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Posting: This agenda has been physically posted in compliance with NRS 241.020(3) (notice of meetings) at Reno City Hall – One East First Street, Washoe County Downtown Reno Library – 301 South Center Street, Evelyn Mount Northeast Community Center – 1301 Valley Road, McKinley Arts and Culture Center – 925 Riverside Drive, Reno Municipal Court – One South Sierra Street, Washoe County Administration Building – 1001 East 9th Street and Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority – 4001 South Virginia Street, Suite G. In addition, this agenda has been electronically posted in compliance with NRS 241.020(3) at http://www.reno.gov, and NRS 232.2175 at https://notice.nv.gov/.

Accommodation: Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically disabled persons attending the meeting. Please contact the Community Development Department at (775) 334-2576 in advance so that arrangements can be made.

Support Materials: Staff reports and supporting material for the meeting are available at the City Clerk's Office. Please contact Ashley D. Turney, City Clerk, 1 East 1st Street, Reno, NV 89505, (775) 334-2030; turneya@reno.gov. Staff reports and supporting materials are also available on the City's website at http://www.reno.gov/meetings. Pursuant to NRS 241.020(6), supporting material is made available to the general public at the same time it is provided to the Planning Commission.

Order of Agenda: A time listed next to a specific agenda item indicates that the specific item will not be heard before that time – it does not indicate the time schedule of any other items. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order and the public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The Planning Commission may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Public Comment: A person wishing to address the Reno City Planning Commission shall submit a “Request to Speak” form to the Secretary. Public comment, whether on action items or general public comment, is limited to three (3) minutes per person. Unused time may not be reserved by the speaker, nor allocated to another speaker. No action may be taken on a matter raised under general public comment until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The presiding officer may prohibit comment if the content of the comments is a topic that is not relevant to, or within the authority of, the Planning Commission, or if the content is willfully disruptive of the meeting by being irrelevant, repetitious, slanderous, offensive, inflammatory, irrational or amounting to personal attacks or interfering with the rights of other speakers. Any person making willfully disruptive remarks while addressing the Reno City Planning Commission or while attending the Reno City Planning Commission meeting may be removed from the room by the presiding officer, and the person may be barred from further audience before the Reno City Planning Commission during that session of the Reno City Planning
Commission. See, Nevada Attorney General Opinion No. 00-047 (April 27, 2001); Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual, § 8.05.

**Appeal Process:** Any final action (not including recommendations) or failure to take action by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Reno City Council by the applicant, the Mayor or a City Council Member, or any person who is "aggrieved" by the action or inaction. An appeal (together with fees) must be filed with the City Clerk within ten calendar days starting on the day after written notice of the action is filed with the City Clerk, and if the tenth calendar day falls on a weekend or holiday when the Clerk's office is not open, the appeal may be filed on the next business day.

**Watch Meetings:** Planning Commission meetings are streamed online when the Commission is in session in Council Chamber at [http://www.reno.gov/meetings](http://www.reno.gov/meetings) and broadcast on Charter Channel 194.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment.)
4. Workshop Item
   4.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Workshop for review of preliminary draft ordinances for the RENOvation Development Code Update.
5. Public Comment (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment.)
6. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

IF THE MEETING GOES BEYOND 11:00 PM, THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY POSTPONE REMAINING ITEMS.
Date: January 21, 2020

To: Reno City Planning Commission

Subject: 4.1. Staff Report (For Possible Action): Workshop for review of preliminary draft ordinances for the RENOvation Development Code Update.

From: Arlo Stockham, Community Development Director

Summary: The January 21, 2020 workshop is scheduled for Planning Commission review, discussion, and recommendations related to the RENOvation Development Code (Title 18) Update. The City Council is scheduled to hold a similar workshop on February 11, 2020.

This is the first round of review for the draft ordinance language. Draft ordinances were prepared in accordance with the general direction received during Planning Commission and City Council review of a Targeted Code Assessment Report and a series of “Issue Sheets”. Feedback on the draft ordinances has been received at a series of public workshops, through input provided on the project web page or directly to staff, and at regular meetings of the Technical Working Group.

The staff report focuses on the major amendments and significant discussion topics that have emerged. Ten key topics for discussion include:

- Code Update Process and Scope of Amendments
- Grading and Hillside Development
- Parking
- Landscaping
- Site and Building Design Standards
- Residential Adjacency Standards
- Historic Preservation
- Application Review Processes and Decision Making Bodies
- Processes for Flexibility and Relief
- Application Review Findings

An assortment of less controversial topics have been discussed and addressed during the drafting and community outreach processes. More detailed information is provided in the digital attachments.
• **Attachment A** is an updated list of potential amendment topics that are outside the scope of the draft code amendments and may be considered through separate processes.

• **Attachment B** includes the preliminary draft ordinances (Modules 1, 2 and 3).

• **Attachment C** is a ±40 page working document of the Technical Working Group that lists each substantive amendment topic, along with suggested modifications based on public input and/or Technical Working Group review. Further review is suggested for certain key sections. The Technical Working Group is completing its review of Chapter 18.08 *Procedures* the morning of January 21. Attachment C will be supplemented with input from that meeting.

• **Attachment D** is a compilation of input received during the public review process. The substantive topics raised are addressed in this staff report and/or Attachment B.

**Previous Commission Action:**

• **August 21, 2019** – Planning Commission provided input on administration and procedures (Issue Sheet 3A).

• **July 17, 2019** – Planning Commission provided input on site and building design standards (Issue Sheet 2B).

• **June 19, 2019** – Planning Commission provided input on development standard amendment topics (Issue Sheet 2A).

• **May 15, 2019** – Planning Commission provided input on residential zoning districts (Issue Sheet 1C).

• **April 15, 2019** – Planning Commission provided input on nonresidential and mixed use zoning districts (Issue Sheets 1A and 1B).

• **March 20, 2019** – Planning Commission provided input on the zoning code update process.

• **January 29, 2019** – At a joint workshop with Council, Planning Commission provided recommendations on approaches for drafting updated zoning districts and land uses, development standards, and procedures in Title 18.

• **October 3, 2018** – Planning Commission provided input on the recommendations in the *Annexation and Land Development Code Targeted Assessment Report*.

• **March 21, 2018** – Planning Commission provided input on plans to update the City’s land development code.

**Background:** Updating the zoning code is a priority implementation initiative in the City’s Master Plan, which was adopted in December 2017.

The comprehensive update to the City’s zoning code is scheduled to be complete in summer 2020. The key objectives of the update are to:

• Implement the updated Master Plan;

• Make the code more user-friendly; and
Establish a more predictable and transparent review process.

**Discussion:** Significant amendment and discussion topics are summarized below. Workshop discussion is planned to be organized similarly, with greatest focus on the ten key topics.

Feedback received during Planning Commission and City Council review will be reflected in the consolidated draft code. Additional review phases are noted on the graphic below.

**Scope of Code Amendments:** **[Key Discussion Topic #1: Code Update Process and Scope of Amendments]** During the Issue Sheet review process, the scope of amendments for the Title 18 update project was discussed and refined. Amendments to certain major topics were not included in the scope of the project, but were identified on a list of potential future initiatives to be considered separately (Attachment A). Some of these initiatives are complete or underway. Stakeholders have generally supported the process of addressing certain complex topics through focused processes. Of the topics not being updated with this process, feedback received focused on updating the City’s flood hazard, wetland and/or major drainageway ordinances; as well as additional efforts related to housing affordability and economic sustainability, such as increased density and greater allowances for accessory dwelling units. Significant interest in code updates related to low impact development (LID) was also expressed and the topic has been added to Attachment A.

**Zoning Map Amendments:** Targeted zoning map amendments will be needed for implementation of the Master Plan and certain text amendments. Public notification of draft
district boundaries is planned to be provided in late March or early April. Map amendments will be proposed for:

- The mixed use district consolidations in the Downtown area and urban corridors.
- Targeted zoning map changes to conform with approved master plan land uses changes. These generally include certain Mixed Use areas being rezoned to Industrial or Mixed Employment in the North Valleys and certain Mixed Use areas being rezoned to Residential near the University and Meadowood Mall.
- Targeted zoning map changes from the IB and GO districts.

Zoning outside these areas is recommend to remain unchanged pending completion of future neighborhood engagement processes. Potential map adjustments based on public input will be considered with review of the consolidated draft code.

Neighborhood engagement process for zoning and public improvements: The updated Master Plan promotes a greater diversity of housing types, land uses and transportation options in and around Reno’s neighborhoods. A neighborhood engagement process is planned following the code update to consider parcel level zoning changes in consultation with the affected residents and businesses. Potential zoning map amendments and multi-modal capital improvements will be evaluated and discussed with stakeholders in each neighborhood.

Neighborhood Plans with neighborhood specific zoning overlay districts have been adopted in certain areas. Many of the topics covered by the existing neighborhood standards are also addressed in the updated design standards. Potential sun-setting or modification of the existing neighborhood overlay district standards will be considered with the neighborhood engagement process following the code update. In the interim, neighborhood plan standards will continue to apply.

Chapter 18.01 General Provisions: [Module 3] Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Some relaxation of restrictions on the expansion of nonconforming uses and structures.
  - General support
- Provisions for the transition from prior ordinances.
  - No significant concerns

Chapter 18.02 Zoning Districts: [Module 1] Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Simplified Zoning for Mixed-Use Areas: The existing mixed-use zoning framework for Reno’s Downtown and Urban Corridors is simplified and updated. The draft code reorganizes and maintains the Downtown districts and the two midtown districts. New Mixed Use Urban (MU) and Mixed Use Suburban (MS) districts replace 24 overlay districts for the remainder of the Virginia Street, Fourth Street and Mill Street corridors. Amendments also address the consolidated development standards for the new MU, MS and ME districts,
Downtown Area Zoning: The existing overlay zoning districts for the Downtown area are reorganized into six base zoning districts with existing provisions generally retained. Master Plan land use and intensity guidelines are reflected, with provisions for reduced intensities in certain situations. Allowed density and intensity is reduced in the Powning district, in conjunction with development of a conservation / historic overlay district. Uses in the University district are somewhat more restrictive.

- General support
- Recommendations to not reduce intensity as much in the Powning District and allow intensity transitions adjacent to other downtown districts.

General Commercial (GC) district: Consolidate the existing AC (Arterial Commercial) and CC (Community Commercial) zoning districts into a new GC (General Commercial) district.

- General support

Update employment area districts: The code update eliminates GO and IB and establishes a new ME (Mixed Employment) district that allows offices, light commercial uses, flex space, and similar uses.

- General support

Residential Districts: Residential zoning districts are proposed to be maintained with generally unchanged standards for density, lot sizes, building height, setbacks, etc. Targeted amendments reduce setbacks adjacent to alleys, establish height/setback standards, and refine standards for accessory structures.

- Significant input promoting the preservation of neighborhood character.
- Significant input in support of targeted zoning intensification.
- Recommendations to narrow expanded allowances for height and setback encroachments.

Chapter 18.03 Use Regulations: [Module 1] Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Targeted Changes to Land Uses Table: Allowed land uses are generally retained with minor changes to include additional non-residential uses in the MF-21 and MF-30 districts, allowances for open lot parking use, opportunities for expanded home occupations in all districts, the consolidation of similar districts and land use categories, and the addition of newer land use types.
  - General support
  - Recommendations to refine certain use regulations.

- Establish Historic / Conservation Overlay Zoning districts: Placeholders for Historic / conservation overlay districts are included for the Powning, Newlands Heights and Wells Avenue Conservation districts. Specific standards will be prepared through the neighborhood engagement process following the code update.
  - General support
- Targeted changes to Use Regulations: Changes include standardizing requirements for auto-oriented uses (gas stations, auto sales, drive through restaurants, etc.) and outdoor storage.
  - General support

Chapter 18.04 Development Standards: [Module 2] Chapter 18.04 is the most complex and lengthy chapter of the updated code. This staff report addresses each Article separately.

Chapter 18, Article 1 Natural Resource Protection Standards: Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Major Amendments for environmental ordinances are planned to be considered separately.
  - General support for the process
  - Continued interest in additional amendment topics, including flood hazard, wetland, and drainageway ordinances.
- Codify 1.3:1 stormwater retention standard in closed basin areas
  - General support with some concern related to State water rights.
- New Source Water Protection ordinance (notification requirement)
  - General support

Chapter 18, Article 2 Grading, Erosion Protection, and Sedimentation Control and Article 3 Hillside Development: **[Key Discussion Topic #2: Grading and Hillside Development]**

Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Reno relies heavily on special use permits for the management of site grading and hillside development. The code update expands construction standards for grading and slopes, while relaxing special use permit requirements to generally reflect existing procedures in the City of Sparks. Grading-related special use permits would not be required for cuts and fills or for hillside developments under ten acres in size. Many common project review considerations and conditions of approval are proposed as code standards. Key changes establish new limitations on the scale, location and design of finished slopes to address engineering and aesthetic topics.
  - Significant support for the concept, combined with concerns from designers that the standards could be overly restrictive and may not allow for the best grading plans. Ongoing discussions are recommended to refine the standards and clarify the process and criteria to consider exceedances and alternative designs.

Chapter 18.04 Article 4 Streets, Utilities, and Services: Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Increased residential sidewalk width (from four to five feet), to be implemented in conjunction with reduced road pavement width.
Chapter 18.04 Article 5 Access, Connectivity, and Circulation: Significant amendments and feedback include:

- New street connectivity standards, including a standard for through access to adjacent private lands every 1,500 feet, with certain exceptions.
  - Some concern about the standards being too rigid. Recommendations for technical review and refinement.
- New pedestrian and bicycle connectivity standards
  - General support with some clarification and refinement of the new standards.

Chapter 18.04 Article 6 Off-Street Parking and Loading: **[Key Discussion Topic #3: Parking]**

Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Minimum Parking rates: The City has minimum parking requirements that significantly exceed contemporary professional recommendations and have been cited as a primary regulatory impediment for infill development projects. Reducing and repurposing parking lots is also a priority of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan.

The existing code includes parking reductions in certain infill development areas or in any location when “a report based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual, or another nationally accepted authority is submitted which substantiates/validates the use of a different standard.” The code update recalibrates and generally reduces minimum parking standards to reflect modern best practice recommendations.

Three “tiers” of minimum parking standards are proposed. Discretionary (aka voluntary) parking minimums are proposed to be expanded to all uses in the Downtown area. Parking is currently discretionary for all uses in the California Avenue district and for retail, restaurant and entertainment uses throughout the downtown area. Level 1 parking is for the urban corridors and is not significantly changed from the already reduced parking standards in these areas. Level 2 parking rates apply to the remainder of the city and are reduced.

The City is also working on a comprehensive parking management strategy, which these regulatory adjustments are a component of. Additional strategies include the potential expansion of public and shared parking facilities, updates to the parking meter and parking permit programs, and funding strategies. The general emphasis is moving away from reliance on the site
specific provision of parking to an area-based approach that is less costly to maintain and less environmentally impactful.

Additional amendments in Article 6 are intended to further support this transition and include transitional parking rate areas, expanded allowances for off-site and shared parking, expanded eligibility for affordable housing parking incentives, and elimination of maximum parking regulations.

- Parking is a primary topic for public input, with many suggesting more aggressive parking reductions and others voicing concern about the availability of parking spaces. Overall, the majority of input has favored parking reductions as aggressive or more aggressive than the proposed standards. Specific suggestions include the following:
  - Consider the further reduction or elimination of on-site parking standards in areas that are outside the downtown area, but served by rapid transit. This could include Midtown and the University area.
  - Consider use of American Planning Association recommendations for Level 2 off-street parking. These generally require less parking than the ITE recommendations and assume some parking congestion is desired.
- Staff is requesting feedback from the Planning Commission and City Council regarding the general direction for parking standards.
- Recommendation to utilize City of Sparks standards (reduced) for Level 2 parking rates.
- A suite of refinements and clarifications are also proposed.

- A draft trip reduction program is also included in this Article.
  - Recommendation to expand and refine the program to address travel distances rather than number of trips, to apply more broadly, and to have a menu of compliance options from which projects could choose some. Model ordinances to be referenced.

**Chapter 18.04 Article 7 Landscaping, Buffering, Screening and Fencing: **[Key Discussion Topic #4: Landscaping]** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- The draft ordinances include modest amendments to refine and clarify the mixed use district landscape standards, along with certain technical amendments.
  - General support for proposed changes.
  - Some Landscape Architect professionals convened a working group and recommended further amendments to promote the growth and survival of urban trees. Recommendations are being vetted with builders and engineers, with the concepts generally supported by staff and the technical working group. Key amendments include:
Reduce required tree sizes at planting (to 2 inch / 6 foot) to reduce costs and increase survival and growth rates.

Establish tree well and soil preparation standards to better promote tree growth.

Update standards for landscaped islands in parking lots.

Other technical refinements.

- The Landscape Architect group also voiced support for new Low Impact Development (LID) standards. Targeted updates may be identified in ongoing discussions, but major updates are not recommended for the code update. The topic has been added to the potential future amendment list (Attachment A).

Chapter 18.04 Articles 8, 9 and 10 Site and Building Standards for Residential, Mixed Use and Nonresidential Districts: **[Key Discussion Topic #5: Site and Building Design Standards]** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- New site and building design standards focus on multi-modal connectivity, active streetscapes, efficient circulation, site layout, building orientation and building design. Architectural and landscape style is generally left to the designer’s discretion.

- Separate Articles apply to Residential (Article 8), Mixed-Use (Article 9) and Nonresidential (Article 10) districts.

- Standards for nonresidential uses in and adjacent to Residential districts are further addressed in Chapter 13 Residential Adjacency Standards.

- Additional standards to improve industrial / residential compatibility are outlined in Article 10.

- More prescriptive standards are proposed with provisions for variability and flexibility.

- Each article includes supplemental standards for certain zoning districts, which generally retain existing code standards.
  - This is a significant topic for public input and discussions. Most reviewers appear to generally support the framework and the topics addressed. Numerous suggestions for refinement have been received.
  - Input focused on the appropriate balance between having specific development standards “with teeth” and having sufficient flexibility to address a variety of different sites and circumstances. Sections with alternative design provisions or a choice of compliance options from which to choose were generally well received, although some concern was expressed for the use of “loopholes”.
  - Approaches for these Articles and for the process alternatives in Chapter 18.08 are inter-related. Proposed processes for flexibility and relief could be used to provide relief from the more detailed design standards.
  - Staff supports suggestions to generally maintain the level of specificity, to refine language in coordination with key stakeholders and to more clearly specify criteria and considerations for the approval of exceptions.
○ Recommendation to relocate *Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility* from 18.02.707 and 18.04.1305(e) to Article 8. These are new standards applicable to all uses in certain residential districts. General support has been expressed for amendments.

Chapter 18.04 Article 11 *Improvement Standards for New Development*: [no substantive amendments].

Chapter 18.04 Article 12 *Exterior Lighting*: Significant amendments and feedback include:
- The code update includes more detailed lighting standards that address different types of lighting and dark sky lighting requirements. Current standards are general in nature.
  - General support with continued technical review and possible refinement.

Chapter 18.04 Article 13 *Residential Adjacency Standards*: **[Key Discussion Topic #6: Residential Adjacency]** Significant amendments and feedback include:
- The code update proposes enhanced residential adjacency standards addressing a broader range of potential impacts when nonresidential development occurs within or adjacent to residential areas. Expanded standards address use limitations, grading, site and building orientation, signage adjacent to residential, spillover lighting, noise, odor, off-street parking, cut-through traffic, use of alleys, and loading activities.
- Process modifications are proposed to modestly streamline the project review process. Site plan reviews replace special use permits and would apply to all nonresidential development within 150 feet of a residential zoning district and nonresidential development over one acre in size within 300 feet of a residential zoning district. Development across major arterial roadway or freeway would not require a site plan review. Process changes are addressed in Chapter 18.08 below.
  - Input generally supported the enhanced residential adjacency standards and focused on the details of certain standards and the appropriate level of specificity.
  - Recommend retaining the site plan review process for large (over 10 acre) nonresidential projects that are adjacent to residential zoning but across a major arterial or freeway.

Chapter 18.04 Article 14 *Skyways*: [no substantive amendments].

Chapter 18.04 Article 15 *Safe Scape Regulations*: [no substantive amendments].
- This material may be moved to another Title of the Reno Municipal Code to reflect its broader use for public safety and code enforcement purposes.
Chapter 18.05 *Signs*: [Module 2] Minor amendments to temporary sign standards are proposed to maintain compliance with new case law (Reed v Gilbert). Broader amendments are on the potential future project list (Attachment A).

- Amendments merge the standards for temporary real estate signs and temporary political signs. Where existing standards for size or duration differ, the less restrictive standard is applied.
  - General support

Chapter 18.06 *Land Division*: [Module 2] No substantive amendments.

Chapter 18.07 *Historic Preservation*: [Module 2] **[Key Discussion Topic #7: Historic Preservation]** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Streamlined procedure for designation and zoning of historic resources.
- Historic Resource Commission review of projects adjacent to historic resources.
- Expanded mitigation measures for the demolition of historic resources, including donation of a resource if other mitigations are not completed.
- Preliminary review of certificates of appropriateness with opportunities for waivers of further review.
- Maintenance obligation and “demolition by neglect” provisions.
  - Review by the Historic Resource Commission is scheduled on January 15 (following staff report publication). Input will be summarized at the workshop.
  - Key issues include demolition permits, including if the City should assume the right to deny a demolition permit for a designated historic resource. Input also addressed ways to expand historic preservation efforts beyond the listed properties and historic overlay districts.
  - Some commenters suggested that documentation and/or mitigation should be applied more broadly when older structures are proposed for demolition.

