



**To:** City of Reno, Business License Division

**Business Name:** Majestic II      **Case#:** LDC21-00044

**Address:** N Virginia St & Seneca Dr

**Completed by:** Burow,C 13298

---

The following document is submitted for your consideration. The ideas, contents herein are the opinions of the listed, qualified Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Police Officer, and are based on CPTED Principles and Factors. Implementation of the recommendations in no way guarantees a crime-free project. Recommendations listed are designed to make the applicant aware of certain issues which may arise and present possible solutions.

---

**Natural Surveillance** (Concept focuses on increased visibility):

Noted Concerns: Based on proposed plans, known successful natural surveillance concepts appear to be considered in building design to include open view windows at celebrated entry points of businesses. With such a high visibility area the promotion of natural surveillance may reduce criminal activity. LED lighting with 90 degree cutoff and uniformity of spread in accordance with IES standards (proper color temperature of 4-5K Kelvin to illuminate true to color) promotes a decreased perception of crime and increases natural surveillance of normal users and observers.

Possible Solution / Resolution:

**Natural Access Control** (Concept that focuses on entry & exit points):

Noted Concerns: Natural access control concepts of physically guiding people through the space by strategic design of streets, building entrances, building layout and landscape appear to be implemented. Dedicated turn lanes large enough to accommodate Semi Trucks should be implemented as they are not indicated in proposed plans. North Virginia St in this area is a single lane undivided roadway and trucks need to have enough room as to not swing into oncoming traffic to properly make right turns into the complex. Dedicated turn lanes may reduce vehicle related CFS and prevent impeding traffic to make right hand turns into the complex, especially with such high residential traffic due to residential proximity.

**Territorial Reinforcement** (Concept of clearly defining ownership over space):

Noted Concerns: The use of pavement treatments in public, semi-public and private space, landscaping, signage, and CPTED fencing all help define ownership of a property which contribute to a reduction in criminal activity and perceived safety. Proposed plans appear to incorporate a celebrated entry way at business entrances which create social management and help ease identification. Adequate roadway signage helps first responders as well as legitimate users identify development.

Possible Solution / Resolution:

**Maintenance and Management** (Concept focuses on how Mgmt. runs/maintains property):

Noted Concerns: Maintenance plan to CPTED standards with lower tree canopy trimmed up to a minimum of 6' and low vegetation trimmed below 2' allows for the continued use of space for its intended purpose. Proper maintenance plans define territory, controls access, and creates ownership over space which all contribute to the reduction in criminal activity. Avoidance of low growing vegetation that will grow into the 6'/2' natural surveillance area should be considered to reduce the need for excessive maintenance to keep open visibility.

Possible Solution / Resolution:

**Design guide for reviewing project – CHECKLIST**

The design guide is summarized in the form of a checklist. The questions help you to go through the security aspects of a project. The checklist will provide an initial crime prevention through environmental design review for the project.

1. Sightlines
2. Lighting
3. Concealed or Isolated Routes
4. Entrapment Areas
5. Isolation
6. Land Use Mix
7. Activity Generators
8. Ownership, Maintenance, and Management
9. Signs and Information
10. Overall Design

---

<b><i>Sightlines</i></b>	Yes	No
1. Can sharp corners or sudden changes in grades that reduce sight lines be avoided or modified?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does design allow clear sight lines and visibility at those areas where they are desired?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do areas of concerns such as stairwells, lobbies of high-rise building have clear sight lines?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. If sight lines are blocked, can it be made visible by using glass or can other enhancements such as mirrors or security cameras be provided?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Does design allow for future sight line impediments such as landscaping in maturity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Does access to hidden areas such as underpasses or parking areas have clear sight lines?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Lighting</b>	Yes	No
1. Is there a need for lighting to be provided if the paths or spaces are not used at night? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is lighting adequately provided such that a person can recognize a face from about 10 metres? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does lighting provide uniform spread and reduce contrast between shadow and illuminated areas? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is lighting provided too glaring? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Are light fixtures provided for areas that require good visibility such as pedestrian routes and entrapment areas? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are light fixtures protected against vandalism or made of vandal resistant materials? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is lighting at areas used during night time e.g. parking lots, space around buildings adequately provided? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Is back lane lighting required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

<b>Concealed or Isolated Routes</b>	Yes	No
1. Can concealed and isolated routes such as staircases, passageways or tunnels be eliminated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
2. Are there entrapment areas within 50 - 100 meters at the end of a concealed or isolated route?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
3. Is there an alternate route?	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. If a pedestrian cannot see the end of a concealed or isolated route, can visibility be enhanced by lighting or improving natural surveillance?	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Are concealed or isolated routes uniformly lit? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is there natural surveillance by people or activities through various land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Is there formal surveillance? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Is access to help e.g. security alarm, emergency telephones, signage and information available? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b><i>Entrapment Areas</i></b>	Yes	No
1. Is there an entrapment area and can it be eliminated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Can it be closed during off hours?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Is the entrapment area visible through natural or formal surveillance? <b>NA</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Does design provide for escape routes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b><i>Isolation</i></b>	Yes	No
1. Does design incorporate natural surveillance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do areas of concerns such as isolated routes and parking areas provide natural surveillance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. If providing natural surveillance is not possible, are emergency telephones, panic alarm and attendants provided? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Can compatible land uses be provided to increase activity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Land Use Mix</b>	Yes	No
1. Are different land uses compatible?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Can land uses that raise security concerns e.g. bars and pubs, be located where their impact is minimized?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Activity Generators</b>	Yes	No
1. Can complementary uses that promote natural surveillance be provided?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does design provide for complementary users?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Does design reinforce activity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Is the area programmed for various events or activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Can a clustering of uses be used to support the intended activity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Are ground level activities incorporated in design?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Can areas be programmed to facilitate increased activity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Ownership, Maintenance, and Management</b>	Yes	No
1. Does the design provide territorial reinforcement through design features?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the design allow for easy maintenance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are there signs and information to guide people on how to report maintenance concerns? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Does the management of space provide maintenance priorities e.g. removal of offensive graffiti? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Signs and Information</b>	Yes	No
1. Are signs visible and legible? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are signs conveying messages clearly? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Is information adequate? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are sign strategically located to allow for maximum visibility? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Are signs well maintained? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are maps provided in large areas such as underpasses, parks, etc.? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are signs displaying hours of operation? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Overall Design</b>	Yes	No
1. Do quality and aesthetically pleasing built environments compromise security concerns?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>
2. Is the scale of development consistent with neighbors to avoid large gaps on streets?	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Is design of the built environment simple and easy to understand?	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is there space that can become dead space?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>X</b>

