feasible without deviations from Title 18 and the 20 additional units in the first place?

More generally -

It doesn't seem as though Title 18 is a meaningful code anymore. Too many new developments are designed under the assumption that deviations from Title 18 requirements will be approved. And they generally are. There must be a reason why so few projects are designed without some built-in lack of adherence to Title 18.

Perhaps the revisions to Title 18 were not well-done in the first place, and need to be re-evaluated.

This PDF is generated with the [Google Forms Notification](#) add-on.

To generate customized PDFs from Google Forms, download [Document Studio](#) ([video demo](#)).

These messages are not added in the [premium version](#).