Chapter 18.08 *Administration and Procedures*: [Module 3] Chapter 18.08 addressed four distinct (but related) amendment topics. These are summarized separately.

Procedure Topic A: Development review process improvements **[Key Discussion Topic #8: Application Review Processes and Decision Making Bodies]**

- The code update streamlines the approval process for relatively minor decisions. Development processing costs can be significant barriers for small businesses and are a substantial expense for the City. Changes include:
  - Reduce reliance on special use permits and increase use of site plan reviews for small projects and design review processes. Both applications involve discretionary approvals with notification requirements for nearby properties and
appealable decisions, but site plan reviews are simpler applications with lower costs and an initial administrative decision in 30 days.

- Distinguish between major and minor site plan reviews and further streamline application requirements for minor site plan reviews.
- Modify site plan review appeal procedures to include review by the Planning Commission instead of the Hearings Examiner.
- Expand exceptions to special use permit and site plan review requirements to include:
  - Hillside developments less than 10 acres in size.
  - Grading with cuts over 20 feet or fills over 10 feet.
  - Nonresidential developments that are adjacent to residential zoning - but only across a freeway or major arterial.
  - Administrative approval of additions to existing development up to 20 percent in size (increased from 10 percent).
  - Administrative approval of certain amendments to Planned Unit Developments up to 10 percent.
- A Land Use Hearing Examiner process is being considered for expeditious review of certain flexibility and relief applications (discussed below). This process involves mailed project notices and a public hearing overseen by a land use professional (staff or appointed). This concept could be expanded to include other categories of applications, modified to include a small panel of experts, or not utilized at all.
- Significant input was received on the process and administrative topics. Discussion topics include:
  - The Technical Working Group is scheduled to review these code sections in detail on January 21. Input will be presented at the workshop.
  - Some input expressed opposition to process streamlining, citing the increased potential for impactful development activities.
  - Other input, including from real estate professionals and preliminary discussions at the technical working group, expressed interest in further streamlined processes. Suggestions include a process for administrative use permits and minor site plan reviews with administrative discretion for approval, but no public notification or hearing process. Certain elements of this recommendation are in currently in place in Sparks, Carson City and other communities.
    - The appropriate level of public notification and involvement is a policy decision warranting discussion at public workshops. This is a key decision that could influence approaches to other decision topics. With expanded development standards, staff is comfortable
with a variety of procedural options, including more significant streamlining and delegation.

- Recommendations from land use professionals also addressed a desire to more clearly differentiate land use decisions from decisions related to physical development. Business licenses and various forms of “Use” permits would be required for certain land uses. Building permits and various forms of “Site Plan” permits would be required for development meeting certain dimension, size or location criteria. Approval findings would be different for the different application types. Some elements of this suggestion are reflected in the increased use of site plan review processes.
  
  - Staff thinks this suggestion has some merit and could be implemented in different ways depending on the desired level of discretionary review. Alternatively, the blending of “land use” reviews and “site plan” reviews is commonly used and retaining that framework is also acceptable from the staff perspective. In practice, issues related to project reviews often involve a combination of land use and site design considerations.

- Feedback regarding the land use hearings examiner options has been mixed. There is interest in the process simplification and potential for increased predictability, but also uncertainty if benefits outweigh the costs of implementing an additional review process and periodic meetings.
  
  - Recommend refinement or possible elimination of this proposal, with specific approaches considered in light of other discretionary review decisions.

Procedure Topic B: New Tools for Design Flexibility  **Key Discussion Topic #9: Processes for Flexibility and Relief**

- The code update includes new tools and approaches for design alternatives and flexibility.
  
  o Minor Deviations: The code update expands use of minor deviations to the maximum allowed by state law. This process applies to deviations not exceeding 10 percent with written consent from affected property owners.
  
  o Major Deviations: The City of Sparks uses Major Deviations to review applications for deviations of code standards up to 50 percent. A similar ordinance is proposed for Reno. Approval would require public notice, a public hearing, and a finding of no significant impact.
  
  o Alternative equivalent compliance: Similar to major deviations, the code update includes an alternative compliance provision that allows deviations from design-
based standards (versus quantifiable standards like setbacks and height) with public notice, a public hearing and a findings generally requiring that the project be as good or better than would be provided under standard code provisions.

○ A Land Use Hearing Examiner process is being considered for expeditious review of Major Deviations and Alternative Compliance applications. This process involves mailed project notices and a public hearing overseen by a land use professional (staff or appointed). This concept could be expanded to include other categories of applications, modified to include a small panel of experts, or these applications could be processed with a planning commission public hearing similar to the current process for special use permits and variances.

○ Design Review Committee (DRC): The code update considered the establishment of a DRC. This is not proposed in the draft ordinances, but could be considered in conjunction in the future or as an alternative to the Land Use Hearings Examiner.

○ Feedback related to these concepts has been generally positive. Discussion has focused on details of each process and the type of public input process that is appropriate for each application.
  ■ The Technical Working Group is scheduled to review these code sections in detail on January 21. Input will be presented at the workshop.
  ■ Based on input received to date, staff is leaning towards utilizing a standard Planning Commission public hearing process for Major Deviations and Alternative Compliance applications. Planning Commission meetings agendas have been relatively light and should be lighter following approval of other process changes. Additionally, planning commissioners currently have the type of expertise desired for a land use hearings examiner or design review committee. This could be supplemented with further delegation of authority for small projects.
  ■ Recommend continued refinement in accordance with general policy direction provided by Planning Commission and City Council.

Procedure Topic C: Application Review Findings  **Key Discussion Topic #10: Application Review Findings**

• The draft ordinances include revised application review findings that are more closely related to the specific types of application.
  ○ Review considerations include general criteria applicable to all application types (18.08.304(e)), as well as updated findings for specific application types.
  ○ Findings specified in State Law are retained.
  ○ As drafted, findings for site plan reviews and special use permits are the same. Draft findings address land uses and site plan considerations as components of an
integrated project review. If changes are made to differentiate site plan and land use review processes, findings should be updated accordingly.

- The Technical Working Group is scheduled to review these code sections in detail on January 21. Input will be presented at the workshop.
- Recommend continued refinement in accordance with general policy direction provided by Planning Commission and City Council.

Procedure Topic D: Planned Unit Developments, Specific Plan Districts and Development Agreements

- The draft ordinances include targeted changes to requirements for the Planned Unit Development (PUD) district. Policy direction from City Council was to clarify standards for Planned Unit Developments, but not to discourage the use of PUD zoning. Key changes include:
  - Requirements for a fiscal analysis.
  - Provisions for reconsideration of PUD zoning if development does not begin within ten years of approval or if the project is less than half built within 20 years of approval.
  - Provisions for minor amendments to approved PUDs (10% or less) to be reviewed administratively, subject to criteria.
  - Updated Findings.
- The draft ordinances propose reinstating the Special Plan District (SPD) zoning district as a tool to establish supplemental land use limitations and development standards in certain areas.
  - Format and content criteria for SPDs should be expanded.
- The draft ordinances propose the elimination of some limitations for the use of Development Agreements to allow increased use of Development Agreements.
  - Requirements for Development Agreements to be associated with a special use permit or PUD are removed.
  - Subject to additional legal review, requirements limiting development agreements to be used only for projects of regional significance are also proposed to be removed.
  - Changes will allow the City to enter into development agreements with a broader range of projects, including urban developments that may not require special use permit review and may not meet the size criteria to be classified as Projects of Regional Significance.
- Feedback related to these amendments has been generally positive.
  - The Technical Working Group is scheduled to review these code sections in detail on January 21. Input will be presented at the workshop.
  - Recommend continued refinement.
Legal Implications: None at this time.

Recommendation: The Planning Commission should review and discuss the draft ordinances and provide recommendations to the City Council.

Proposed Motion: I move to recommend (insert recommendations).

Attachments:
- **Attachment A:** Updated list of potential amendment topics that are outside the scope of the draft code amendments and may be considered through separate processes.
- **Attachment B:** Preliminary draft ordinances (Modules 1, 2 and 3).
- **Attachment C:** A ±40 page working document of the Technical Working Group that lists each substantive amendment topic, along with suggested modifications based on public input and/or Technical Working Group review.
- **Attachment D:** A compilation of input received during the public review process. The substantive topics raised are addressed in this staff report and/or Attachment B.

Attachments:
- Attachment A - Potential Future Projects  (PDF)
- Attachment B1 - Module 1 - Zoning Districts and Uses - Public Draft (Electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk)  (PDF)
- Attachment B2 - Module 2 - Development Standards - Public Draft (Electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk)  (PDF)
- Attachment B3 - Chapter 18.07 - Administration - Public Draft (Electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk)  (PDF)
- Attachment C - Code Review  (PDF)
- Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment  (PDF)
### Exhibit A:
*Preliminary List of Potential Code Amendment Topics (for Consideration Separate from the Code Update)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reno Mayor’s Housing Committee - Interim Code Amendments</td>
<td><strong>Adopted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an interim suite of targeted amendments to address glitches in the current code and help reduce housing construction costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signs Required by State Law</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adopted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a code maintenance item to address a glitch with the current code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Licenses for Package Alcohol, Beer and Wine</strong></td>
<td><strong>City Council passed a 1-year Moratorium and directed staff to prepare code amendments on May 8, 2019. Ordinance development is in process.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a targeted amendment to address businesses with package alcohol licenses and package beer and wine licenses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Engagement Efforts.</strong></td>
<td><strong>This is a priority initiative to begin following adoption of the Code update in the summer of 2020.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A process is planned to review zoning maps and capital improvement priorities at the neighborhood scale following adoption of the Code update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation District Overlays</strong></td>
<td><strong>This a priority initiative to be completed in conjunction with Neighborhood engagement efforts following adoption of the Code update.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In coordination with neighborhood stakeholders, prepare overlay district standards for the Powning, Newland Heights and Wells Avenue Conservation Districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Code Maintenance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Staff recommends a regular and continuing process to monitor and refine the updated code as needed following its adoption.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree Protection Ordinances</strong></td>
<td><strong>The project in initiated and ordinance development in is process.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an initiative of the Urban Forestry Commission to enhance Reno’s tree protection ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Short Term Rental, Accessory Dwelling Unit and/or Guest Quarter Ordinances</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are Code topics that are not being amended in the Code update and could be considered at a later date through a separate process. These topics could also be included in a broader review of housing standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing: Phase 2 Amendments</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This potential project would evaluate additional Code amendments beyond those to be included in the Code update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Hazards: Phase 2 Amendments</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This potential project would evaluate additional Code amendments related to Flood Hazards beyond those to be included in the Code update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands and Streams</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This potential project would evaluate Code amendments related to Wetlands and Streams. This could be combined with other topics in a broader review of hydrological ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Drainageways</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This potential project would evaluate Code amendments related to Major Drainageways. This could be combined with other topics in a broader review of hydrological ordinances and/or as a component of an open space and greenway planning initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Spaces and Greenways</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an option, Open Space and Greenway planning initiatives that are outlined in Master Plan Policies 7.2a-g could be expanded to also include an update of the major drainageways plan and ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit A:
**Preliminary List of Potential Code Amendment Topics**
(for Consideration Separate from the Code Update)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Wildland Interface and Fire Safety</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a master plan implementation topic that will be led</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the Reno Fire department, but also involves updates to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Development Code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs: Phase 2 Amendments</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This potential project would evaluate additional Code amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for signs beyond those to be included in the Code update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Impact Development (LID)</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a potential project to update site development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering standards with increased utilization of Low Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENOvation Code Update
Technical Working Group
Code Amendment Review Sections
Updated January 14, 2020

This working document began with a list of significant amendment topics in each chapter of the preliminary draft code, along with some initial staff suggestions for refinement based on public input received. The technical working group is reviewing the complete document and providing recommendations for changes, including other topics not listed.

Review will begin with module 1 (chapters 18.02 and 18.03), then proceed to module 2 (Chapters 18.04 through 18.07), then module 3 (Chapters 18.01 and 18.08). This review will continue through multiple meetings. The document will be updated as issues are identified or addressed.

For chapters reviewed by the technical working group, recommendations (including items requiring further discussion) are noted in blue text. Draft ordinances and staff recommended changes not highlighted were generally supported by the technical working group.

December 17, 2019  Technical Working Group reviewed Chapters 18.02, 18.03 and 18.04 (Articles 1 through 5)

January 7, 2020  Technical Working Group reviewed Chapter 18.04 (Articles 6 through 8)

January 13, 2020  Technical Working Group reviewed Chapter 18.04 (Articles 9 through 15), Chapter 18.05, Chapter 18.06 and Chapter 18.07.

January 21, 2020
Module 1 Zoning Districts and Uses:
Chapter 18.02: Zoning Districts:

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Simplified organization
2. Zoning District reorganization and consolidation
   a. Refine Powning District Standards
   b. Refine building setback and separation standards
   c. Refine height and setback encroachment standards
3. Future map amendments
   a. Pending property owner notifications and feedback

- 18.02.106: Classification of Newly Annexed Land.
  o Updated table 1.2 for land use and zoning upon annexation to reflect current City and County designations.

- Article 2: Residential Districts
  o Process to consider updates post-update with neighborhood outreach
  o Updated naming for SF districts (density vs lot size)
    ▪ Updated density minimum, but no change to lot sizes, setbacks, etc
  o Standardized accessory structure heights (29’ / 16’ / 12’)
  o Standardized accessory structure setbacks (regular for 2 story, reduced for one story, zero setbacks allowed along alleys with 24 foot vehicle back up space)
    ▪ Recommend refining language to clarify zero foot alley setbacks are allowed for primary buildings, not just accessory buildings.

- Article 3: Mixed Use Districts
  o Conversion of overlay districts to primary districts
  o MU district consolidations
    ▪ TWG Recommends revising building separation for all districts to 10 feet regardless of number of nits. Currently 20 foot separation is required between buildings with 50 units or more.
  o Side and rear setbacks – reduced from “zero or 10’ min” to “zero or 5’ min”
  o 18.02.306 MD-PD: Downtown – Powning District
    ▪ Draft proposes reduced building height and density – significant public input to allow more, especially in transition areas to downtown standards.
    ▪ Staff recommends height and density match MF-30 (45 feet / 30 du per ac), not MF-14 (35 feet / 14 du per ac)
    ▪ Staff recommends transition area as follows:
      • 65 feet / 45 du per acre for parcels fronting Second Street
• 65 feet / 45 du per acre for parcels fronting and west of Ralston Street
• 105 feet (no density max) between Ralston and Arlington Street with additional height allowed by site plan review

  o 18.02.307 MU: Mixed Use Urban – consolidated district
    ▪ Review density and setback standards
    ▪ Review height (85 feet, additional w/ discretionary review
    ▪ Suggest SPR process for increased height
    ▪ Suggest replacing “abutting corridor” and “supporting corridor” standards with street names (corridors are Virginia, 4th and Mill St)

  o 18.02.307 MS: Mixed Use Suburban – consolidated district
    ▪ Review density and setback standards
    ▪ Review height (55 feet, additional w/ discretionary review)
    ▪ Suggest SPR process for increased height

  o 18.02.3014 Additional Standards for Mixed Use Districts (Initial material - review topics with development standards)

• Article 4: Nonresidential Districts
  o 18.02.402 IC: Industrial Commercial
    ▪ Height increase from 40 to 45 feet
  o 18.02.403 ME: Mixed Employment New district
    ▪ Review development standards
    ▪ Recommend side and rear setbacks of “zero or 10’ min”
    ▪ Note height standard and note 2

• Article 5: Special Purpose Districts
  o 18.02.501 PG: Park, Greenway and Open Space
    ▪ Recommend additional building height be allowed with site plan review and finding of compatibility
  o 18.02.502 PF: Public Facility
    ▪ Recommend additional building height and stories be allowed with site plan review and finding of compatibility (vs special use permit)
    ▪ TWG recommends updating lot size and width standards with size waivers similar to the Washoe County process.
  o 18.02.502-505 UT districts: Unincorporated Transition
    ▪ Accessory building height changes from 29 feet to 35 feet to reflect county code.
  o 18.02.506 PUD: Planned Unit Development
    ▪ Review with changes in 18.08 (module 3)
  o 18.02.507 SPD: Specific Plan District
• Add new section per module 3

• Article 6: Overlay Districts
  o 18.02.602 General Overlay Districts
    ▪ (c) Cooperative Planning Area Overlay: Delete per Regional Plan and module 2
    ▪ (d) Gaming Overlay District: Placeholder – review with module 2.
    ▪ (e) Historic Overlay District: Placeholder – review with module 2
    ▪ (f) Wellhead / Source Water Protection Overlay
      • Module 2 recommended general standards and no overlay district – delete
  o 18.02.603 Neighborhood Plan Overlay Districts
    ▪ Neighborhood Overlays retained – address post-update with neighborhood outreach

• Article 7: Measurements and Exceptions
  o 18.02.702(b) Affordable Housing Incentives
    ▪ To be reorganized
    ▪ Expanded eligibility for density and parking incentives
  o 18.02.704 Property Line Setbacks / Yards
    ▪ Public input: Recommend changes to (e) to be closer to current code (allow less setback encroachments)
  o 18.02.706 Heights
    ▪ Public input: Recommend changes to (c) to be closer to current code (allow fewer height exceptions)
    ▪ TWG recommends in making changes, to keep allowance for access enclosures for rooftop decks to not be considered a story.
  o 18.02.707 Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility
    ▪ Relocate to and review with module 2, 18.04.8xx (residential district development standards)

• Any other discussion topics??
**Chapter 18.03 Use Regulations**

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Simplified organization
2. Consolidated Land Use Table
3. Use Regulations
   a. Refine certain use regulations

- **18.03.207 Table of Allowed Uses**
  o Format of Use Table
  o Changes to uses or permissions

- **18.03.302 Residential Uses**
  o New (a)(1) Duplex, Triplex and Fourplex
    - TWG Recommends updating use standards to provide additional design flexibility, especially (a) and (d)
  o New (a)(2) Live/Work dwelling
  o Section (a)(7)(b) Per Footnote 103, recommend development of incentives for improvements to existing mobile home parks.

- **18.03.304 Commercial Uses**
  o New (b)(4) Allow permanent urban farm with site plan review (currently temporary only)
  o New (c)(1) microbrewery size limit in certain districts
  o New (g)(2) banquet hall standards
  o New (i)(2)(b) consistent location standard for vehicle sales/rental in certain urban districts
  o New (i)(4)(b) consistent location standard for gas stations in certain urban districts
  o New (i)(5) allowance for permanent open parking lots (currently only temporary). Willow allow parking businesses.
    - TWG recommends deleting (i)(6)a.2.[f] related to LID concepts for truck stop projects.

- **18.03.306 Industrial uses**
  o Updated (b)(3) consolidated standards for outdoor storage
    - TWG recommends updating (b)(3)a.2 to reduce residential district screening from 750 feet to 300 feet, to address height limits for outdoor storage and consider landscape screening as an alternative.

- **18.03.403 Accessory Structure dimensional standards**
  o Table 1.7 Clarified accessory structure dimensions
    - TWG recommends further review of code organization and possible including these standards with each zone district.

- **18.03.405 Standards for certain accessory uses**
  o Updated (g)(1) standards for drive through facilities (food service)
- Consistent location standard in certain urban districts
- Recommend correcting organization error (b-h should be applicable in all districts)
- Recommend deleting e – addressed in 18.04.13xx (Residential Adjacency Standards)
  - TWG recommends also updating or deleting (h)(1)d for consistency.
  - New (l)(17) allows expanded home occupations with site plan review
  - New (m) standards for live entertainment use
    - TWG recommends modifying standards to not require a SUP for every situation (eg downtown)
  - Updated (n) consistent standards for accessory outdoor storage.
    - TWG recommends updating (b)(3)a.2 to reduce residential district screening from 750 feet to 300 feet, to address height limits for outdoor storage and consider landscape screening as an alternative.
- 18.03.503 Standards for Temporary Uses
  - Updated (f)(1) consistent standards for temporary open lot parking
- Any other discussion topics??
Module 2 Development Standards:
Chapter 18.04 Development Standards
Article 1: Natural Resource Protection Standards

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Scope of Amendments considered in this process vs separate processes
   a. Update flood hazard text to reflect current documents, but not initiate major regulatory change

   • Scope of Amendments: Minor edits only. Other amendments may be considered through separate processes.
   • 18.04.101 General Environmental Standards
     o TWG Recommends revisions to 18.04.101(c) Shading of Parks and Residences to provide design alternatives for infill development in conjunction with enhanced building design and compatibility standards.
   • 18.04.102 Flood Hazard Areas
     o New (c)(7)(2) codifying 1.3:1 stormwater detention/retention requirement in closed drainage basin areas (Silver, Swan and Whites Lakes).
       ▪ TWG recommends deleting “on site” from retention requirement to allow off site retention.
       ▪ Cary Chisum to send proposed text changes to reflect current flood regulation documents.
   • 18.04.106 Wildland Interface / Fire Safety
     o New text referencing applicable State requirements in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)
   • 18.04.107 Source Water Protection
     o New section with notification standards to enable TMWA monitoring of potentially contaminating uses.

   • Any other discussion topics??

Article 2: Grading: (draft proposes enhanced standards with streamlined review process)

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Streamlined process and additional standards for grading and hillside development.