5. How is the built environment used at night time? <b>UNKNOWN</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are construction materials used to enhance safety and security?	<b>X</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments / Concerns:



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

*Metropolitan Planning • Public Transportation & Operations • Engineering & Construction*

Metropolitan Planning Organization of Washoe County, Nevada

March 11, 2021

FR: Chrono/PL 181-21

Mr. Brook Oswald  
Community Development Department  
City of Reno  
P.O. Box 1900  
Reno, NV 89505

RE: LDC21-00044 (Majestic II)

Dear Mr. Oswald,

The Regional Transportation Commission has reviewed this request for a special use permit for: a) grading that results in cuts deeper than 20 feet in depth and fills greater than 10 feet in height; b) grading disturbance of a major drainageway; and c) alternative building orientation to accommodate a ±247,295 square foot industrial/warehouse development. The ±19.92 acre site is located on the southwest corner of Seneca Drive and North Virginia Street. The site is in the Mixed Use/North Virginia Street Transit Corridor (MU/NVTC) zone and has a Master Plan land use designation of Industrial (I). This project has requested to be reviewed, analyzed, and heard using the Title 18 standards in existence immediately prior to the adoption of the comprehensive zoning code update (Zoning Code RENOvation) on January 13, 2021.

The 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies North Virginia Street (Business 395 to Red Rock Road) as an arterial with moderate-access control. To maintain arterial capacity, the following RTP access management standards should be maintained.

Access Management Standards-Arterials <sup>1</sup> and Collectors							
Access Management Class	Posted Speeds	Signals Per Mile and Spacing <sup>2</sup>	Median Type	Left From Major Street? (Spacing from signal)	Left From Minor Street or Driveway?	Right Decel Lanes at Driveways?	Driveway Spacing <sup>3</sup>
Moderate Access Control	40-45 mph	3 or less Minimum spacing 1590 feet	Raised or painted w/turn pockets	Yes 500 ft. minimum	No, on 6 or 8-lane roadways w/o signal	Yes <sup>4</sup>	200 ft./300 ft.

<sup>1</sup> On-street parking shall not be allowed on any new arterials. Elimination of existing on-street parking shall be considered a priority for major and minor arterials operating at or below the policy level of service.

<sup>2</sup> Minimum signal spacing is for planning purposes only; additional analysis must be made of proposed new signals in the context of planned signalized intersections, and other relevant factors impacting corridor level of service.

<sup>3</sup> Minimum spacing from signalized intersections/spacing other driveways.

<sup>4</sup> If there are more than 60 inbound, right-turn movements during the peak-hour.

The policy Level of Service (LOS) standard for North Virginia Street is LOS D. Policy LOS for intersections shall be designed to provide a level of service consistent with maintaining the policy level of service of the intersecting corridor. This project should be required to meet all the conditions necessary to complete road improvements to maintain policy LOS standards.



The 2040 RTP and the 6th Ed Regional Road Impact Fee Capital Improvement Plan (RRIF CIP) identifies N. Virginia Street between Panther and Stead Blvd to be widened from a 2-lane to a 4-lane facility in the 2022-2026 time frame. This project should be required to meet all the conditions necessary to maintain policy LOS standards.

The applicant may be eligible for RRIF Waivers for right-of-way and/or construction for of improvements to N. Virginia Street through a RRIF Offset Agreement. To be eligible for RRIF Waivers against the RRIF Program, capital improvements must be included in the RRIF CIP. A letter requesting to enter into a RRIF Offset Agreement must be submitted prior to the initiation of work with a fully executed agreement in place before completion of work on the improvements. Questions regarding RRIF credits should be directed to Dale Keller, RTC Engineering Manager (775-335-1827).

The RTC reviewed the applicant's traffic impact study and supports the proposed recommendations identified in the report.

The RTP, the RTC Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan and the Nevada Department of Transportation Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, all indicate that new development and re-development will be encouraged to construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities, internal and/or adjacent to the development, within the regional road system. In addition, these plans recommend that the applicant be required to design and construct any sidewalks along the frontage of the property in conformance with the stated ADA specifications.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application. Please feel free to contact me at 775-332-0174 or email me at [rkapuler@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:rkapuler@rtcwashoe.com) if, you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,



Rebecca Kapuler  
Senior Planner

CC: Angela Fuss, City of Reno  
Jeffrey Borchardt, City of Reno  
Dale Keller, Regional Transportation Commission  
Blaine Petersen, Regional Transportation Commission  
Tina Wu, Regional Transportation Commission  
Andrew Jayankura, Regional Transportation Commission  
Sara Going, Regional Transportation Commission  
Scott Miklos, Regional Transportation Commission  
Alex Wolfson, Nevada Department of Transportation