   • Note that Chapter 18.08 (module 3 procedures) removes special use permit requirement for 20 foot cuts / 10 foot fills.
   • 18.04.202 Limits on Grading (Cut and Fill)
     o Updated (e)(2) references residential adjacency standards for grading
New (e)(3) location limits for slopes. Subsection a facilitates maintenance by property owner. Subsections b and c address infrastructure maintenance issues for public works dept.

- TWG recommends updating c to require access and flat ground around manholes, not the entire sewer or storm drain pipeline

New (e)(4) codified typical condition of approval for noxious weed abatement

New (e)(7) (missing footnote) applies hillside development slope treatment standards (18.04.309) to slopes exceeding four feet in height.

Updated (e)(9) updates grading hours of construction near residential zoned properties (common condition of approval).

- Any other discussion topics??

Article 3: Hillside Development: (draft proposes enhanced standards with streamlined review process)

Major Discussion Topics:

1. Streamlined process and additional standards for grading and hillside development.

- 18.04.302 Applicability and Exemptions
  - New (b) removes special use permit requirement for hillside developments less than ten acres in size.

- 18.04.307 Visually prominent ridgelines
  - No change to code. Note map.

- 18.04.309 Slope Treatment (consider side review with subdivision designer(s).)
  - Significant updates include:
    - New (a) slope height limits – Recommend update to refine for non-stabilized slopes (3:1 or less steep) and stabilized slopes (steeper than 3:1). For 3:1 slopes, allow cut slopes up to 60 feet and fill slopes up to 50 feet. For steeper slopes, allow cut slopes up to 40 feet and fill slopes up to 30 feet. Maintain option for larger slopes with major deviation and finding.
    - Updated (b) “contouring” standard – common condition of approval
    - New (c) slope variations – common condition of approval
    - New (f) through (i) – standards for retaining walls
    - New (j) exception provision for cuts into stable rock.
    - TWG recommends focused discussion of proposed 18.04.209 Slope Treatment standards. Cary Chisum, public works and community development staff. General concern that the standards are overly restrictive.

- 18.04.3012 Hillside Architecture
Updated with last sentence with more directive language for stepped foundations where major grading disturbances (cut slopes over 30 feet or fill slopes over 15 feet) are proposed.

- TWG recommends continued review with designers.
- Any other discussion topics??
  - TWG recommends relaxation of density reduction formula for multi family units and clarification of requirements for natural and disturbed slopes.

**Article 4: Streets, Utilities and Services**

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Applicability of curb, gutter and sidewalk requirements and criteria for waivers.

- **18.04.401: Streets**
  - Intersection spacing removed to eliminate conflict with PWDM.

- **18.04.402: Sidewalks, Cubs and Gutters**
  - TWG recommends clarifying in (a)(3) that the sidewalk determination is to occur at the tentative (not final) map stage.
  - Updated (a)(4) with clarified requirements for waivers to sidewalk, curb and gutter requirements
  - TWG recommends further discussion of sidewalks with articles 8-10.
  - Updated (b) sidewalk dimension standards:
    - Reconciled for consistency with the PWDM
    - Expanded residential sidewalks from 4’ to 5’ proposed together with PWDM updates to reduce street widths
    - Administrative modification provisions to address existing conditions
      - TWG recommends further review of proposed street sections. Public works to prepare drafts

- **18.04.403: Utilities and Services**
  - Redundant with PWDM. Plan to delete from Title 18 with consolidated draft.

- Any other discussion topics??

**Article 5: Access Connectivity and Circulation**

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Requirements for traffic impact analysis
2. Connectivity standards / subdivision design

- **18.04.501: Vehicle Access/Circulation and Traffic Analysis**
  - Updated (c) with clarified Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements
- TWG recommends further discussion of traffic impact analysis standards.
  - New (d) with standards for street connectivity
  - TWG recommends changes to increase subdivision design flexibility.

- **18.04.502: Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity**
  - Expanded and new material with standards for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.
    - TWG recommends edits to (b)(2)c and d to minimize subjectivity

- Any other discussion topics??
Article 6: Off Street Parking and Loading

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Minimum parking rated
   a. Downtown discretionary parking
   b. Level 1 parking
   c. Level 2 parking
2. Maximum Parking
3. On Street parking and shared
4. Trip reduction ordinance

- 18.04.603: General Standards
  o Single family driveway/parking standard updated and moved to Article 8
    (residential site and building design)
- 18.04.604: Calculation of Parking and Loading Requirements
  o Updated (c) with options for shared parking (retain table of standard reductions
    and allow parking study)
    - TWG recommends clarification of (c)(1) and consolidation of this material
      with similar material for shared and off-site parking in 18.04.606(c).
  o New (e) project specific parking calculations for certain uses
- 18.04.605: Off-Street Parking Requirements
  o New (a)(1) with three tiers of minimum parking and blended calculations in
    transition area.
    - TWG recommends inclusion of a map of parking tiers.
  o Note removal of “parking study” option, as ITE/APA recommended standards are
    proposed to be codified.
    - Recommend retaining the option (based on public input) for alternative
      parking rates or adjustments with a ITE-based parking demand study
      (existing 18.12.1102(a)(3)).
    - TWG recommends continuing to not require preparation by a licensed
      traffic engineer.
  o Updated (2) with recalibrated and relaxed maximum parking standards —
    - Recommend deleting (2) and not having maximum parking limits.
  o ***Updated Table 1.7*** Updated parking table
    - Recommend updates to not require parking in Level 1 areas for food and
      beverage and retail uses in structures constructed prior to adoption of
      this code update. This generally reflects the existing standard in the
      South Virginia Transit Corridor.
    - Other discussion of parking rates?
• TWG recommends investigation of further relaxation of level 2 parking rates. Reference City of Sparks rates.
  TWG recommends clarifying the that the rates listed in the table for certain residential uses are the “maximum minimum” requirement (ie requirement will not exceed the highest requirement listed).
  o Footnote on (b)(4) Suggestion to move design specs to an administrative manual.
  o TWG supports use of administrative manuals for technical requirements that are frequently updated.
  o New (c)(3) location and design standards for bicycle parking.

• 18.04.606 Parking Alternatives, Credits and Adjustments
  o Updated (b) with reduced on-street parking allowance reflecting generally lower rates (25% on-street vs 50%).
    ▪ Recommend discussion and possible increased on-street parking.
    ▪ TWG supports the 25% on-street allowance in conjunction with reduced parking rates.
    ▪ TWG recommends requiring that the on street parking abut a site (rather than adjacency, which allows parking on the other side of streets).
    ▪ TWG recommends trying to not use employees as a measure for parking standards to the greatest extend feasible.
    ▪ Require that accessible spaces be on site whenever feasible.
  o Updated (c) with expanded allowances for off-site and shared parking.
  o Updated (d) with expanded eligibility for affordable housing parking incentives
  o New (e) with trip reduction program for large employers.
    ▪ TWG recommends changes to:
      • Focus on VMT (total travel distances) rather than number of trips.
      • Apply the program to all projects.
      • Provide a menu of compliance options from which projects could choose.
      • Allow centrally located projects to satisfy requirements with little or no additional requirements, while requiring additional measures for projects in auto-dependent areas.

• 18.04.607 Off-Street Parking Layout and Design
  o Clarified (a) standards for use of parking areas
  o New (d)(4) addressing pedestrian conflicts
    ▪ TWG recommends standards for walkway accessibility from all spaces (no large rocks blocking access).
  o Updated (e) permitting additional modifications to parking design.

• 18.04.608 Off-Street Loading and Stacking
  o Updated and reorganized (b) vehicle stacking standards.
• TWG recommends clarifying requirements for each drive through window vs total stacking requirement. Suggest a base requirement, with additional spaces for each additional window.

• Any other discussion topics??
Article 7: Landscaping, Buffering, Screening and Fencing

Major Discussion Topics:

1. ASLA recommendations for changes to better promote tree growth.

Draft ordinances are listed below. Additional recommendations from a group of landscape architects is listed on the following page.

- **18.04.703 Landscape Plan**
  - Updated (f) to expand allowance for landscape installation following Certificate of Occupancy and to increase bonding from 120% to 125% of cost.
    - TWG recommends possible relaxation of requirements for a preliminary landscape plan.

- **18.04.704 Minimum Landscaping Required**
  - New (b) prioritizing shading of paved areas in landscaping plans.
  - Updated (c)(2) / Table 1.14 with refined landscape area standards for MS (Mixed Use Suburban), MU (Mixed Use Urban), MU-MC (Mixed Use Midtown Commercial) and MU-RES (Mixed Use Midtown Residential). Added 10% standard in all districts for moderate density projects (vs 5% or 20%). Removed 5% standard in MS.
  - Updated (d)(5), consistent with practice, to not include public right-of-way landscaping in the minimum landscaped area calculation, except in parkways or medians with maintenance arrangements.
  - Updated (e)(2)a.4 to require extra landscaping in large parking lots when parking exceeds minimums by 150% (current code is 100%). The change is to generally keep the standard, but adjust to reflect reduced minimum parking standards.
    - Recommend deleting this as part of a shift towards increased shared and off site parking. This would eliminate the penalty for “overparking”.
  - Note for (f)(1)c.3 to reference the updated Downtown Streetscape Master Plan.
    - Recommend change to reflect the new name “Downtown Streetscape Design Manual”.
    - TWG recommends clarification that work permits from the city are not required for regular maintenance and pruning of trees in landscaped parkways (City ROW).
  - Note for (f)(5) and other sections to potentially move the street tree species list and other material to an administrative manual.
    - Also need to update and reflect current updated list.

- **18.04.708 Screening**
- Updated (b)(1) / Table 1.17 with targeted changes generally addressing discretionary review recommendations, including definition of “wall” screening reflecting “solid” screening standards, but with a masonry wall.
- New (c)(1)c.4 requiring recycling containers for certain projects per state law.
- Note (c)(2) (landscaping for outdoor storage) to be relocated to chapter 18.03 use standards for consistent organization.

- **18.04.709 Fences and Walls**
  - New (c)(7) requiring city approval and maintenance agreement for any fences within public right-of-way. This reflects current practice.
  - Updated (c)(8) to clarify open view fencing adjacent to open space may be solid for portions of the fence less than 4 feet in height.
    - TWG recommends investigating if the fence code could be simplified and clarified, including addition of graphics.
- Any other discussion topics??

Recommendations of the Landscape Architect group are listed below. The TWG generally supported the proposals with further discussion of details.

- **18.04.701 Purpose**
  - Expand purpose statement to include reduction of the urban heat island, encouraging low impact development (LID), and benefiting the pedestrian, bicycle and roadway environments.
- **18.04.703 Landscape Plan**
  - Update (f)(2) to clarify the landscape inspection letter is to be prepared by a Nevada landscape architect except for projects where professional landscape plan preparation is not required.
  - Update (d)(3) Sample Plant List to differentiate “size at planting” from “size at maturity”.
- **18.04.704 Minimum Landscaping Required**
  - Consider deleting (d)(3) landscape credit related to wetland preservation.
  - Update (e) Parking Area Landscaping and Screening Requirements to:
    - Require separation between parking lot light poles and parking lot trees so tree pruning won’t be needed to maintain lighting levels.
    - Update (e)(2)b.2 to require large canopy trees (or two medium canopy trees) in each parking lot island.
    - Consider updating (e)(2)b.2 parking lot tree placement to replace current requirement for one tree per 10 spaces (which may include edge landscaping) to instead require no more than 12 spaces in a row without a tree island.
Consider updating (e)(2)b.4 to modify the minimum size of landscaped parking lot islands to approximate one parking space.

- Update (f) Street Tree Requirements to:
  - Update street tree sizes to be 2 inches (vs 2 ½ inches). Update (f)(1)b.1 and (f)(1)c.3.[a]. Note same change is recommended for all trees.
  - Update (f)(5) / Table 1.16 Street Tree List.

- 18.04.705 Landscaping Standards
  - Update (c)(2)b to relax requirement for groundcover to achieve full coverage in three years.
  - Update (c)(2)c to increase allowances for inert material and require variability, including limits on the use of large rocks for mulch.
  - Update (c)(3) to update minimum tree sizes:
    - Eliminate small and large tree categories
    - Require 2 inch deciduous trees (vs 30% @ 1 inch and 70% @ 2 ½ inch).
    - Require 6 foot evergreen trees (vs 30% @ 10 feet and 70% @ 6 feet)
  - Suggestion for soil depth or volume standard for tree plantings. This would likely be an update to (c)(3)f to apply generally.
  - Update (c)(4) to eliminate the small and large shrub categories and allow all shrub and vine plantings to be 1 gallon pots (vs combination of four inch, one gallon and five gallon).

- Additional adjustments related to low impact development may be considered.
Article 8: Site and Building Standards for Residential Districts (**Significant Discussion Topic**)  

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Site design standards  
2. Circulation standards  
3. Building design standards

- **18.04.802 Applicability**
  - (a) Applies Article to all residential districts  
  - (b) Provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.  
  - (b) Also applies NC district standards for mixed use and nonresidential projects in residential districts.

- **18.04.803 General Standards for all Residential Development**
  - Recommend renaming to “General Standards for Residential Districts” to better reflect applicability.  
  - (a) Site layout and Development Pattern
    - (a)(1) Relationship with Major Roadways requires 30 foot setback from freeway frontage and outlines design considerations for arterial streets.  
    - (a)(2) Streetscape Design references general sidewalk standards (5 feet) and refines landscaped parkway requirements to apply to all residential districts (expanded from MF14, SF4, SF6 and SF9) and provides exceptions based on adjacent development.  
      - TWG Recommends looking into the option of deferred installation in some cases with bonding (review Sparks approach and possible replicate).  
      - Clarify allowed adjustments for hillside development.  
      - Consider increased front setback standards where parkways are not provided (primarily for subdivisions)  
      - Consider alternatives to parkway to include street trees.  
    - (a)(3) Parking and Garage Location refines and generally increases flexibility for limitations for residential driveways and front yard parking.  
      - Recommend updating c to clarify and also allow single family driveways up to 30 feet wide in the front setback area on parcels with 30 foot or wider garages.  
      - TWG Recommends clarification and refinement of this standard.
TWG Recommends lot width (90 feet) rather than lot size as the standard for circular or multiple driveways.

- (a)(4) **Building Orientation** generally maintains current provisions.
- (a)(5) **Setbacks and Building Location** updates current residential infill standards with increased flexibility for residential front setbacks.
  - TWG Recommends adjustments to focus this standard on the dominant front building elevation, which would allow front porches and similar features to extend closer to the street.
- (a)(6) **Cluster Development** converts existing cluster development land use to a similar (optional) development standard.
- (a)(7) **Site Compatibility and Adjacency Standards** is a new development standards applying some of the existing cooperative plan overlay standards city wide (which are proposed to be deleted). Standards address parcel size matching, buffering, yard width matching and building height matching.
  - Recommend correction to formatting so parcel size matching, buffering and yard matching and the three allowable options (1-3) under d.
  - Recommend update to Height Matching to only apply the limitation to buildings within 100 feet of a different adjacent district.
  - TWG Recommends clarification that density transferred to address this standard may be located in other zoning districts within a large project.
  - TWG Recommends maintenance of zoning maps to reflect adjustments.

- (b) **Circulation and Access**
  - (b)(1) **Cul-de-Sacs** limits cul de sacs to 25% of total street length with sidewalk connections and exception provisions.
    - Discuss changes per prior meeting discussion.
    - TWG Recommends deleting this standard.
  - (b)(2) **Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity** limits barriers that hinder access to abutting streets, sidewalks and trails.
    - TWG Recommends clarifying applicability and generally exclude connections to private (gated) streets and where topography or other features obstruct connectivity.
  - (b)(3) **Recreational Access** requires trailheads and public access to abutting public land trails.

- (c) **Building Design**
- (c)(1) **Wall Articulation** updates design standards to provide a certain number of articulation features from a menu of options.
- (c)(2) **Ground Level Interest** requires ground floor windows along 20 percent or street facing frontages.
- (c)(3) **Roof Planes** updates design standards to provide a certain number of distinct roof planes based on building type and size.
  - TWG Recommends increased design flexibility related to the number of required roof planes.
- (c)(4) **Exceptions** allows approval of alternative building designs for adaptive reuse or expansion of existing buildings.
- (c) **Building Design** standards should also include standards for **Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility**, which are currently located in 18.02.707 and 18.04.1305(e). A cross reference should remain in Article 13 Residential Adjacency. All standards apply in and adjacent to the MF-14 and lower intensity residential districts, with certain exceptions. Review 18.02.707 topics noted below:
  - Recommend relocating material to this section and removing MD-PD (Powning) district from applicability for all subsections.
- (1) **Front Setbacks** requires a 2:1 height/setback ratio from front property lines for building massing.
- (2) **Side Setbacks** require side setback matching, 1:1 additional side setback above 24 feet in height, 1:1 additional side setback above 12 feet in height for structures in the front or rear setback area, and provisions to waive standards with consent of the adjacent owner.
- (3) **Stepbacks and Height Limits** apply tiered building height limits of 60 feet within 75 feet of these districts and 100 feet within 150 feet of these districts.

- 18.04.804 **Supplemental Standards for Single Family Residential Structures**
  - (b) **Site Layout and Development Pattern** retains existing Street Image Standards
    - TWG Recommends clarification of “varied front setback” standard in relation to new site design standards for the same topic.
    - TWG Recommends referencing or relocating the RV parking standard in this section.
  - (c) **Circulation and Access** retains current limits for RV parking on single family lots.
    - Recommend changing title to “Recreational Vehicle Parking”.

- Any other discussion topics??

**Article 9: Site and Building Standards for Mixed Use Districts**
Major Discussion Topics:
1. Site design standards
2. Circulation standards
3. Building design standards

- **18.04.902 Applicability**
  - (a) *District Applicability* applies Article to all mixed use districts
  - (b) provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.
  - (b) *Project-Specific Applicability* also allows administrator approval for use of Article 8 residential design standards for residential development in mixed use districts.
  - (c) *Discretionary Review* generally maintains expedited processing provisions from the current Mixed Use zoning district, but not in the new MS district.

- **18.04.903 General Standards for all Mixed Use Development** (**Significant Discussion Topic**)
  - Recommend renaming to “General Standards for Mixed Use Districts” to better reflect applicability.
  - (a) *Site layout and Development Pattern*
    - (a)(1) *Relationship with Major Roadways* requires orientation towards arterial and collector streets and design accommodations for planned roadway expansions.
      - TWG Recommends clarification that the standards refer to City (not RTC) roadway classifications.
    - (a)(2) *Setbacks* clarify that setbacks in downtown and higher intensity districts in measured from the curb, not property line. Provisions also allow setback reductions due to existing building locations and excess street right-of-way.
      - TWG Recommends change to measure from back of curb, not face of curb to better address use of sloped or rolled curbs.
    - (a)(3) *Minimum Lot Sizes* requires maintenance of alley access for land divisions under 6,000 square feet.
      - TWG Recommends changes to restrict new curb cuts and allow shared access from existing driveways (with possible driveway widening) in these situations.
    - (a)(4) *Densities* maintains and expands existing provisions allowing exceptions to minimum density and intensity standards.
      - Recommend adding the additional existing allowance for lower densities with SUP approval, modified to use a site plan review.
process. This is consistent with Council direction and was a
drafting omission.

- TWG Recommends clarification of intensity standards for projects
  that are partly new development and partly adaptive reuse.

  (a)(5) Sidewalks generally maintains the existing sidewalk/streetscape
  standards from existing mixed use districts with added provisions for site
  by site adjustments.

  - Recommend edits to specify locations for the 18 foot, 12 foot and
    10 foot setback standards so readers don’t need to cross
    reference with chapter 18.02.

  - TWG Recommends adding standards for utility boxes that are
    located in sidewalk areas (likely a case by case decision).

  (a)(6) Pedestrian Amenities maintains current standards for 1 percent of
  project cost to be applied to enhanced pedestrian amenities.

  - Recommend removing this requirement from the MS district to
    reflect reduced priority as a high intensity transit corridor. Also
    note that footnote 148 was carried forward from an initial staff
draft – staff is not recommending these changes and did not
    propose the Common Open Spade article that is referenced.

  (a)(7) Building Orientation modifies existing standards to require building
  orientation toward the front property line, or pedestrian connections.

  (a)(8) Street Frontage Requirements generally maintains existing
  standards with added clarity establishing a quantifiable standard and
  allowances for pedestrian amenities in lieu of buildings along street
  frontages.

  (a)(9) Loading and Service Areas maintains current standards with added
  limitation against trash and loading facilities along the Truckee River.

(b) Circulation and Access

  (b)(1) Site Connectivity requires accommodations for off-street
  connections between mixed use development projects where feasible.

  - TWG Recommends clarifying that this applies to vehicular connections.

  (b)(2) Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity limits barriers that hinder
  access to abutting streets, sidewalks and trails.

  (b)(3) Recreational Access requires trailheads and public access to
  abutting public land trails.

(c) Building Design

  (c)(1) Wall Articulation updates design standards to provide a certain
  number of articulation features from a menu of options. Language
  expands design flexibility compared to current code.
Note that an intended section (c)(2) was inadvertently omitted from the public review draft.

- Recommend adding the following:
  - (2) Ground-Level Interest: Ground floors of street facing facades shall have transparent doors or windows no less than four feet in height along at least 60 percent of the facade’s horizontal length facing Fourth Street or Virginia Street and 40 percent along other street frontages. Primary building frontages not facing streets shall also have transparent windows or doors along at least 60 percent of the façade’s horizontal length. Modifications may be approved by the Administrator for adaptive reuse of existing buildings. See Section 18.04.904 for transparency standards in the Downtown Districts.
  - TWG Recommends a relaxed standard for ground floor residential uses in mixed use districts.

- (c)(2) (reorganized to (c)(3)) Parking Structures maintains current standards, with clarifying language.
- (c)(3) (reorganized to (c)(4)) Building Massing and Form requires design variations in multi-building mixed use developments.
  - (d) Sustainability Elements maintains existing provisions for the mixed use district, with updates reflecting new building code requirements and expanded applicability to include all mixed use districts in the updated code.

- 18.04.904 Supplemental Standards for Downtown Districts:
  - (b) Maintains standards currently in place for the Entertainment District.
  - (c) Maintains standards currently in place for the Truckee River District (including Riverfront Esplanade) and California Avenue District. This is a little challenging, as the Master Plan includes both existing districts in the new Mixed Use Downtown Riverwalk (MD-RD) District. Locational criteria are added to keep current standards in the areas they currently apply.
  - Recommend final review for accuracy in maintaining existing supplemental standards in this area – the current document has some drafting errors, including:
    - Subsections 2, 3, 5 and 6 should only apply within the former Truckee River District (West of Lake Street and North of State Street or East of Lake Street and North of Mill Street)
    - On (c)(2) / Table 1.18: Side setback outside the Riverfront Esplanade is 0 ft. or greater than 5 ft.
    - Subsection 5 title is for the MD-RD district, not MD-PD.

- 18.04.905 Supplemental Standards for Other Mixed-Use Districts
o (b) maintains existing supplemental standards for the PO district.
  o (c) maintains existing supplemental standards in portions of the MU district.
  o (d) maintains existing supplemental standards for the Midtown districts with targeted edits to remove standards that duplicate new city-wide standards.
    ▪ TWG Recommends clarification of hours of operation limits and maintenance of existing provisions.
• 18.04.906 Supplemental Standards for Large Retail Establishments maintains existing standards with targeted edits to reduce repetition.
  o TWG Recommends clarification of applicability (move from definitions) and inclusion of standards related to the subdivision of large retail establishments and reciprocal parking and access agreements.
• Any other discussion topics??
Article 10: Site and Building Standards for Nonresidential Districts

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Building design standards
2. Standards for compatibility with residential districts

- 18.04.1002 Applicability
  - (a) District Applicability applies Article to nonresidential districts, including Mixed Use – Airport.
    - Note footnote 192 is incorrect – RTIA standards are included.
  - (b) Project-Specific Applicability provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.

- 18.04.1003 General Standards for Nonresidential Districts (**Significant Discussion Topic**)
  - (a) Site layout and Development Pattern includes general site design standards, which are considerably more flexible than in residential and mixed use districts.
    - TWG Recommends clarification of subjective language, including “framing streets”.
  - (b) Circulation and Access
    - (b)(1) Use of Public Streets limits truck loading from public streets
    - (b)(2) Site Layout requires a pedestrian access route from public sidewalks.
    - (b)(3) Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity limits barriers that hinder access to abutting streets, sidewalks and trails.
    - (b)(4) Recreational Access requires trailheads and public access to abutting public land trails.
  - (c) Building Design
    - (c)(1) Building Articulation retains current articulation standards with reduced applicability to only apply in nonresidential districts.
      - TWG Recommends changes to existing horizontal and vertical articulation standards to allow other forms of quality design, which may include materials, landscaping and other features. Consider a menu of options similar to the draft residential and mixed use standards, but with different design requirement standards more applicable to industrial and other nonresidential buildings.
    - (c)(2) Integration of Architecture, Signage and Lighting requires certain design features to maintain visual interest when viewed from public streets.
(c)(3) **Materials and Colors** includes limitations to blend with natural surroundings.

- TWG Recommends updating and consolidating these standards with building articulation standards into a more comprehensive building design section. Standards related to fire resistant materials are redundant and requirements for earth tone colors may preclude good design.

(c)(4) **Parking Structures** generally retains standards for parking structures.

- (d) **Sustainability Elements** applies existing provisions for the mixed use district, with updates reflecting new building code requirements and expanded applicability to include all nonresidential districts in the updated code.
- (e) **Additional Standards for Residential District Compatibility** establishes new design standards to minimize impacts of large nonresidential buildings on adjacent residential areas.
  - (e)(1) regulates the orientation of truck loading, outdoor storage and refuse areas.
    - TWG Recommends the addition of an option to screen these features with walls and landscaping.
  - (e)(2) requires larger landscaped buffers adjacent to residential areas for buildings over 100,000 square feet and sites over 10 acres.
    - TWG Recommends addition of a compliance option involving physical separation and distance.
  - (e)(3) requires a site specific assessment of potential impacts on adjacent residential areas (if any) for buildings over 100,000 square feet and sites over 10 acres
    - TWG Recommends change to trigger this at 150,000 sf of building area, which is more typical for a 10 acre project site.

18.04.1004 **District Specific Standards**

- (a) **Mixed-Use Airport District** retains existing standards for the Reno-Tahoe International Airport and the Reno-Stead Airport, including the option to use IC and I district standards in certain circumstances.
  - TWG Recommends clarification related to the location of the Boynton Slough to better describe where certain requirements apply.

- Any other discussion topics??
Article 11: Improvement Standards for New Development

- No substantive changes.
- Any discussion topics??
  - TWG Recommends technical revisions to better align existing code language with actual processes. For example, many subdivisions are approved by the Planning Commission, but code language only identifies the City Council as a deciding body. Changes may also relocate some technical design requirements to a technical manual.
Article 12: Exterior Lighting

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Unpermitted lighting
2. Light pole height
3. Color of lighting

- 18.04.1202 Applicability
  o (b) Additions and Renovations provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.
  o (c) Exemptions provide certain exemptions for emergency lighting, seasonal lighting, lighting required by the FAA or FCC, special event lighting, lighting required by the building code, and lighting for outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities.
    ▪ TWG recommends clarification of requirements related to unpermitted use of light strands and other lighting to attract attention to buildings. Consider not allowing.

- 18.04.1203 Administration requires a lighting plan submittal and allows administrative approval of alternatives.

- 18.04.1204 General Exterior Lighting Standards apply outside the Downtown districts (but within Powning)
  o (a) prohibits certain types of lighting
  o (b) requires shielding of light fixtures and limits light trespass onto other properties
  o (c) limits light outputs
  o (d) establishes limits for nighttime lighting and motion sensors
  o (e) establishes standards for floodlights and spotlights
  o (f) allows exceptions for nonrestricted gaming operations

- 18.04.1205 Parking Area Lighting establishes a 30 foot maximum height for parking lot lights and exempts lighting within parking structures from illumination limits.
  o TWG Recommends retaining the 30 foot height limit in the non-residential districts, and having a reduced 20 foot height limit in Mixed Use districts (and retaining the 18 foot limit near residential)
  o TWG Recommends a reference to proposed landscape code requirements to not locate parking lot light poles in tree islands (or a duplicate standard).

- 18.04.1206 establishes standards for Outdoor Recreation and Entertainment Facility lighting.
- 18.04.1207 outlines Installation and Maintenance standards
- Any other discussion topics??
TWG Recommends consideration of standards for the tint (temperature) of lighting for increased consistency. In general, warmer shades that appear similar to incandescent lights are preferred over cold/blue shades.
Article 13: Residential Adjacency

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Grading adjacency standards
2. Residential privacy provisions
3. Noise standards
4. Trash removal

- 18.04.1302 Applicability applies article 13 standards to nonresidential development within, adjacent to, and within 150 feet of residential zoning districts.
- 18.04.1303 Use Limitations outlines limitations for public address systems, outdoor storage, drive through lanes, and hours of operation.
- 18.04.1304 Grading
  - (a) establishes fill depth limits adjacent to residential districts with provisions for exceptions.
  - (b) maintains current (more restrictive) standard for grading adjacent to single family districts.
  - TWG Recommends refinements to applicability and allowed alternatives, including consideration of adjacent building locations and potential waivers if adjacent residences are a considerable distance from the development site and possible alternative compliance measures including increased landscaping.
- 18.04.1305 Site and Building Orientation
  - (a) Site Orientation addresses orientation of higher activity areas away from residential areas where feasible.
    - TWG Recommends clarification to focus adjacency requirements on adjoining residential properties preferentially over residential properties that are adjacent across a street.
  - (b) Building Configuration calls for transitional/reduced building heights on portions of sites that adjoin residential districts.
    - Recommend deleting language at the end of (b)(1): “so that new structures....”. This conflicts with the new setback and stepback standards and may be too restrictive.
  - (c) Outdoor Above Grade Spaces requires design so that upper story balconies avoid direct views into rear yards of single family areas.
    - TWG Recommends changes to address privacy more broadly, noting that floor to ceiling windows can be more impactful that upper floor porches. Broader to require landscaping or other buffering to address residential district privacy concerns.
  - (d) Building Facades requires architectural treatments on all facades visible from public streets or residential districts.
(e) Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility is to be relocated to Article 8 and was addressed in that section.

- Replace with a reference to the Article 8 standards so applicable provisions also apply adjacent to and within 150 feet of residential districts.

- **18.04.1306 Signage Adjacent to Residential**
  - (a) prohibits side or read wall signage abutting residential districts.
  - (b) addresses the design of signage adjacent to residential areas and prohibits internally illuminated signs from being orientated towards residually zoned property. Indirect illumination of signs may still be allowed.

- **18.04.1307 Spillover Lighting** limits spillover light levels to 0.5 foot candles adjacent to certain residential districts (MF-14 and lower intensity), limits light fixture heights within 100 feet of residential districts to 18 feet in height, and allows administrative flexibility.

- **18.04.1308 Noise** generally retains noise limitations with clarifications regarding sustained and recurring noise levels.
  - TWG Recommends refinements in coordination with noise experts, to include a review of other community ordinances, improved provisions for ambient noise levels and clarification of standards for single event, recurring and sustained noises.

- **18.04.1309 Odor** clarifies nuisance limitations related to Odor and requires that garbage containers be located at least 25 feet from residential areas where feasible.

- **18.04.13010 Off-Street Parking** outlies locational considerations for the location of off street parking for nonresidential uses adjacent to residential areas.

- **18.04.13011 Cut-Through Traffic** seeks to prevent site designs that promote cut through traffic in adjacent residential areas.

- **18.04.13012 Use of Alleys** prohibits use of residential alleys for commercial business deliveries at night.

- **18.04.13013 Loading Activities** addresses the location, orientation and screening of commercial loading areas adjacent to residential areas.

- Any other discussion topics??
  - TWG Recommends investigation of authority (or voluntary agreements) with waste management to not collect trash during overnight hours in alleys that separate businesses from homes.
Article 14: Skyways
- No substantive changes.
- Any discussion topics?
  - TWG Recommends consideration of site plan reviews to replace special use permits for skyways (pending process discussion).

Article 15: Safe Scape Regulations
- No substantive changes.
- This section of code was written to address ongoing operational standards from a law enforcement perspective. The entire article may be relocated to a section of RMC not in Title 18 to better reflect the sue and applicability of these code provisions.
- Any discussion topics??
Chapter 18.05 Signs

Major Discussion Topics:

1. Consolidated limitations for real estate and political signs.

Updates to sign ordinances are generally outside the scope of this code update project. Substantive changes are limited to the minimum required for compliance with a recent supreme court ruling (Reed v Gilbert) involving content neutrality.

- 18.05.1010(b) is updated to consolidate existing standards for temporary real estate signs and temporary political signs. Where standards for size or duration differ, the more permissive standard is applied.
- 18.05.1003 / Table 1.22
  - Table note [6] is updated to remove allowance for one additional 16 q. ft. freestanding sign for gas stations price signs. Freestanding signs for all use types are limited to one per frontage in specified mixed use districts.
- Any other discussion topics??

Chapter 18.06: Land Division

- No substantive changes.

Any discussion topics??
  - TWG Recommends technical corrections to reference current building codes and remove a redundant and inconsistent provisions related to townhomes.
Chapter 18.07 Historic Preservation

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Incentives for preservation
2. Demolition standards
3. Certificate of Appropriateness exemptions for certain maintenance activities.

Targeted changes were made per Master Plan implementation measures. These provisions apply to the locally designated historic resources, not the more common federally designated historic resources.

- 18.07.202 Procedures for Nomination and Designation
  - (f)(2) is amended to automatically apply the HL overlay district upon designation of a historic resource with approval of the property owner. This eliminates the need for a separate rezoning process.
  - (g) is amended to automatically rescind the HL overlay district upon approval of a demolition certificate, also eliminating the need for a separate rezoning process.
    - TWG Recommends clarification of historic features upon nomination to focus future review of proposed improvements on significant historic matters.

- 18.07.302 Historical Resources Commission Recommendation on Related Zoning Applications
  - (c) is added to call for HRC review of Planning Commission cases located adjacent to an historic resource.

- 18.07.303 Demolition Certificate
  - (b)(4) Findings are added
  - (c) Mitigation of Historic Resource Loss or Alteration is added to specify acceptable mitigation options for demolition if an historic resource, including a new process by which the HRC may initiate the relocation or salvage of historic resources proposed to be demolished without completing other mitigation actions. Some have proposed granting the HRC and City Council the right to deny demolition permits, but this document does not do that.

- 18.07.304 Certificates of Appropriateness
  - (c)(introduction) is added to administratively allow modifications determined to have no significant impact.
  - (c)(4) is added to establish an initial review by staff and two HRC members to determine if applications are significant enough to warrant review by the full HRC and to approve applications deemed to create no significant impact.
    - TWG recommendation for more meaningful streamlining to eliminate Certificate of Appropriateness requirements for maintenance activities.
and minor improvements such as window replacement, painting and similar work.

- **18.07.305 Maintenance Obligation and Demolition by Neglect** is a new section, drafted per Master Plan language, to establish maintenance obligations and a process for determination of “demolition by neglect”. Note that subsection (c)(5) ultimately allows the City to determine that demolition by neglect is occurring, which would trigger the mitigation measures required for demolition permits.

- **18.07.306 Economic Hardship** includes expanded criteria whereby applicants may petition for approval of demolition permits or certificates of appropriateness based on economic hardship.

- **18.07.307 Incentives for Historic Resource Preservation** is a new section calling for HRC development of an incentive package.
  - TWG recommends the development of actual incentives in accordance with Master Plan provisions, rather than a call for a future work program that may or may not occur. Incentives could include:
    - Eliminating on-site parking requirements
    - Allowances for minor improvements without HRC review
    - Members to research other City ordinances and may identify other topics to more effectively encourage preservation of historic resources.

- Any other discussion topics??

**Note that review by the Technical Working Group has been completed through Chapter 18.07. Further review of Chapter 18.08 (Administration and Procedures) is scheduled to occur on January 21. Input on the remaining topics will be summarized at the Planning Commission workshop.**
Module 3 Administration and Procedures

Chapter 18.01: General Provisions:

- **18.01.403: Nonconforming Uses** (Generally allowed to continue and requires SUP to expand).
  - New subsection (b) allows expansion up to 20% in the same building administratively with finding
  - New subsection (d)(5) allows expansion up to 25% with site plan review and findings
  - New (d)(7) allows expansion of single family use by right
  - Revised (f) allows planning commission approval of SUP to reestablish a non-conforming use, except for gaming (revised from council approval).

- **18.01.404: Nonconforming Structures** (Generally allowed to continue and requires SUP to expand).
  - Reorganized to be distinct from nonconforming uses
  - New (a) clarifies ongoing interpretations
    - Non-conforming buildings may be expanded in a conforming way
    - Non-conforming expansions may be allowed with SUP and findings
  - Updated (b) allows restoration within 18 months following calamity without limitations/conditions

- **18.01.504: Enforcement, Remedies and Penalties**
  - Updated/new (b) and (c) clarify right to issue stop work orders, and withhold or deny permits for violations (vs revocation only).

- **Article 6: Transition from Prior Regulations**
  - In process applications may pick old or new code (not some of each)

- Any other discussion topics??
Chapter 18.08 Administration and Procedures

This chapter is generally based on existing Chapters 18.04, 18.05, and 18.06 with modifications to improve organization, streamline certain review procedures, establish additional processes for flexibility and relief, update findings and address PUDs and SPDs.

- Article 2 / Table 8.1 is an updated version of existing Section 18.06.108 Summary Table with new procedures (discussed later) included.
- Article 3 Common Review Procedures
  - 18.08.302 Pre-Application Meeting specifies procedures for (voluntary) pre-application meetings
  - 18.08.303 Application Submittal and Handling
    - New (a) outlining authorities to submit an application
    - New (b) referencing administrative fees and application forms
    - Updated (d) outlining concurrent review procedures reflecting current (new) practice allowing review of separate zoning and SUP applications (or similar) at the same meeting. Intended to provide a faster option for pre-development entitlements.
    - Updated (e) establishing intake dates twice per month and calling for site plan reviews and new application types to be submitted on intake dates. The change for site plan reviews is proposed in conjunction with increased use of site plan reviews instead of special use permits.
    - New (f) addressing state law requirements for determination of application completeness.
    - New (g) addressing withdrawal of applications and fee refunds.
      - Recommend adding a new (3) allowing Administrator to establish additional allowances for partial fee refunds.
  - 18.08.304 Review and Action
    - New (a) through (d) specifying typical procedures for review and action.
    - New (e) specifies approval criteria for all applications, covering some topics currently address in application specific findings.
    - New (f) authorizes conditions of approval with criteria for potential conditions generally reflecting legal requirements.
  - 18.08.305 Scheduling and Notice of Public Hearings
    - Updated (b)(2) outlining current practice for on site notification posting
    - Updated (c) with consolidated standards for mailed and posted notice (eliminates duplication).
    - New (f) addressing constructive notice, including minor notification defects and failure to receive notice.
  - 18.08.306 Review and Decision
- Expanded (a) and (b) include generally applicable review and decision criteria, allowing the removal of duplicative language in individual procedure sections.
  - 18.08.307 Post-Decision Actions and Limitations
    - New section consolidating and expanding generally applicable post-decision actions and limitations. This includes certain provisions that are currently specified for some applications, but should properly be applied to all applications (e.g. (e) Revocation of Approval, (f) extension of approval, (g) modification or amendment of approval, (h) compliance with plans, and (j) Temporary Certificates of Occupancy).

- Article 4 Annexation, Interpretation and Master Plan Procedures
  - Material is reorganized from Chapters 18.04 and 18.05, with few substantive changes.
    - Recommend moving 18.08.402 Administrative Interpretations to Article 5 and Renaming Article 5: Ordinance Amendments and Interpretations
  - Updated 18.08.404 (b) Applicability including NRS criteria for minor master plan amendments.
  - Updated 18.08.404 (c)(1) allowing Planning Commission initiation of Minor Master Plan Amendments. Planning Commission is already authorized to initiate major master plan amendments.

- Article 5 Ordinance Amendments and Interpretations
  - Material is reorganized and updated from Chapter 18.06 Article 4.
  - Updated 18.08.501(c) with procedures for Code Text Amendments
  - In 18.08.502 Rezoning, Footnote 85 indicates new review timelines have been established, but they have not.
    - Recommend adding procedures similar to SUP + appeal.
  - 18.08.503 Rezoning to Planned Unit Development
    - New (c)(7)b Minor Amendments to PUD Plans establishing administrative amendment procedure for PUDs allowing up to 10% increase.
      - Discuss scope – should this allow additional development as written or be limited to reconfigurations or land use conversions?
      - Recommending the authorization of conditions and making PUD approval findings applicable.
    - New (c)(7)c Reconsideration and Expiration establishing time limitations for development of PUDs. Applies to future approvals. Rezoning may be initiated if no development occurs in 10 years or less than 50% in 20 years.
    - New (c)(7)d specifies procedure to rezone a PUD to another district.
New (d) **Findings** for PUDs. Findings address compatibility, public benefits and also codifies master plan language related to consistency of PUD land uses with the City Master Plan Map.

- Article 6 **Development Permits**.
  - Updated 18.08.601 *Projects of Regional Significance* clarifies procedures for PRS review to reflect current practice.

Updates to 18.08.602 *Site Plan Review*

- Updated (b)4 *Activities Subject to Site Plan Review* establishes site plan review procedures for adjacency to residentially zoned property and cluster / small lot development.
- New (c) *Exemptions* expanded to allow small additions (updated and expanded from current SUP exemptions). Also exempts residential adjacency across a major arterial or freeway.
  - Recommend correction of drafting error – exemption (c)(2) should be the same as special use permit exemption 18.08.603(c)(2).
- Updated (d)(2) *Public Notice* to establish major and minor site plan review noticing standards. Noticing radius reduced to 250 feet and ten owners for smaller projects.
- Updated (e)(3) *Appeal* changes appeal procedure from hearings examiner to planning commission. Final appeals go to council.
- Updated (f)(2) *Time Limitations and Extensions* with time extension allowances similar to SUPs.
- Updated (g) **Findings** similar to SUP findings.

Updates to 18.08.603 *Special Use Permit*

- Updated (b) *Applicability* to eliminate SUP review (now site plan review) for residential adjacency and cluster / small lot development.
- Note footnote 109 regarding formatting with some duplication of SUP triggers.
- Updated (b)(9) reflects grading and hillside development review changes.
- Updated (c)(2) broadens applicability for additions to nonresidential facilities. Does not require that the project previously received an uncontested SUP. Keeps 20,000 sf limit, but increases allowed addition from 10% to 20%. Modifies compatibility language.
- Updated (e) **Findings** with new general findings for approval.
• (e)(2) findings for hillside development to be relocated to 18.04.3xx to apply to all hillside development applications, including those not requiring SUP approval.
• Note highlighted material suggested for relocation to applicable code sections.
  o Article 7 Other Development Permits and Approvals
    ▪ Note and correct drafting error in 18.08.604 (b) Grading Permits with general finding language inserted where existing language regarding permit requirements and findings should be. Intent is to not change current grading permit standards.
  o Article 8 Flexibility and Relief
    ▪ 18.08.801 Variances
      • Updated (c)(6) Time Limitations for consistency with SUP and tentative map procedures.
    ▪ 18.08.802 Major Deviations. This is a new process allowing deviations up to 50% from quantifiable code standards. This is similar to a variance, but without a requirement for a “hardship” or “exceptional situation”.
      • Discuss option of public hearings before the planning commission vs land use hearings examiner (as specified in text). Following research, staff and consultants determined that NRS requirements for special exceptions (NRS 278.315) permit the use of an administrative hearings examiner for land use matters. This process involves an administrative public hearing with appeals to the city council. Alternatively, the process could include a planning commission hearing, similar to a variance. Another option is to standardize the process for variances, major deviations and alternative compliance applications and have review triggers based on project size. There are some new administrative duties associated with a new process and the value added may not be significant. If this process is established, it could also be used for site plan reviews.
        o If retained, recommend adding an alternative procedure available to applicants involving planning commission review similar to a variance or SUP.
    ▪ (b) establishes applicability at 50% of quantifiable development standard.
      • Recommend edits clarifying that major deviations are not allowed for density or lot size standards.
    ▪ (c) establishes the review process and introduces the Land Use Hearings Examiner
• (d) establishes findings for approval.
  ▪ 18.08.803 *Alternative Equivalent Compliance* is a second new process, similar to major deviations, allowing deviations from other development standards.
    ○ Recommend keeping the process consistent with major deviations.
  • (b) establishes applicability limited to Chapter 18.04 Development Standards.
  • (c) establishes the review process and introduces the Land Use Hearings Examiner
  • (d) establishes findings for approval.

  • 18.08.804 *Minor Deviations*
  ▪ Updated (b) *Applicability* to maximize use of the process as specified in NRS 278.319
  ▪ Updated (c)(1) to use written consent language consistent with NRS.
  o 18.08.805 *Appeal*
    ▪ New (a) *Appeal of Administrative Decisions to Planning Commission* establishes a new appeal process. This is for site plan reviews in the draft code.
    ▪ Updated (c)(2)a, consistent with NRS, to provide options for scheduling appeals before the City Council based on meeting attendance or length of agenda
  o 18.08.806 *Development Agreement*.
    ▪ Updated (b) to allow development agreements for projects not requiring PUS, SPD or SUP approval. Plan to further update (b), if permissible following further legal review, to allow development agreements for any project rather than only those projects qualifying as projects of regional significance.

• Article 9 *Review and Decision Making Bodies*
  o 18.08.903 *Planning Commission*
    ▪ Updated (d) to be consistent with City Council resolution for appointments.
  o 18.08.904 *Hearings Examiner*
    ▪ Updated (b) *Powers and Duties of the Historical Resources Commission* to clarify responsibilities.
    ▪ Updated (c) *Composition* to have broader qualifications and attract a wider variety of professionals and increase the pool of potential candidates.
  o 18.08.906 *Land Use Hearings Examiner*
- New decision making process proposed for major deviations, alternative compliance and potentially other processes.
  - (c) requires the examiner be a licensed attorney or AICP planner to be appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council.
- Any other discussion topics??
Chapter 18.09: Rules of Construction and Definitions

Code construction and definitions are largely retained from the existing code with targeted updates made. Substantive amendments are addressed in prior review topics. Updated terms are footnoted in the draft code.

- Article 1 (Module 2) *Rules of Construction and Interpretation* includes expanded general provisions typical of modern codes.
- Article 2 (Module 1) *Definition of Use Categories and Use Types* includes definitions for new use categories, consolidation and certain use categories, and some targeted modernization and clarification.
- Article 3 (Module 2) *All Other Terms Defined* includes some targeted modernization and clarification.
- Any discussion topics??
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Initial Contact</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Meeting (If Appropriate)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>How the Customer Reached Out</th>
<th>Staff Who Responded</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Dory</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevindory@hotmail.com">kevindory@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm reading the City's Annexation and Land Development Code doc. from 3/18. On page 12 of the doc. under Residential Districts, I have a question regarding districts labeled LLC2.5, LLC1 and LLC5. Will these large lot parcels be subject to your new proposed ADU ordinance? Beth, Dory</td>
<td>Vision Form Nate</td>
<td>8/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/2018</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Zonge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lynn@nc-mv.com">lynn@nc-mv.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hello, I am reaching out to you regarding source water and well head protection. It states on page 19 of the City of Reno Annexation and Land Development Code Targeted Assessment Report dated March 2018 that a Proposed Zoning District is the Wellhead/Source Water Protection. As you are aware, the Source Water Protection Planning team is currently developing Source water protection areas as an outcome of our multi-year planning effort. We need to know more about your timeline and process and what product you need from our source water team so that we may meet your deadlines. We would enjoy meeting with you regarding this or chatting on the phone at your earliest convenience. Thank you very much for your help.</td>
<td>Vision Form Nate</td>
<td>8/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td>Ivye</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ivyejohnson137@gmail.com">ivyejohnson137@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I purchased a property in Reno that is three city lots but one piece of property. Two of the lots are zoned Commercial/Residential and one is zoned Residential only... how can I get all three zoned commercial/residential?</td>
<td>Vision Form Nate</td>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Jigour</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jigour@blogglobal.net">Jigour@blogglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have a concern about this topic if it is not being addressed because the building department would allow that conversion and what is to stop a second dwelling unit?</td>
<td>Vision Form Heather</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/15/2019</td>
<td>Shari</td>
<td>Weinberger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shari@HomeGateRealty.com">shari@HomeGateRealty.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am helping out with an organization called MF1 of Northern Nevada which serves students of the University of Nevada Reno as well as TMCC. There is a property that is available for rental which is zoned MF30. I am trying to determine whether renting this property for the purpose of MF1 of Northern Nevada would be in compliance with the MF30 zoning. The property address is 1421 N. Virginia Street. Please advise. Thank you.</td>
<td>Vision Form POJ</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/2019</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hemanway</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stops.tonewithfreedom@yahoo.com">stops.tonewithfreedom@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are the RENovation meetings on 2/19 and 3/19 open to the public? Would I be able to attend as I have some interest of the zoning codes.</td>
<td>Vision Form Calli</td>
<td>2/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4/2019</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Jansen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jansen.j12@gmail.com">jansen.j12@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am reviewing you GIS website and would like some clarification on the zoning for my assistses parcel. I see there is a base zone for the surrounding parcels but nothing for the parcel of interest. Please advise on its status. APN 081-024-07 &amp; 081-031-40</td>
<td>Vision Form Brook</td>
<td>4/4/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/2019</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Hubert</td>
<td>bussaquagmail.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My name is Mark Hubert. I live at 109 Gallente 989509. I grow organic food for human consumption on my property. It is of utmost importance to me that and ordinance eliminating the spraying of pesticides and herbicides in the Midtown be implemented. Thank you for your attention to this issue.</td>
<td>Email Calli</td>
<td>4/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/2019</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaykenny@abcglobal.net">jaykenny@abcglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to see if both homes at 320 Stewart at. APN 013 012 02 same APN are professional office or are they zoned for single family. How do we change it from PO to SF.</td>
<td>Vision Form Kyle</td>
<td>5/3/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/29/2019</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jay20122012@abcglobal.net">jay20122012@abcglobal.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to see if both homes at 320 Stewart at. APN 013 012 02 same APN are professional office or are they zoned for single family. How do we change it from PO to SF.</td>
<td>Vision Form Kyle</td>
<td>5/3/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/2019</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Friedchts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edfriedchts@gmail.com">edfriedchts@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly disagree with your conclusion and recommendation regarding ADUs. I suggest you look at a pre fab product being built right here in Reno. Perfect approach for ADUs. Sustainable fabrication and operation.</td>
<td>Email Kim</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/14/2019</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Kratzer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kent@kratzerconsultinggroup.com">kent@kratzerconsultinggroup.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Call. I wish I had time to help with this but I am absolutely slammed. I think the biggest issue with the residential code is setbacks. I feel that you need to think long and hard on setbacks that will protect and preserve existing neighborhoods in conformance with the adopted master plans – meaning setbacks in keeping with those in the associated neighborhoods including possibly large setbacks for two story homes. Landscaping and window placement also play in to protect pricing but these can be changes by the homeowner once the project is complete with little oversight on the part of the city, especially landscaping. This might have avoided the whole Francovich flasco on Mark Twain. Good luck!</td>
<td>Email Calli</td>
<td>5/14/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21/2019</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Bower</td>
<td><a href="mailto:urusaloe@mac.com">urusaloe@mac.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where can I read the definition of Land Use Code 2407? Is there a list of all Land Use Codes and their definitions online? Where?</td>
<td>Vision Form Nate</td>
<td>5/23/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment (11936 : RENOvation Development Code Update)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Initial Contact</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Meeting (If Appropriate)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>How the Customer Reached Out</th>
<th>Staff Who Responded</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2019</td>
<td>Jaimie</td>
<td>Dalmann</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jaimie.richards@hotmail.com">jaimie.richards@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>307-272-6197</td>
<td>I am in the process of looking in to opening a private preschool. I am trying to find where schools can be zoned in the sparks and Reno area, so that I can start looking into properties. Do you have any information or do you know where I can go to find out? Thank you! Jaimie 307-272-6197</td>
<td>Email Form</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>6/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2019</td>
<td>Beckley</td>
<td>Jesssee</td>
<td>rebecca.f <a href="mailto:coke@gmail.com">coke@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Not up for jumping through the hoops here to address you that I think Reno is fully capable of stepping up and acting on the cost of living vs wages offered that don’t even come close. Money is not an excuse. Don’t be afraid to go ahead and take good care of the little people.</td>
<td>Email Form</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2019</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Fuss</td>
<td><a href="mailto:afuss@lumosinc.com">afuss@lumosinc.com</a></td>
<td>The Housing Task Force Subcommittee has reviewed the issue sheet #2A and the group provided the following comments for your review. Please let us know if a separate meeting is needed to discuss any of this input.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2019</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:manvelson627@bbsglobal.net">manvelson627@bbsglobal.net</a></td>
<td>I would like to know the definition of “Single Family Residence” as it pertains to homes located in the City of Reno and Caughlin Ranch.</td>
<td>Email Form</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>7/15/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2019</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:manvelson627@bbsglobal.net">manvelson627@bbsglobal.net</a></td>
<td>I would like to know the definition of “Single Family Residence” as it pertains to homes located in the City of Reno and Caughlin Ranch.</td>
<td>Email Form</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>7/15/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2019</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Jehle-Peppard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Iris@oneonetruckserver.org">Iris@oneonetruckserver.org</a></td>
<td>450-5489</td>
<td>Attached are comments pertaining to the Development Standard Amendments issue sheet (2A)</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>7/15/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melindas@thebuilders.com">melindas@thebuilders.com</a></td>
<td>(775) 329-4611</td>
<td>Please see the attached comments from the Reno Housing Task Force Subcommittee on issue sheet 23</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>7/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/2019</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Jehle-Peppard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Iris@oneonetruckserver.org">Iris@oneonetruckserver.org</a></td>
<td>450-5489</td>
<td>Attached are comments for issue Sheet #28.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>8-14/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2019</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Wray</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwray@markwaylaw.com">lwray@markwaylaw.com</a></td>
<td>Hi, I represent Scenic Nevada. I'm interested in finding out more about land use in the different zones. Specifically, what zones will billboards be allowed in with the changes being implemented under RENOvate? Thanks very much, Lori Wray</td>
<td>Email Form</td>
<td>Nata</td>
<td>8/15/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/2019</td>
<td>Beckley</td>
<td>Jesssee</td>
<td>rebecca.f <a href="mailto:coke@gmail.com">coke@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Pollinator Friendly please. Whatever you have to do to make that happen. Doesn't seem like it should be so complicated given the examples we have in other cities. I have sat through a couple few City meetings, etc and appreciate that you are accepting online input as well. However this is all the hoop I am up for jumping through currently as I have no real reason to believe (despite the artwork across the street) that the public's opinion of what elected politicians do is actually given it's due. Always hoping for good things but not surprised with Business as usual. Good Luck.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melindas@thebuilders.com">melindas@thebuilders.com</a></td>
<td>(775) 329-4611</td>
<td>Please see the attached comments from the Reno Housing Task Force Subcommittee on issue sheet 23</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>8/27/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/2019</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Crooks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.crooks3@gmail.com">paul.crooks3@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>What is MIXM zoning</td>
<td>Email Form</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>8/27/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>825-4495</td>
<td>Numerous questions regarding organization and content. Support for residential setback/ripback sections. Opposition to expansion allowances for setbacks encroachments. Support for neighborhood outreach process. Support for changes to keep SF-4 density generally unchaged. General opposition to ordinances that permit higher intensity neighborhood scale infill development. Preference to return to larger setbacks similar to those in the 1990's. Discussed arranging a meeting following initial review by Donna and her colleagues.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>8/31/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2019</td>
<td>Rudy</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>rudy. <a href="mailto:leon@gmail.com">leon@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Public open house scheduling concerns/questions</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>9/3/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>825-4495</td>
<td>Concerns about codifying exceptions for setbacks. See written comments</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>9/3/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment (11936 : RENOvation Development Code Update)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Initial Contact</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Meeting (If Appropriate)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>How the Customer Reached Out</th>
<th>Staff Who Responded</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2019</td>
<td>Judi</td>
<td>Gest</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gjud@charter.net">gjud@charter.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes to my Area. I live in the Del Monte/Douglas Diamond area. I don’t know what District is, and if there are changes to my area. Wards 2 &amp; 3. Thank you, this will affect the Daybreak development before the city.</td>
<td>Konvelo Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
<td>Frederick A.</td>
<td>Van Den Abeel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fda2000@gmail.com">fda2000@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dear City of Reno. While I am not a resident of the Wonderful City of Reno, I could not pass up on the opportunity to contribute hopefully a helpful thought as Reno begins a review of their zoning practices. Japan could be an excellent source of inspiration. While housing costs continue to rise in many parts of America and around the world, in Japan, home prices stay flat. Supply keeps up with demand in Tokyo, thanks to few restrictions on development. I believe this can be partly attributed to the simplification of their zoning laws which removes barriers while allowing for growth. An excellent article which describes how Japan has structured their zoning can be found here: <a href="https://urbankingnotes.blogspot.com/2014/04/japanese-zoning.html">https://urbankingnotes.blogspot.com/2014/04/japanese-zoning.html</a> With Your Success in Mind, Frederick A. Van Den Abeel, ASBCB (Accredited Small Business Consultants)</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>Egan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paddy@urbannreono.com">paddy@urbannreono.com</a></td>
<td>775-233-0913</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m wondering with this new zoning code release- how soon would this take place? I’m a little worried with how far down the road we are with our Riverside development plans. Arto addressed question.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/7/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2019</td>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dani@szdme.com">dani@szdme.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Housing. The zoning districts look fine. I don’t see anything addressing density bonuses or parking reductions for affordable housing. I know it’s in play as an affordable housing developer, but not sure if it applies to the zoning code update. Feel free to reach out to me directly. I am on the 14th floor of city hall building. Thanks!</td>
<td>Konvelo Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2019</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Samuelsson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.samuelsson@gmail.com">andrew.samuelsson@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email supporting the elimination of minimum parking requirements. Returned message and provided contact for follow-up.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/9/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/2019</td>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>Trincher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lilieta@gmail.com">lilieta@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan for my parcel - Hello, was hoping to understand what the master plan for my parcel of land is in Reno, where can I find that information please? Address is 3715 Warren Vey, Reno, 89509</td>
<td>Konvelo Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/2019</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Coedl</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garycoedl621@gmail.com">garycoedl621@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please explain, in layman’s terms, what the following means to me as the owner of a downtown condo in the Montage. The following is from the current issues document, “Downtown Area Zoning: The existing overlay zoning districts for the downtown area are reorganized into six base zoning districts. Minimum density and intensity standards are increased, with allowances granted for lower intensities in certain situations. Allowed density and intensity is reduced in the Powning district, in conjunction with development of a conservation; historic overlay district. Uses in the University district are somewhat more restrictive.”</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2019</td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Dupay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdupay01@gmail.com">pdupay01@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What Zone I live in? I would like to find out what zone of Reno we live in. Our address is 205 Brockport Dr. Once I find out, then we can make sense of the zoning plan. Thank you for your help. Peggy Dupay</td>
<td>Konvelo Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Adkins</td>
<td>775-303-4535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ovens several commercial properties at 1330 - 1350 Geiger Grade. Wants to make sure that his zoning has no changing and that any changes will not affect the nearest property to conduct business (customer advised that it will not). Does not like all of the apartments being built in the area. Tired of the out of control growth. Neighbors getting together to voice accordingly.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Agmone</td>
<td>775-412-7844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Called on behalf of a client that owns property at 3150 Mill Street in IC zoning district. Wanted to understand if the IC zoning district would still apply to the property. Was not interested in learning more about the project through the project website or reviewing draft documents.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Sienna</td>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Guistion</td>
<td>775-530-4056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted to know if the zoning code update will result in a property tax increase. Explained property tax valuation method.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Sienna</td>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>Sandhu</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned that their neighborhood would experience an increase in density. Was not concerned about the zoning code update generally, more concerned about neighboring properties and the current potential for lot splits.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>775-746-4531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customer accessed documents online but was unsure whether the zoning code update was directly related to her property. Confirmed that there would no change to the zoning for her lot or her subdivision.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td><a href="mailto:audreyrc07@yahoo.com">audreyrc07@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hello, I am planning on building a small home in the near future and I am considering purchasing land on the west/horsetail end of Reno. Can you tell me the minimum square footage that is required for building a new home and if building the home out of shipping containers is allowed? I’m just looking for a broad answer on the subject to help steer me in the right direction. Thank you for you time. – Audrey Link</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (If Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2019</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Brose</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lbrose@abcglobal.net">lbrose@abcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>None provided</td>
<td>I received your postcard about zoning code changes. My question is, is my address going to change it’s zoning? I live at 1765 Helena St. Reno, NV 89512. I believe it is currently both residential and small business. What is the plan for this part of town? I am along the Oddie Boulevard corridor and West of 395 North. My question is, is my address going to change it’s zoning? I live at 1765 Helena St. Reno, NV 89512. I believe it is currently both residential and small business. What is the plan for this part of town? I am along the Oddie Boulevard corridor and West of 395 North</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2019</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Vancoy</td>
<td>None provided</td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>I was interested to know if the zoning code update would impact the existing open space property to the east of his property. Informed him that there would be no changes to the zoning of open space to the east but there would be city initiated changes to open space identified in his subdivision that were previously zoned SF to PGOS based on the master plan.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>9/11/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Will the code be HTML searchable? Important to be easy to use.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Sealing other cities make substantial changes to zoning to support infill, such as banning single family zoning. Is Reno heading that direction?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Parking is a major issue. How are current regulations working now? What changes are we looking at through this update? Will there be a very clear way to determine parking requirement? Need an easier way to determine the parking requirement very simple to look up is important.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Once adopted, how will the new code be implemented? Apply retroactively? Phase in period?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Discussion about the recommended planning changes coming from Master Plan policies and where those changes will apply</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>If you have an existing shop with a drive-thru, how will this code change that? Impact existing businesses? How about banks or pharmacies?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Mobile home regulatory system is confusing. Too many bodies involved in that process.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>In additional to parking, landscaping would be another area to look at to reduce the cost of construction and support affordable housing. Also concern about TIVWA rate increases.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>When you have a big box next to residential, will the recommendation be stepped height increases?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Will the noise standards be revised? Consultants that have been brought in to our area on recent projects have noted that our noise standards are very antiquated.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Will hours of operation related to trucks traffic be addressed? Seems to be handled on case by case basis but conditions are very similar. Would be better to codify the standard. Same for construction equipment and slab pours. Generally, standardization is more preferred so everyone knows the rules up front and are treated the same.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>How will we implement the new code with our staff to ensure seamless transition and consistency? Training, etc.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Okay with deleting infill-specific section and discussed how those will be transitioned into different sections of code. Group seemed supportive.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Supportive of changes to avoid the sidewalk to nowhere</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Support for no max for parking, similar to Sparks. Let the market dictate.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>What does “review of projects for effects on nearby historic resources” mean? How would that be implemented?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Seems like Planning Commission would be the more appropriate body for appeals on site-specific issues</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>NAQP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQP Government Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Support for cuts and fill changes. Should go back to original purpose of that SU to its not being overused for situations that are needed.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afto</td>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (If Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Eiken</td>
<td>541-988-4654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General questions on zoning surrounding her property at 212-122/04</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>9/13/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like the new format, colors and simplification.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Even with the best plans intentions to update code on an ongoing basis, it can be difficult to maintain.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciate the ongoing code update plans but would suggest being more willing to remove neighborhood plans now. Example: Do not believe there is a large vested interest in the Plumas Plan.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would be helpful to have a link to the map directly in the code</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too much vague and administrative authority in the draft. It's going to be difficult for that person to justify decision during appeals.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UT40 purpose statement</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Height is a false argument and a segment we don't see.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned about freeway off ramp provision for drive throughs. Not sure if 1/2 mile is the right distance. Maybe it should be further than that. Concern that it is intensifying in the urban core.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft says that we will implement University Master Plan. What if URMC changes their plan? Does this mean we just implement it as they dictate?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clustering is concerning to me. It seems like more a...</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential adjacency is very involved in draft. It seems to me if the zoning map is refined a bit more, the focus on residential adjacency is not needed.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breilhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need to fine tune our industrial uses. It's a missed opportunity to not have something for warehouse district.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Sanner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How does this check with newly adopted sustainability plan?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support for new form at</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-family is broken out by duplex/triplex/fourplex in this new code, but standards are the same. Why was it broken out if the standards are the same?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You say the footnotes may go away with adoption of code. Maybe you want to consider keeping some footnotes. It will help provide information about original intent and purpose.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 35 - University District there is an FAR max. Why there but not other Downtown districts? Isn't that an area that we want to intensify? Seems conflicting.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page 36 - Downtown Entertainment District (Page 28) - is measurement from property line? What is measured from? Should be more specific standards for more specific instances - Downtown Streetscape standards and how it connects with code</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment (11936 : RENOvation Development Code Update)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Meeting (if Appropriate)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>How the Customer Reached Out</th>
<th>Staff Who Responded</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Breinhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
<td>It seems to me that the Downtown District standards is more relevant in other documents. We skipped planning for the Northwest Quadrant and now the standards will be in code.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Anfo</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Balinda</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>775-343-5678</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted to know if the zoning code update would change her zoning as PUD - Caughlin Ranch</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>AnnMarie</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonobetcstar@gmail.com">jonobetcstar@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted a summary of the code amendments.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>AnnMarie</td>
<td>9/17/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2019</td>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:floyd@rowleyrealestateadvisors.com">floyd@rowleyrealestateadvisors.com</a></td>
<td>775-224-3183</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great to see you and Anfo @ the NAPO/GA Committee meeting last week. I was distressed by the revelation about proposed height limits for the Powning District. Can you please send me the detailed code sections (A90) the map? I have done a lot of work for Jeff Jacobs and Don Clark - and I own 1/2 AC @ the NEC of Rafton and 1st Street. I can guarantee you that all 3 owners are planning high rise apartments and condos right on the river - eventually. Hello Anfo: Thank you for your detailed response to my question below. The map that you sent as part of the document titled, &quot;master plan Powning page 09&quot;, appears to show Arlington Avenue as the eastern boundary - then heads west. Other than the 21st Century Buliding and the Moonlight House that I just bought, there is NO THING E of Rafton that could remotely be deemed historic. The St Thomas Aquinas Cathedral is not going anywhere. How hard would it be to move the eastern boundary of this district to Rafton? This is the perfect eastern boundary. Thoughts?</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Anfo</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2019</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Trieger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morgan.triger@gmail.com">morgan.triger@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:morgan.triger@gmail.com">morgan.triger@gmail.com</a>&gt; wrote:&lt;br&gt;Dear Mr. Stockham,&lt;br&gt;Thank you for considering the comments and making them part of the record for the city zoning code update. Parking minimums should be eliminated or significantly reduced in central neighborhoods where the city has invested, and plans to invest, in alternative transit, including bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, and transit upgrades. Namely, in Downtown, MidTown, West of Wells, and Mill Street near Renown neighborhoods.&lt;br&gt;By insisting that we dedicate space for cars even in areas where residents have expressed interest in walking, biking, and using transit, parking minimums &quot;build-in&quot; demand for driving and make it easier for people to drive than to use the transit alternatives they prefer.&lt;br&gt;Eliminating or significantly reducing parking minimums would facilitate the City's progress toward implementing the goals outlined in the recently adopted Sustainability and Climate Action Plan. Specifically, by avoiding &quot;building in&quot; demand for driving, the City can make real strides towards creating the lively, low-carbon neighborhoods it desires.&lt;br&gt;Parking minimums also make housing more expensive even as our region faces a critical affordable housing shortage. The housing crunch disproportionately affects the poorest among us, who often don't have cars or struggle to afford gas. Why are we requiring these critically affected people to shoulder the cost burden created by parking minimums?&lt;br&gt;Thank you for your time and consideration.&lt;br&gt;Sincerely,&lt;br&gt;Morgan Trieger, MidTown Reno resident</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Anfo</td>
<td>9/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/2019</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Jehle-Peppard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:irs@onetrukeeyer.org">irs@onetrukeeyer.org</a></td>
<td>(775) 450-5489</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iris Jehle-Peppard, One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;I am inquiring what the City of Reno's plans are to address the amendment topics (Incentives for Affordable Housing, Flood Hazard Areas, Wetlands and Streams, Major Drainageways, and Wildland Interface Fire Safety) that are proposed to be pulled from the Zone Code Renovation process? Thank you for your time and consideration of my question in advance. &lt;br&gt;Sincerely,&lt;br&gt;Iris Jehle-Peppard, One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Anfo</td>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2019</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Davoncenti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question about building units and parking requirements - Have hand written letter in file. No phone or email provided. Need to draft letter and mail. Floyd sent this to me. I don't disagree with the Powning district, but would think the Truckee River Lodge at Rafton at 5 stories is the natural boundary on the east side. The rest makes sense to me. How do we add this input? Thanks. I spoke with Don. He generally concurred with Floyd that taller buildings are appropriate in the Powning district east of Rafton. This would be transitional in scale between the 2-3 story development pattern to the west and high rise development to the north and east. He plans to prepare a letter with more detailed recommendations.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2019</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:don@dcclarkgroup.com">don@dcclarkgroup.com</a></td>
<td>(775) 329-3341, ext. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td>I spoke with Don. He generally concurred with Floyd that taller buildings are appropriate in the Powning district east of Rafton. This would be transitional in scale between the 2-3 story development pattern to the west and high rise development to the north and east. He plans to prepare a letter with more detailed recommendations.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Anfo</td>
<td>9/21/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (if Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2019</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>Lear</td>
<td></td>
<td>(915) 218-0498</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Phone call. Discussed Carter's preference for reduced minimum parking requirements in urban areas. Carter will review code module 2 and provide further input.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2019</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:qual102@juno.com">qual102@juno.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Call. I would like to attend the presentation tomorrow night, but I may be unable to do so. Is there an overview or agenda you can email me ahead of time? Would there also be a handout or presentation that could be emailed to me after? I understand this meeting will address proposed policy and procedure changes, and not specific regional center plans, zoning or projects; please confirm. Thank you, Barbara</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219-2847 ('7)</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Asking about impact to him and his property</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Unable</td>
<td>9/25/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harv57@gmail.com">harv57@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>281-513-1144</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Please call to discuss property specific questions. From email: I would like a snapshot of the draft version of the revised zoning map for the area with the boundaries listed below- North MacCarran Blvd N Virginia Blvd 395 Hwy North E Parr Blvd</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>With regards to the residential zoning, what are those going to be?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Residential parking driveways and commercial use with bars need parking. Concerns me that you said it would turn into a conservation district. What does that mean for parking?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Something about density and lot sizes. Is there a larger key on these posters of allowed uses, that isn’t as hard to read?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Wondering about the uses you are adding to the code, all of those hundreds of dollars and hours businesses are you creating an enforcement nightmare? Who’s live? Concerns about single family duplexes, quadplexes are more like multifamily. Which requires approval for multi-family versus duplexes?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>I don’t understand - how is a duplex not multifamily?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>How do es the urban farm change things?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>There is a property that is SF15, could I subdivide that up? Isn’t this UZoning?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Billboards - I am concerned that billboards are more allowed? What are you going to do with that.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>If your new zone has more restricted requirements, will there be an automatic grandfathering?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Concerned about the project on Jones street and Washington by Beauloie's restaurant. It seems like a significant project. When would the surrounding neighbors be notified? if they haven't applied, which code do they fall under?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>Will there also be a winery use as well?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>How important will you be concerned with green building?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>9/24/19 Zoning Open House</td>
<td>What is the zoning for the parcel next to Dickerson Road and the Oxbow? I am concerned something is coming there.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2019</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Chenoweth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:evancheenoweth@gmail.com">evancheenoweth@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dear Mr. Stockham and City Council members:</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am a resident of Ward 3 in Reno in the Wells/Midtown area. Parking minimums should be eliminated or significantly reduced in central neighborhoods where we've invested in bike lanes, walkability, and transit - namely downtown, Midtown, Wells Avenue, and Mill Street near Renown. To fight the dreaded sprawling town [see San Jose, CA], we need to continue to increase density in these areas and parking minimums are incompatible with this density.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By insisting that we dedicate space for cars even in areas where residents have expressed interest in walking, biking, and using transit, parking minimums &quot;build in&quot; demand for driving and make it easier for people to drive than to use the transit alternatives they prefer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking minimums also make housing more expensive even as our region faces a critical affordable housing shortage. The housing crunch disproportionately affects the poorest among us, who often don't have cars or struggle to afford gas. Why are we requiring these critically affected people to shoulder the cost burden created by parking minimums?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additionally, parking minimums are anti-free market. The government is tipping the scales towards the well-off. The free market is perfectly adept at dealing with parking allocation: If parking is desired, developers will put it in. Or if there isn't enough parking in a certain area, a private entrepreneur can build and open a parking structure. I've never known Nevada to be a fan of government overreach, but here it is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finally, requirements for off-street parking create additional curb cuts that disrupt our walking and biking infrastructure. Each curb cut makes it harder for a person in a wheelchair to navigate the side walk and creates a new, potentially dangerous intersection between cars and bikes. As we expand our network of protected bike lanes and cycle tracks, it will become even more evident that these curb cuts are where our vulnerable street users are injured or killed by cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We all want our city to be a more equitable place for all people and increase our sustainability by decreasing our carbon and pollution output. Parking minimums do the opposite of this. Please heed this warning and eliminate or significantly reduce parking minimums in our growing and densifying city core. Thank you for your time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sincerely, Evan J. Chenoweth Ward 3, Reno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2019</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Nevin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.nevin@marinmobius.com">david.nevin@marinmobius.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your recommended changes for &quot;Off-street Parking and Loading&quot; are to ITE standards, but ITE says &quot;A farewell to minimum off-street parking requirements.&quot; Is Reno proposing removing offstreet requirements?</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9/3/2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2019</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>775-323-4415 (cell) 510-853-1432 (owner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1205 Beach St - got a zoning code postcard - wanted to know the current zoning and what does that mean. Advised that current zoning is MF-14. She advised that they have 16 units per building. She would like to have the zoning match her property.</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>10/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2019</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:inputthree@yahoo.com">inputthree@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>775-848-4119</td>
<td></td>
<td>4385 Sleepy Hollow Dr - Map shows that this property is within Washoe County Unincorporated. Hello! I got a zoning code renovation for 4385 sleepy hollow dr in nv 89502. do you know what it is about?</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2019</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tomtstewart2000@gmail.com">tomtstewart2000@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How do I see the proposed zone maps?</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (If Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Brodovjiev</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brodovjiev@yahoo.com">brodovjiev@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good afternoon. This comment is related with section 18.02.305 M3-UD and is related with Floor area ratio FAR. Other section of the downtown area don’t have limits on FAR while University section (Evens, 6th Valley Road ...) does impose cap (FAR). This limit on maximum height (currently FAR) will create issue with achieving desired density of this district and affordability. It will deter future and fast development that this district requires and awaits for a long time. FAR is most economical as far as wood frame structure height and price. Lowering FAR ratio to 4 or 3 would pass disproportionally construction cost to fewer units where we already have expensive student housing around campus. Therefore I suggest removing maximum FAR ratio within this district. (Ivan is at 327 East 6th Street, Reno NV 89512)</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2019</td>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Brodovjiev</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brodovjiev@yahoo.com">brodovjiev@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This comment is related with City of Reno Zoning update. My suggestion is to set different parking requirements within downtown district. For areas near bus station through out this City we would need to remove required parking [waive at least 80% requirement] where major transportation hubs exist (bus station, train, ...) like within one mile of walking. There is no one-cutter fits all and for example within the University district we need to encourage development for students and reliance on public transportation (MTA, bike lanes, zip cars, ...). For example this code update could encourage students walking, using bikes and rely on UNR shuttle services. This comment is pointing to delineate different need among each Downtown quadrants with different need and use exists already and will be different by proposed changes.</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Nassett</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Brent.Nassett@kimley.horn.com">Brent.Nassett@kimley.horn.com</a></td>
<td>775-200-1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hi Calli, It was great to meet you a few weeks ago at the NAOP event on the new Reno code. I was on the phone with one of our code consultants and it reminded me of your new code update regarding noise. I'm trying to find the copy of the development standards but can't find anything except the new building/zoning uses/guides. Can you send me the draft development standards as a well? Thanks!</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2019</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Greath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard@unr.edu">richard@unr.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good morning. I have a question about the &quot;Zoning Code Renovation&quot; (see following.) Do the proposed changes to the Zoning Code include provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units (Granny Flats)? I hope not, I am strongly opposed to those. Thanks very much, Richard W. Greath, M.L.S., M.A. Reference Librarian Emeritus University of Nevada, Reno <a href="mailto:richard@unr.edu">richard@unr.edu</a></td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/27/2019</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Mooney</td>
<td>blue <a href="mailto:diver10@yahoo.com">diver10@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hello, I looked over the zoning info you sent out recently. I didn't see much for North Valleys. Are you planning parks, trails or anything like that in the North Valleys? We don't have any parks and there's constant housing development in our neighborhood in Golden Valley behind the high school. I'm amazed that parks aren't a part of these building plans. It's frustrating when the south mountains and other areas have wonderful trails, parks, etc. Also, development of roads a part of this zoning? I can't believe that the highway hasn't been expanded. It needs to be 4 lanes on each side all the way to Cold Springs (US 395) with all this residential and commercial development. Why is this not a top priority? Thanks!</td>
<td>Nevada Form</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2019</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harv57@gmail.com">harv57@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>281-613-1144</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the zoning and coding for RENOvation considered long term water usage? This would include water usage, storm, run off, re-purposing, and treatment. The next 20 years will see water levels rise and fall with greater swings in volume. TMWA as you most likely aware is actively updating reservoirs, pipelines, and treatment facilities (both existing and new including injection). RENOvation taking into account these water adaptations, zoning and codes (among others) to ensure the water needs of the city and community for the next 20 years? Thank you, Bryan Harvey 281 613 1144</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>10/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2019</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gonakot@bat.co.com">gonakot@bat.co.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff note: In discussion with Bryan, he supports a range of efforts to improve water quality and flood</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (If Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dowl340@hotmail.com">dowl340@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I own the property at 1151 Valley RD, 89912. I have almost 1/4 acre, I feel I have plenty for room to add at least 3 apartment maybe more on the back half of my property. I see today that they are offering incentives for builders to build more housing. I have been seriously considering doing this with my property. I have no idea what I am doing, but do know I am zoning mixed-use land and that I can add housing to my property. If you could please advise me or show me where I can find the information to help with our housing problem, that would be much appreciated.</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2019</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barrie@barrielynn.com">barrie@barrielynn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I own a property at 3103/12 Stewart Street that is a residential duplex zoned PO. The property itself from the street looks exactly like a residential duplex as that is how it was built to look and function 90 years ago. It has had a CPA occupying one of the units for the last 20 or so years, but no major changes were made to accommodate the office use, no walls were removed and it still has a kitchen and a bathroom. It is my understanding that single family residences zoned PO can revert back to residential use under PO zoning without a zone change, but the fact that this property is a duplex does not allow it to revert back to residential use without going through the zone change process. My CPA tenant is retiring, and I would love to put a residential tenant in her unit. I don't even think I could find another professional office tenant as the 90 year old unit is not ADA compliant. I would like to suggest that a small blue collar landlord such as myself be able to obtain an administrative decision call on this situation, rather than having to endure the costly and time consuming zone change process. This is a residential duplex in the middle of a residential neighborhood with one professional office tenant occupying a residential unit. The process for getting approval to revert the unit back to its original residential use should be easier in this situation. The APN for this property is 013-012-01. The person who owns the property directly next door at 320 Stewart is in the exact same situation and he wants to do the same thing I want to do. We are the only 2 duplexes on the entire block zoned PO, all other parcels are zoned MR20. My phone number is (775) 544-6744 because your fields above are flawed and will only allow me to type my email address into the phone number field.</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2019</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Vonarx</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gregg112@gmail.com">Gregg112@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can you please tell me what proposed changes are planned for industrial property in the East Fourth Street area? We own property there And we need to be assured that outside storage will still be allowed. Can you please tell me what zoning and new district my industrial property will fall under? The address is 2620 E. Fifth Street, APN 08-226-11 &amp; 12 Thank you Deborah Ps, we believe it is currently MUE4TG</td>
<td>Nate - Front Counter on POQ</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2019</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Kinners</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lkinner@gsln.com">lkinner@gsln.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the re-zoning going to affect our property taxes. Current address is 1401 Mt. Rose St. Reno 89509</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Vonarx</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard0154@gmail.com">richard0154@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>POQ</td>
<td>Nathan, thank you for taking the time to meet with us today. To re-cap, our properties on East 5th Street &amp; Tachino Street will be in a “Suburban mixed use” zone. Current 641C zoning for Heavy Machinery &amp; Equipment is “Allowed” and Outside Storage is “Allowed” as an accessory use. We would like to have the existing uses remain the same. Thank you again. Staff comment: MS column in the land use table lists accessory outdoor storage as a new use allowed through SUP; however, it is not now and is currently allowed by right. Consider changing to an allowed accessory use. The draft code would make Heavy Machinery and Equipment Rental a prohibited use in the MS and GC zones. The customer does not want his property to become existing nonconforming.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Nate - Front Counter on POQ</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (if Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2019</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barle@barlelynn.com">barle@barlelynn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hello Arlo, I attended the meeting on Tuesday night. I have a very specific question. I own a property at 310 Stewart Street A/P N 013-012-01 that is a residential duplex zoned PD. Current use is one unit residential, one unit professional office. The current code allows for single family use in PD, but not duplex and beyond. My professional office tenant has been there for 20 years and will Soon be retiring. It is my desire to return her unit to residential use. I had thought the best course of action would be to submit a zone change application to MP 30 which is the zoning on the rest of the block, but now I see that duplex, triplex and 4 plex will be allowable uses in PD once the changes go into effect. My problem is, I can't wait that long. My CPA is retiring and I can't wait until next year to fill her unit. With ever changing ADA rules, I'm not even sure I could find another professional office tenant who could get a business license in that 90 year old non-accessible building. I am just a small landlord and the zone change application process seems like overkill. Is there anything I can do in the interim? Incidentally, the neighboring property owner, Terry Schmidt, 320 Stewart A/P N 013-012-02 is trying to do the exact same thing right now. He just purchased this property which contains two separate dwelling units (detached). Are two detached units on the same parcel still considered a “duplex”? Terry wants to convert the unit that was an office into his personal residence but is unable to do so under current zoning. Our two neighboring properties are the only two properties on the entire block zoned PD, everything else is MP 30. We were going to split the cost of a zone change application, but are wondering if we even need to do that now that the changes are on the horizon. Like me, he can't wait until next year. He needs to act now. Any assistance and advice you can provide would be greatly appreciated. Thank you, Barme Lynn</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>Concern about density in North Valley. New homes are very close together, streets are narrow. Wouldn’t even be able to park on the street to wash your car. Driveways virtually don’t exist.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>If someone bought a piece of land under the current zoning, how will that impact their ability to use their land? What would be the trigger to be under the current code?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>Will the boundaries of the UNR plan change? I see that direction is to move south, but I’m wondering about specific boundaries. Previously, became more restrictive. Want area east of UNR to be okay for industrial</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>How much detail is available regarding the university’s plans to integrate south into downtown?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>There is a property in Summerstat that just went on the market, (Rod Fox) and I’m wondering what they can do with it?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>Will this project encourage more PDUs? How many do we have now?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>What are some components of moving toward affordability?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>What is being considered with parking? Will this help some of shopping centers redevelop?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/19 Public Open House</td>
<td>I hope this plan is aligned with local and state economic development plans. Development impacts and tax revenue impacts are often occurring at different times and long-term vision is important. There’s a lot of communities who’ve made mistakes in not planning for growth and we can learn from them.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2019</td>
<td>Thérèse</td>
<td>Duggan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tduggan84@gmail.com">tduggan84@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hi. I live in Damonte Ranch. The current US Post Office on McCabe Street is way over capacity. Is there plans for another post office in the Damonte Ranch area? Are there planning commission meetings that the public can attend?</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>10/2/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (If Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2019</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barry@barrylynn.com">barry@barrylynn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to urge you to expand the new definitions of duplex, triplex and fourplex to include attached AND detached structures. Existing draft language for these new definitions does not refer to &quot;under one roof&quot;. I cannot see a reason for creating a separate category for attached and detached 2/4 unit properties, especially within the context of the existing built environment of the multifamily neighborhoods. In the Midtown and Woho Avenue neighborhoods, the majority of 2 unit properties consist of 2 houses on 1 lot, NOT attached duplexes. You don't begin to see attached duplexes as much until you begin to head east of Kimball and south of Vassar. This is because of the era in which most of these structures were built, and the divorce trade that required people seeking a divorce to obtain 6 months, then later 2 years, which sometimes resulted in being granted a divorce in the Reno Courts. Just as current homeowners are taking advantage of the income opportunities on their own properties associated with Reno's divorce trade by building a small house on their property, usually in the alley, and providing short-term housing for people seeking a divorce. There are also many &quot;in-law&quot; houses in Midtown and Woho that consist of a house and duplex on one lot or even 3 separate houses on 1 lot, and many 4plexes that consist of 2 duplexes on 1 lot, or sometimes a house and a triplex on one lot. The new definitions of duplex, triplex and 4plex should include all attached or detached units, and focus primarily on the number of units, not the type of construction. I would be happy to provide any neighborhood examples you may need. Thank you.</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>10/3/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2019</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Schmidt921@gmail.com">Schmidt921@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Q: (775) 329-4011; C: (512) 575-6917</td>
<td></td>
<td>It appears the planned new code may have an unintentional limitation due to definitions. In Reno's Master Plan there are goals to promote 'Retention of Existing Housing' and 'Infill and Redevelopment.' The new Zoning Code 18.03.207 Table of Allowed Uses does expand Residential Living options with the addition of Duplex, Triplex and Fourplex to some Zoning Districts, such as PD. However, for example, current Code (Section 18.24.203.1800 - Dwelling, Duplex) narrowly defines Duplex as 'A type of multi-family dwelling in which one unit is attached to one other dwelling unit located on the same lot (for a total of two dwelling units on one lot). Each dwelling has its own front and rear access, no unit is located over another unit, and each unit is separate from the other unit by one or more vertical common walls.' I believe this narrow definition is too restrictive and conflicts with Zoning Code Change goals by eliminating the majority of existing, separate, detached, multi dwelling (less than four) housing configurations in older neighborhoods throughout Reno. It is my recommendation to update the definitions of Duplex, Triplex &amp; Fourplex to include both attached and DETACHED configurations. Alternately, if the strict narrow definition of Duplex, Triplex &amp; Fourplex needs to be preserved, a new Residential Living option could be created to support Lot configurations with four or less SEPARATE/DETACHED dwellings.</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>10/3/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/7/2019</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melindasa@thebuilders.com">melindasa@thebuilders.com</a></td>
<td>Q: (775) 329-4011; C: (512) 575-6917</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attached are the Reno Housing Task Force Subcommittee's comments on the draft code related to the zoning districts. Please let us know if you have any questions.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Calli</td>
<td>10/8/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9/2019</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Wagoner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:catalosy@yahoo.com">catalosy@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I wanted to know if the midtown mf-14zoning will be revised to allow for infill/identity?</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Pagni</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mpagni@mcdonaldcarano.com">mpagni@mcdonaldcarano.com</a></td>
<td>775.788.2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arlo:</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2019</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Morrissey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pat@morrisseyrealty.com">Pat@morrisseyrealty.com</a></td>
<td>775-771-7229</td>
<td></td>
<td>It has been awhile since my masterplan zoning was changed against my wishes. I would like to get my zoning changed ADAP as it is hindering my ability to sell the site. Your assistance to expedite this would be greatly appreciated.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>10/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>Piercy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:earlpiercy@gmail.com">earlpiercy@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop the &quot;Teapot&quot; development. Your annexation of the Verdi area and subsequent deconstruction of the Verdi community through huge housing development is criminal. The 300+ units on Old US 40 will force all of these people to commute many miles for work, services, and entertainment. You've turned Verdi for all of us who love it.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>10/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2019</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Broadhead</td>
<td><a href="mailto:broadhead@charter.net">broadhead@charter.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hello! Got a zoning code renovation sent to us. I assume it is for the house we own at 3485 Yosemite Dr. Title Zephyrk, Broadhead E.T. All because it is in city, however it was sent to the 4970 Amberly Dr. House. Probably because that is where bills are sent. All this being said what's the zone change?</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>10/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (If Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2019</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmghope@yahoo.com">dmghope@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI: Fairly new to area and live in newly built house in Damonte Ranch, little concerned about amount of development and hope City of Reno is on top of services required for all the building going on. Like water, schools etc. Also, very disappointed that the city was bullied by builder and are going to develop wetlands along Veterans Parkway. City and citizens should be in charge, not builders and rich developers. Question. They are building on mountain behind our development. How can I see what is planned? Regards, Dean Good 2990 Bonfire Lane Reno, NV 89521 775-300-3279</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2019</td>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>Rowley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:floyd@rowleyrealestatesadvisors.com">floyd@rowleyrealestatesadvisors.com</a></td>
<td>775-224-3183</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorsed please find my letter requesting that the eastern boundary of the Powersen District be moved from Arlington to Halston.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/14/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/2019</td>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Jahle-Reppard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:irishoneybuffer@msn.com">irishoneybuffer@msn.com</a></td>
<td>775-450-5489</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 documents sent to Angela Fuss via Truckee Meadows Beautiful director</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>10/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2019</td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rebecca@reckie.com">rebecca@reckie.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Still not interested in jumping through your hoops in order to offer input. Currently residing in midtown among the building sites. Congested for sure. For cleaner air we suggest a pesticide free community and the leaf blowers need to leave permanently. The call for climate change is upon us. Here in this community, local climate change. If daily for our civilians who's current climate conditions seem dire indeed. Now it seems they need protection from those other civilians who feel threatened by their inability and/or lack of motivation to be a team player in the current system. How can the elected leaders of the community help in a way that won't piss the capitolists? Probably can't be done.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>11/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2019</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Joeson</td>
<td>775-357-7756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would like information about how this will impact property in Midtown (782 Humboldt)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Taxer</td>
<td>775-250-4972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>There are a lot of unused parking lots in the Midtown area. It would be great to allow folks to park there during certain hours, etc.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>775-297-4212</td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Makes sense for minor/major/alternative equivalent compliance when there is a quantifiable measurement. What happens if it is not quantifiable?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Taxer</td>
<td>775-243-1234</td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Regarding adjacency and major arterials, how is arterial defined? Is it clear?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Taxer</td>
<td>775-243-1234</td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>What stops folks from developing and “getting things in” before the code is adopted in a year?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>775-267-9872</td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>What is required prior to demolition when it comes to historic preservation? Would like to see ability to not allow demolition.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Aimsee</td>
<td>LeMay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moonmoth7@yahoo.com">moonmoth7@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Concern about parking in the university area. Getting to the point where I cannot park at my own house. Enforcement is also an issue. Residential permit parking?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Aimsee</td>
<td>LeMay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moonmoth7@yahoo.com">moonmoth7@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Appreciate the simplification. Will likely still need changes going forward but the simplifications are positive</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
<td>Aimsee</td>
<td>LeMay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:moonmoth7@yahoo.com">moonmoth7@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Hello! My husband and I are recent Reno residents, originally from the Detroit area. We moved here for Teslas. As avid hikers and kayakers, we have been thoroughly enjoying this beautiful region of the country. The thought that the Reno area could be at risk for being as overdeveloped as southeast Michigan in the future, of course the city should work with developers to remedy the current housing shortage (which, we realize, we personally play a role for moving here!), but to rush projects through without consideration of environmental damage, or selecting the best projects for the specific criteria, would be a mistake. Of course developers will prefer to make as much money as they can, as quickly as they can. But possible unforeseen consequences would make a hysterical decision to ok. I'm just an average citizen, not a “fringe”, as the developers like to paint anyone with objections to reckless development. Thank you very much for your time and consideration!</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Raydon</td>
<td>775-234-5678</td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>Seeing a lot of good changes but there are a few concerns: (1) bicycle parking is encouraged in Midtown but not required. Need to think about requiring parking. Also need a balance to ensure there isn’t a forest of bike spots. (2) Reduction of parking requirements - Concern that on-street parking won’t be allowed to be counted. Being able to count on-street parking is critical for redevelopment and impacts ability to increase infill density. Cannot stress this enough. (3) Propose that Wells Ave parking requirements are the same as they are in Midtown and Downtown. Feels this is need to protect residential construction and ensure a balance of residential/service, etc.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>775-234-5678</td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>Overlays on Wells is creating an area that is overly protected. Midtown and Wells are merging naturally and need to allow that to occur.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>775-234-5678</td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>Need to be careful as we develop in these unique areas, we want to preserve the diversity and uniqueness of the neighborhoods. Need to be aware of housing affordability to preserve it.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Krippada</td>
<td>775-234-5678</td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>As a representative for 20 years, parking is the most difficult issue. Related to concern that off-street parking cannot be counted. Examples of successful projects that have handled projects: Mt. Rose Coffeebar and Pub N Sub. I would like to understand philosophically where the City is going.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Initial Contact</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Meeting (if Appropriate)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>How the Customer Reached Out</td>
<td>Staff Who Responded</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Samuelson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.samuelsen@gmail.com">andrew.samuelsen@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>Any parking minimums create a demand that is not really needed/requested by the public, as shown in the Master Plan and public surveys. I like discretionary parking and ability to figure it out on a parcel by parcel basis. We won't end up with no parking as it will</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Hunn (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>I'm looking to build affordable for housing and it's currently not viable. The new proposed plans are great but it's all coming down to parking. I've left plans to develop RFD in Reno and decided to invest elsewhere. There's a huge social justice issue here when you are adding parking requirements.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Eckes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>To help with the lack of parking concern, how does the code contemplate public transportation and or drop offs for Uber, etc.?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Vicks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>Regarding parking maximums, I've never worked with a developer that wants to build more parking than required.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Raydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>If we are moving toward a shared parking model, we don't want to see of blacktop. More supportive of parking structures.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Krmpotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>I hope that AOU's are reconsidered. It's important to housing supply.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TWG Meeting</td>
<td>Believe that the future neighborhood meetings with help with the AOU issue. The blanket rules are what caused the issues.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Question about footnotes referencing previous nam es of zoning districts</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Dory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Is the parking going to be reduced in the residential areas? Will we be able to pay for signs so only homeowners can park on the street?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Feels that 24 ft wide roadway is too wide/large</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Dory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>What is the criteria for circular driveways?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>What happened to changes discussed previously (related to child care, etc.)?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Sannier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Where did Truckee River standards move to?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Sannier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>In relation to Regional Plan and trails connectivity, our understanding that there will be requirements to connect the trails regionally. How will that be incorporated through this?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Sannier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Question about what changes are proposed for OIC</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Concern about noticing requirements for small site plan review - 250 f is not enough. Discussed concerns related to SUP changes - What dictates a &quot;small&quot; project? Lack of public notification is an issue.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Module 2 Open House</td>
<td>Discussion about the need of the housing market - housing types and affordability. Various views about the impact of code update related to this topic.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Afro</td>
<td>11/19/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.f

Attachment: Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment (11936 : RENOvation Development Code Update)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Initial Contact</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Meeting (If Appropriate)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>How the Customer Reached Out</th>
<th>Staff Who Responded</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2019</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>775-338-4347</td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Raised concerns about growth areas and lack of consistency with implementing previous direction related to transportation (freeways).</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/16/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/2019</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Concerned that NAAs will not be able to provide input with streamlined SUP process. Will it have opportunity to go to NAAs? NAAs are important to shaping our community. Support the idea of making it easier for small businesses, but having input is still a constructive process. Would like some feedback mechanism.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/16/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
<td>TWG 12/17/19 Meeting</td>
<td>See discussion notes</td>
<td>TWG 12/17/19 Meeting</td>
<td>See discussion notes</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Concern about reducing SUPs - individuals will not have an opportunity to voice their concern in person</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Residential adjacency - If this is only for major arterial, should that be defined in code? Major arterials listed?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Wray</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Signs - How are signs at schools handled? Should that be addressed?</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Concern about pot holes. Don’t feel like the City is taking care of what they have and wasting money in other ways.</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>12/17/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/2019</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Medeiros</td>
<td>call: 843-8559</td>
<td></td>
<td>Requested clarification on the proposed gaming overlay in Boomtown area. Discussed Section 18.02.104(e)(1) provision for access from major arterial. This is from existing code but appears to preclude gaming on parcel 038-870-19, as Boomtown Gaming may not be a major arterial. Advised that staff would check into the status of the Boomtown Truckstop nonrestricted gaming entitlement. Also will verify if existing provision requiring existing footprint of casino to be 500 ft from residential zoning would be the designated casino floor area or the footprint of the overall facility with a casino.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>12/18/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/2019</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Going</td>
<td><a href="mailto:saragoing@yahoo.com">saragoing@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on housing - see attached</td>
<td>Reno Direct</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>12/25/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/25/2019</td>
<td>Frostie (???)</td>
<td>775-329-2455</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to know if her zoning is changing</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Mazziemkt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kasmziemkt@edawn.org">kasmziemkt@edawn.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on housing - see attached</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/30/2019</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Foster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike@idex.com">Mike@idex.com</a></td>
<td>(775) 843-0124</td>
<td>Good morning, and happy new year. My partner and I are considering taking over restaurant lease and putting in food truck commissary at 6148 Max Anne Ave, Reno, NV 89523. Before we get too serious, is this area zoned or allowed to have a commercial shared kitchen?</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Wray</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwray@markswaylaw.com">lwray@markswaylaw.com</a></td>
<td>Zoning Code Open House</td>
<td>Sent Lor follow up email from concerns related to co-de update and billboards and possibility of Scenic Nevada review of draft lightning standards. Hi Lor, I'm just following up with our conversation at the workshop regarding proposed lighting standards. If this is something Scenic-Nevada is interested in, the draft section can be found in Article 12 &quot;Exterior Lighting&quot; (starting on page 167 of the pdf document). <a href="https://www.reno.gov/home/showDocument?id=82751">https://www.reno.gov/home/showDocument?id=82751</a> The draft section on signs is listed on pages 187-202 of the pdf link above]. The consultant’s footnotes 98-246-246 on page 197 outline the concerns we discussed at the meeting regarding off premise signs. We want to ensure that the existing standards remain unchanged even though many of the referenced zoning districts are proposed to be removed. As the footnotes suggest, we are still working on the best approach and will submit with the consolidated draft. Happy New Year!</td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/2020</td>
<td>Krista</td>
<td>Italiano</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mvecuapuncture@gmail.com">mvecuapuncture@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am wondering if commercial use is allowed in zoning area MUSV for an acupuncture practice? Thank you</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td>Vision Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/2020</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
<td>TWG discussion 18.04.600p, 18.04.600, 18.04.600, Article 7, and Article 8. See attached for notes</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Arlo</td>
<td>1/7/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 26, 2019

Arlo Stockham & Calli Wilsey
City of Reno

Dear Arlo and Calli,

The Housing Task Force Subcommittee has reviewed Issues Sheet #3A and the group provided the following comments.

While not minimizing the importance of the previous discussions, the Builders Association believes this is the section of code that will have the biggest impact on development moving forward. Streamlining processes, refining findings, and reducing discretion will bring a new level of certainty to both the business community and the general public. Currently, the processes and procedures result in projects mired in unequal enforcement of provisions, differing interpretations, and broad discretion that often extends beyond a particular request. This is often a result of applications with findings that too broad and not related to the scope of a project. Much like this issue sheet, our comments below are broad in scope and we look forward to continuing to work with the City as specific provisions are developed.

Development review process improvements

- **Reduce reliance on SUP’s:**
  - *SUP’s should be focused on use, not physical development.*
  
  We agree that the SUP process is currently used as a catch-all application, which results in findings that are not necessarily related to a specific request. The Special Use permit should migrate away from encompassing applications for physical development (e.g. building orientation, height, residential adjacency, grading, etc.) and be used for uses. These are commonly referred to as conditional use permits in other jurisdictions and relate to the appropriateness of a use in a given location. The findings are related to ensuring the proposed use is compatible with existing surrounding uses and conditions of approval are related to use restrictions, not physical development. Typically, CUP’s can be revoked. When specifically related to a use that is not complying with their specific use restrictions, revocation is much more understandable. However, when intermingled with physical development, it makes revocation much more difficult to untangle. How is a physical development condition that is already constructed revoked?
On the same note, the use table currently uses the SPR application as a more streamlined process over the SUP. This application is not necessarily tailored to the use. SPR should be used for physical development. If a less cumbersome process is desired for uses that should be conditionally permitted, then consider something along the lines of an administrative use permit (a discretionary action that occurs within 30 days but is approved by staff; much like the minor site plan proposed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BANN Suggested Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major SPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor SPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reduced use of SUP's**
  The Planning Commission commented that we should not be reducing the use of SUPs. These comments appeared to be more aligned with not wanting to reduce the level of public hearings. Bringing more items to the staff for review does not have to reduce discretion nor does it have to reduce the ability for the public to be involved. For many applications, public noticing could still be required, it would just be a different avenue for how that public input is provided (e.g. not during public comment). While BANN prefers both the consultant and staff's recommendation to transition certain processes ministerial as opposed to discretionary, we would be supportive of discretionary action for certain applications. However, the applications and associated findings should be aligned with the proposed scope (see comment on SUP's above). Further, we would prefer discretionary applications dealing with physical development be decided at the staff level. With this approach, public involvement would still be available, but the
applications and findings would reduce the denials or the addition of unrelated conditions of approval.

- **Distinguish between Major and Minor Site Plan Review**
  - BANN is supportive of the intent to create two different levels of SPR.
  - As mentioned in the previous comments, SPR should be related to the physical development of the site and the findings should be tailored accordingly.
  - We agree with staff’s recommendation to keep the SPR discretion at the staff level and the first appeal with the Planning Commission.

- **Residential Adjacency**
  - If residential adjacency cannot be replaced with consistent design standards, then we agree with expanding the targeted exemptions. The application should really be focused on what it is attempting to mitigate. When separated by a railroad, freeway, large natural feature, etc., there is inherently a buffer that is provided and the development is no longer adjacent. If it is determined that discretion is required, this application should only focus on developments abutting properties. Further, it should be better classified as to what triggers this requirement; it should be new construction that triggers the action, which should be reviewed through an SPR application. A use going into an existing building should not trigger this requirement. If the use itself is sensitive, then it should be placed as a conditionally permitted use and require its own assessment through the CUP process. Residential adjacency should be solely focused on how the physical development of the property is being mitigated to reduce impacts on the adjacent residentially zoned properties.
  - Residential adjacency should also not be required if it is internal to a project. This discourages mixed use or creative use of zoning to develop residential, which is often a principally permitted use in many commercial zoning designations.

- **Entitlement Amendments**
  - BANN is supportive of adding clarity and flexibility to the minor amendment process. Many times, builders will buy an entitled property (whether entitled speculatively or by another builder) and
will want to make changes that better align with their project vision (e.g., product changes, lot size changes, etc.). If that minor modification process is outlined and not left up to the interpretation of a single individual, it provides predictability, which is desired during the due diligence process.

- **Design Modifications (Minor/Major Deviations; Alternative Equivalent Compliance; Variances)**
  - BANN supports the creation of a Major Deviation as another avenue to vary from code without needing a variance.
  - We also support the concept of an Alternative Equivalent Compliance application (or something similar) that allows for creative projects that may not meet code but provide an overall benefit to the fabric of the community. This application can also take the many special use permit applications (e.g., height, parking/building orientation, etc.) and consolidate them.
  - We are supportive of staff exploring the possible creation of a Design Review Committee in the future. However, we are only supportive of a DRC if it is left as an alternative option for the application. In addition, the DRC should be made up of architects, engineers and planners who are appointed for a maximum of one or two terms. The Washoe County’s previous DRC is a great model to reference.

- **Better Aligning Findings**
  - While no specifics are provided at this time, BANN is in support of better aligning findings with the associated applications to reduce arbitrary decision-making, unnecessary and unrelated conditions of approval, and potential room for denial of applications that meet all code requirements.

Regards,

Don Tatro
CEO
Builders Association of Northern Nevada
October 7, 2019

Arlo Stockham & Calli Wilsey
City of Reno

Dear Arlo and Calli,

The Housing Task Force Subcommittee has reviewed the drafted code for the Zoning Districts and Uses, and the group provided the following comments for your review.

First, we would like to express our support of the new format. This version is much easier to understand and follow.

As we have went through the document, we have questions and comments on the following items:

Page 35 | MD-UD: Downtown - University District - We have concerns as to why a FAR Maximum has been set in an area that should be intensified. We recommend not setting a FAR Maximum.

Multi-family - Duplex, Triplex and Fourplex have been broken out under Multi-family. We understand that more detailed standards for each type of dwelling are forthcoming. However, we believe that these items should not be broken out and should be left as is under the former code. Giving more standards to subsections of multi-family will only make the code more constricted, especially when we see no problems with the prior code.

Face of Curb - If Face of Curb is going to be used as a baseline for measurement, we believe there should be an exact interpretation of the Face of Curb when referenced, especially in Mixed Use standards. There are different types of curb (e.g. rolled curb, L-curb, etc.), of which could have different interpretations. The Builders Association’s members have received different answers on this topic. However, all builders generally agree that measuring from the back of curb is a good standard form of measurement.

Landscaping - There should be some flexibility when requiring the specific location of landscaping. In some situations, cables might be two feet below a surface where landscaping is required. The allowance of site furnishings or moving of a sidewalk would be ideal alternatives in situations like this. In addition, on page 66, 30% of landscaping is required. This percentage seems high. We recommend considering tree canopy when evaluating this percentage. Often, trees or plants are planted too close together and one or more eventually need to be removed.

Cluster Development - While cluster development and small lot development are similar in nature, there are differences that still warrant keeping two separate categories. We recommend keeping two distinct development standards for small lot developments and cluster developments. Regardless, both should not be considered uses. In both cases, the uses are single family residential and should be allowed anywhere single family residential is allowed. The code should simply outline what specific standards are necessary to be met to qualify for small lot or cluster development, it should not be discretionary in nature. Further, not every small lot is a cluster. If a small lot meets
density, then there should not be a requirement for cluster. The missing middle that is often referred to in our community could be addressed by not requiring cluster in a small lot.

**Neighborhood Commercial** - On page 43, requiring 50% of building FAR to remain commercial is difficult for infill pieces, both from a marketing and practicality standpoint (when factoring in parking and landscape requirements). A parcel that is less than five acres should be allowed to be residential if it is adjacent to or within a certain distance to a commercial site. This allowance could also be considered under uses instead of zoning.

**Public Facilities** - On page 54, height is permitted to be increased, but not stories. Why is this? The increase of stories should be permitted with height as the two work together. Additionally, schools are not restricted in this manner which creates a contradiction.

**Adjacent Setbacks** - This section appears to be written in a more complicated manner than it should be. We recommend creating a rule that if the minimum setback is 10 feet to a house or porch, then set it at that point. If the goal is to intensify, then let that occur.

Finally, we strongly encourage the exploration of creating design exceptions, site plan reviews, and conditional permits in place of Special Use Permits. Applications should be distinctly related to their request (i.e. use, physical development, design).

Sincerely,

Don Tatro  
CEO  
Builders Association of Northern Nevada
December 17, 2019

Arlo Stockham & Calli Wilsey
City of Reno

Dear Arlo & Calli,

We would like to thank you for continuing to keep us informed and allow us to offer our input on the zoning code update. The building industry understands the importance of this document in being able to: 1) create more predictability in the process; 2) reduce costs from excessive or complex requirements, and 3) streamline entitlements and permitting to bring needed housing supply to market quicker.

All these items will help increase the supply of housing thereby reducing the overall cost to consumers. As the Builder's Association has mentioned in numerous public comments and letters to City Staff, Planning Commissioners, and the City Council, every $1,000 increase in housing cost prices out 251 people. This code update not only can implement the master plan but can also repair ongoing housing supply and affordability impediments present in the current code.

We have reviewed the Module 2: Development Standards draft and offer the following comments:

**General Comments**

- There are several sections that require licensed traffic engineers, architects, arborists, or other licensed professionals when that work can be performed by an equally competent trade at a lesser rate. Consider when a licensed professional is necessary and whether there are alternative trades that can achieve the same result.
- There are numerous cross-referenced sections throughout the development standards. The current code does not provide adequate indexing or hyperlinking of cross-references. When it comes to ease of use, we recommend providing hyperlinks to specific referenced sections.
- There are a few figures referenced that appear to be missing. Additionally, there are several places that would benefit from a graphic representation of the requirements. We have called them out wherever possible below.
- There have been recent issues with conflicts between utility plans that are designed and installed by the utility companies and the requirements of the City. Based on the franchise agreements of the City, the utility plans shall prevail. A section should be added to the code that clearly notes that utility plans are the prevailing plans.

**Definitions**

- The following terms should be defined in the definitions or elsewhere in the code:
  - Residentially zoned;
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Process

During the review of the prior module, the Technical Working Group came to the consensus that the processes needed to better align with their associated application. This group, which is widely representative of numerous community interests, all agreed that uses would be governed by use permits, variances from standards would be governed by deviations and variance, and physical development would be governed by varying levels of site plan review. The idea was to better align the findings and scope of review with the request and to segregate the code in a more logical manner. The Planning Commission and City Council expressed the desire to keep the Special Use Permit (SUP) process for certain requests (hillside development, grading, etc.). But this was more so related to the desire to maintain a process with a public hearing rather than the SUP application itself. Given that there are numerous references in this module to needing a SUP for physical development requirements, we believe it is necessary to reiterate the TWG's position on better aligning processes to the application request. While we would encourage more discretionary actions be brought to the staff level for decisions, we are not opposed to requiring public hearings for certain applications. Our position is that these applications and their associated findings should be associated with the correct request. Below is a chart of various processes to better describe how processes should be organized. We request that the updated process section be reflected throughout the development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Type (Review Body)</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Physical Development</th>
<th>Variances/Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministerial (City Staff)</strong></td>
<td>Based on the use table. This process and findings will relate to the appropriate of specific uses and their operating characteristics. This will allow for appropriate conditions of approval and revocation if the CUP conditions are not correctly followed.</td>
<td>• Building/Grading Permit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discretionary - Administrative (Administrator)</strong></td>
<td>• Business License</td>
<td>• Minor Site Plan Review (projects that deserved to be)</td>
<td>• Sidewalk Waivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Major Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Temporary Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditioned, but are not of major concern to warrant a public hearing</td>
<td>Design Modification Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Height Modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Building Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>• Conditional Use Permit</td>
<td>• Major Site Plan Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. hillside development over a particular size)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>• Major Conditional Use Permit (e.g. Hazardous Materials)</td>
<td>• Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(City Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appeals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are number of references to Administrator authority to vary development standards. When there is authority granted to the Administrator, there should be a clear process by which variances from code occur. Further, these decisions should be documented better than a verbal conversation. This gets back to predictability and assists with ensure equal treatment across all applicants. Should the applicant or higher decision-making body disagree with an Administrator decision, then there should be clear process and criteria for appeal.

**Environmental Standards**

- Construction operations should not be subject to the vibration standards. Permanent use should be better defined.
- The “Fire or Explosive Hazard Materials” is duplicative. This is already governed under NAC and the Fire Code. For brevity and reducing the opportunity for conflicting regulations, we recommend referencing these other sections.

**Flood Hazard Areas**

- Shaded X areas should have lesser requirements than other flood zones.
- We support the language in the warning and disclaimer of liability section.
- Section (B)(2) references needing a permit from the Nevada Division of State Lands. Are they not in charge of the Truckee River? Usually NDEP issues working in the waterway permits. We suggest that the code section simply references the State and City staff can advise applicants on the correct agencies to reach out. This works particularly well with code longevity should the State change departmental responsibilities.
- The potential impact to water rights with the increased flood storage requirements should be explored.
25% flood storage mitigation has been consistently applied on recent projects. What is the reasoning behind increasing to 30%? Is this backed up by some data?

Wetland and Stream Environment Protection

- Under the "Mapped Resources" and "Administrative Manual/Guidelines" Sections, there are two referenced documents that do not appear on the website. Are these new documents that will be prepared? Why are these requirements not incorporated into the code? If they are only being referenced for mapping purposes, why is the mapping not imported into the City Map Server?
- The applicable applications section should be revised to reflect the updated processes. Further, it seems premature to require Master Plan and Zoning Map amendments to analyze how the drainageway will be mitigated, when development plans have not typically been considered at that point. We recommend that the analysis on wetlands or streams should be done at the time of development permit. If the City desires to keep some level of Wetland or Stream review of Master Plan and zoning map amendments, then I recommend there be a separate set of requirements specifically associated with map changes.
- An exemption should be added to not require multiple reviews with each "Development Permit" if it was previously encompassed at the entitlement stage. If an analysis is done during a Tentative Map or Site Plan Review, a new analysis shouldn’t have to be done for the final map or building permit.

Drainageway Protection

- The purpose section references the "City of Reno Major Drainageways Plan." Wasn’t this removed with the new Master Plan?
- This looks like a copy from the prior Drainageway requirements. I thought the intention was to move to clearer requirements and protection standards.
- The standards still reference the requirement for a special use permit. See comments above about suggested process modifications to better align with physical development proposals. Initial discussions with staff indicated that we were moving away from discretionary approvals and to clearer development standards. Discretionary approvals have historically led to a repeat of the same conditions of approval. If some level of discretion is required, we recommend keeping it at the staff level through the minor site plan review process.
- The beginning of this section should clearly distinguish the difference between natural and disturbed drainageways.

Tree Protection

- We realize that there is a separate process for the tree ordinance. We will reserve most comments until that ordinance is prepared for review.
This section requires an arborist prepare a tree mitigation plan. We suggest that a landscape architect, horticulturist, or licensed landscape contractor also be able to prepare a tree mitigation plan.

Grading and Erosion Control

- This section still references a special use permit for hillside development, major drainageway, and grading within PGOS. As discussed in the process section above and in prior meetings with the technical working group, a special use permit should be related to use. If a discretionary process with a public hearing is what is desired by the Planning Commission and City Council, then it should be through a Major Site Plan review process with findings better tailored to physical development.
- Section 18.04.202(e)(2) references the grading standards for residential adjacency. This section should clarify that these are only applicable to residential adjacency so that it is not interpreted that the residential adjacency standards are applicable everywhere.
- Section 18.04.202(e)(3)(a) is oddly worded. This standard should be rewritten or accompanied by a graphic to show the allowed location of cut and fill slopes.
- Section 18.04.202(e)(3)(c) is unnecessary. The Public Works Design Manual governs street slopes. Why would the slope matter for other easements? If manhole access is the concern, shouldn’t this be what’s regulated?
- Section 18.04.202(e)(9) states that a plan detailing operations “shall be submitted and approved to the satisfaction of the Administrator”. When should the plan be submitted and is the Administrator approving or Planning Commission?

Hillside Development

- This section references the special use permit process for hillside development. See prior comments with regards to our suggested process for physical development.
- Not all slopes are equal. Just because a site has an average slope that meets these requirements, doesn’t necessarily mean it is worth protecting in its natural state. For example, a hillside that is surrounded by development that would be better suited matching the surrounding contours should be exempt. There should be some process that would allow the administrator to decide on conditional exemptions.
- Numerous utility facilities are listed as exempt from a discretionary review. We recommend water tanks be added to this list of exemptions.
- Section 17.04.307 references the “visually prominent ridgeline and related landforms” map. The old map was difficult to read and there was not good data to determine what was or was not a prominent ridgeline. If this is referenced, there should be clear data in the GIS system that is available to determine how to meet this requirement.
• Section 18.04.034(d) requires a wet-stamped set of plans. Why can it not be a scanned signature? This makes it difficult for engineers not located in Reno to ship many pages. What is the benefit to it being wet-stamped and signed? If it needs to be wet-stamped, can it be limited to just the cover page?
• Section 18.04.305(b) does not seem fair. It is double dipping in the density reduction and require open space section by not allowing the preservation of open space in major drainageways to count toward the density calculations. Other natural features can be counted, why not these? Additionally, Section 18.04.306(d) conflicts with the aforementioned section.
• We were told that the hillside density section would be revised. A studio apartment and a 7 bedroom house are treated equally under the density requirements, but their density may have wildly different impacts. I do not think density is the best measure for potential impact. Therefore, is there another metric that can be used to reduce slope impact (i.e. lot coverage or similar)?
• Section 18.04.306(f) appears to require all open space areas resulting from the hillside development standards be dedicated to the City of Reno. Is the City still requiring open space areas to be held privately under an association and simply allow a blanket public access easement or has this direction changed?
• This new code limits slopes to a maximum height of 30 feet. We recommend allowing slopes to exceed this height if separated by a landscaped bench. This will be very difficult to achieve as we move into hillside development.
• The maximum ratio listed in 18.04.309(i) doesn’t work unless you had a very large bench or very low walls. This is counter intuitive to reducing grading. Walls can help reduce necessary grading.
• We are supportive of Sections 1.04.3010 and .3011.
• Rather than having a large paragraph for Section 18.04.3012 (Hillside Architecture), we recommend breaking out into more digestible chunks.
• With regards to hillside adaptive architecture, what would be considered a “deviation from standard construction methods?” This should be clarified.
• The examples of major grading disturbances listed in Section 18.04.3012 should be comprehensive and definitive. Stating, “included, but not limited to” leaves a lot of room for interpretation and unpredictability. Stepped foundations are extremely expensive (approximately $100k additional) and the standards should be clear on when they will be required.

Streets, Utilities, and Services

• To the extent the Public Works Design Manual (PWDM) or Orange Book covers a topic, it should be removed from the zoning code in order to reduce potential for conflicts between standards and to streamline the code. We were told early in the zoning code update process that the PWDM update would be occurring concurrently.
• The street section should reference back to the grading/hillside exceptions.
• The code requires a sound barrier along arterial streets. Will this also be required along highways? If so, that should be clarified. Also, this section describes a “public improvement easement.” Is the barrier proposed to be dedicated? If a public agency is not required to maintain the wall, shouldn’t there also be provisions allowing the wall to fall within common area?

• It is not clear what constitutes a sound barrier? Is it a berm? Wall? This section should give examples with standards in addition to an ability for the administrator to make determinations for alternatives.

• Shouldn’t Section 18.04.401(d)(8) clearly state exemptions from the Engineer of Record inspection requirements?

• Section 18.04.402(a)(3) requires the location of sidewalks at the time of “map” or “parcel map” approval. The first section is missing the clarification of “tentative map.” Also, this section should be limited to tentative maps and should not apply to parcel maps. We suggest double checking this section against NRS requirements for parcel maps and ensure this is not exceeding those requirements.

• Section 18.04.402(a)(1) requires sidewalks on both sides of all streets. What about in the case of single loaded streets or narrower streets within hillside developments? This requirement for sidewalk on both sides should allow modification through Administrator approval.

• Section 18.04.402(a)(4)(a) references an application to waive curb, gutter and/or sidewalk – what is that application and at what point during the process is that required? Does it have to be submitted and approved prior to submitting SUP or TM? The process should be clear.

• This section also removed flexibility to account for LID objectives...why?

• Section 18.04.402(b) requires different sidewalks based on residential collector street or commercial collector streets...where are these street sections defined?

• Section 18.04.403(b)(4) references conformance with “City Standards” but does not reference what standards in particular. This section is vague and the standards should be specified.

• Section 18.04.403(c)(1) requires amperage to be shown in addition to kilovolts. Why would average and kilovolts need to be shown? Wouldn’t it only be necessary to analyze kV?

• Section 18.04.403(c)(2) requires conformance with “applicable setbacks” but does not reference what setbacks apply. Additionally, this section requires “aesthetic screening” but does not clarify what is considered aesthetic. This section is vague and should be clarified. Additionally, City staff should confer with NV Energy to determine whether aesthetic screening will conflict with their requirements.

• Section 18.04.403(c)(3)(c) allows for an exception to undergrounding when the impact on public or private improvements is “deemed excessive.” What is considered excessive? There should be a metric associated to reduce the arbitrary enforcement of that standard.
Access, Connectivity, and Circulation

- The driveway section refers to NRS. Why would it refer to State law and not the Minor Deviation section of code?
- Section 18.04.501(a)(1)(e) is problematic, particularly in the downtown area where existing residential homes are being converted into nonresidential uses (office) where the only parking available for the site is a driveway. There should be additional flexibility for residential that has transitioned to non-residential use.
- Section 18.04.501(a)(2)(a)(2), by requiring to be built directly adjacent to a property line, is two-way traffic still required? It would make sense that one-way traffic be allowed since the City cannot require someone to build on someone else's property.
- Would the City consider a road trust option allowing a developer to contribute to a fund and when the adjacent property develops, the road trust can be used to construct the road?
- The section governing the number of curb-cuts should be a model of how the code should be written, it is measurable, understandable, and predictable.
- Sections 18.04.501(a)(2)(a)(c and d) references the term “City Standards” but does not specify what specific City standards.
- The figure demonstrating vision triangles is missing.
- If Traffic Impact Analysis will be required for Master Plan and Zoning Map amendments, the code should specify clear scoping since these have broad impacts. These applications bring all the uses allowed in a zone making it difficult to determine a particular impact.
- Section 18.04.501(2)(c)(2)(a)(3) requires a TIA for projects phased over the course of 10 years. This makes sense for a PUD, tentative map, or some type of discretion governing physical development. However, this does not make sense for Master Plan and zoning map amendments, which do not have applications. We foresee the decision-making bodies using this to try and tie MPA and ZMA applications to development proposals.
- This draft indicates that a building permit would necessitate a TIA? What would be the purpose to requesting a TIA? A building permit is a ministerial action and cannot be conditioned. An entry and access study justifying the placement of driveways or other points of access seems more fitting for a non-discretionary project.
- Section 18.04.501(2)(c)(2)(a)(4) requires a TIA for projects that may impact planned roadway projects. An entry and access study seems more appropriate.
- Isn’t there an existing Interpretation regarding TIA for infill projects that could be incorporated into Code?
- The section dealing with external street connectivity [18.04.501(d)(1)] is unnecessarily confusing, internal conflicting, and appears to eliminate the ability to have private roads.
- The second half of the aforementioned standard relating to traffic calming measures should be a separate requirement.
- The Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity Section needs an applicability subsection. This section seems more appropriate for multifamily residential, townhomes, mixed use, and non-residential development. It doesn't really seem applicable to single family residential.
- Section 18.04.502(b)(2) regarding walkway design contains subjective requirements (e.g. adequate, convenient, etc.). What is adequate or convenient to one planner may not be for another. These should be better stated. Additionally, why should the walkway be centrally located? Shouldn't the walkway be located to wherever is most convenient to access each unit?
- The bicycle circulation section refers to "plans" by RTC or the City but does not make specific reference to which plan is applicable.

Parking

- Section 18.04.602(d) states that a site plan review can be used to relax minimum parking standards to accommodate changes of use. This seems like it is the incorrect process and would have a hard time aligning with appropriate site plan review findings. It seems more appropriate to process a major or minor deviation.
- The restrictions on garage parking in multifamily projects should be expanded and clarified.
- Section 18.04.603(c) gives the Administrator authority to require bus turn outs in accordance with "city standards." This section is vague and does not give much reference on when a bus turn out would be required. There should be clearer thresholds defined (e.g. transit route, number of units, size of project, etc.).
- The uses in the parking table should be directly tied to the use table. Like the use table, the number of uses should be greatly consolidated.
- Parking rates should be consistent with the City of Sparks. While the parking rates are generally going in the right direction, we feel they are still too high. The parking rates in Sparks appear to be function without issue and should serve as a test case for Reno.
- When considering fractional spaces, the rounding should follow conventional rounding methods. The requirement to always round to the next higher whole number is too restrictive.
- A demand study should not limit to preparation by a traffic engineer. A broader list of professionals should be provided to allow for more cost-effective options.
- Section 18.04.604(c)(1) should be re-worded. It currently doesn't make sense.
- Sections 15.04.604 and 18.04.606(c) should be merged.
- Where Section 18.04.605(a)(1) references "parking districts" a map should be included to clarify where those districts are located. Alternatively, a note could
be added to the Zoning tables that reference the specific parking district for easier reference.

- Section 18.04.605(a)(2) is a significant increase (from 10% up to 100%) but its confusing which may lead to different interpretations. This is further complicated in Section 18.04.607(d)(3) where it allows “up to 150% of the required parking” but only with additional landscaping. Consider clarifying these sections to make your goal clearer. This comes up again in Section 18.04.704(e)(2)(a)(4) Additional Requirements for Excess Parking in Surface Lots.

- Table 1.6 showing the adjustment factors by type of use should add a residential component in to encourage a true mix of uses.

- Single family residential uses have language that states “not to exceed 3 per unit.” This makes it seem like 3-car garages are not allowed. Since tandem parking is allowed, driveway parking would count. This requirement needs to be reviewed and clarified.

- There are a few uses that have requirements based on operational characteristics (e.g. number of employees on the largest shift). These are always difficult to enforce and difficult from a long-term operational standpoint from the business. This should be revised to relate to a more fixed characteristic such as square footage.

- Credits for on-street parking allow for adjacent parking. Traditionally this has only allowed for abutting parking so that someone else cannot claim your spaces. This should be revised.

- The processes referenced in the on-street parking credit section are incorrect based on prior discussions with staff and the technical working group. Please find the comments on processes above. We recommend ensuring that these are incorporated throughout the code.

- Section 18.04.606(c)(1)(b) references a “legal pedestrian route” but that is not defined anywhere in code. This should be clarified and/or modified.

- The section on vehicle stacking should clarify if the stacking requirement is per lane or total over all lanes. Four stacking spaces per lane for something like a financial institution with multiple windows would be excessive.

**Landscaping**

- Section 18.04.703(a)(1) discusses the need for a landscape plan with a special use permit application. This is inconsistent with the process section discussed above. Because SUP’s should be related to the use, there should be no need for a landscape plan as part of their application. The landscape plan should only be required with discretionary applications that result in physical development.

- Section 18.04.703(c)(3) is not necessary and is duplicative of subsection (d)(1).

- This section has increased the contingency required on bonds from 20% in the current code to 25%. Is there a reason for this? Most developers carry 20% contingency themselves. Why is the 25% necessary? It should be reduced back to 20%.
- The bonding section allows for the issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy. It was prior practice to issue a standard C of O with the bond serving as the mechanism to ensure adequate installation of landscaping. As far as we know, there have been no recent issues with this. As such, we ask that this practice continue moving forward.
- The district specific standards related to single-family and duplexes do not reference townhomes or condominiums. If the single-family referenced in the aforesaid section was intended to be detached, it should be noted as such.
- Section 18.04.704(e)(3) should be put into table form for ease of use.
- It is unclear if the wetland areas/stream environment preservation gets removed from the overall area of calculation as well. We believe that this section can serve as an incentive if it can serve as a landscape credit and be removed from the overall calculated area.
- Section 18.07.704(d)(4) is confusing. Wouldn’t the common area landscaping already be counted as part of the overall landscaping?
- The parking area landscaping and screening sections exempt single family dwellings. However, it should specify that more because this section would clearly apply to a condo or townhome development.
- Rather than using the word "ratio" in section 18.04.704(e)(2)(b)(1)(d), it would be better to use "average rate."
- There are numerous graphics missing from this section. Additionally, Section 18.04.704(e)(4)(b) would be well-served by a graphic.
- The MD zone has specific tree species called out and reference various sub districts that are not consistent with the Master Plan. The appear to match the current Redevelopment Design Standards. We were under the impression that these additional standards were being eliminated and would be incorporated into the code. Regardless, the subsections referenced should be clearly indicated on a map to easily determine what trees are allowed where.
- A Tree Work Permit was referenced for trees in the right of way. This seems like another permit that can easily be incorporated into another permit, if it can be grouped together with another permit.
- It has never been clear when the minor, intermediate, or major trees are required. The landscape section should note when these trees can be planted.
- Section 17.04.705(b)(1) states that parking lot trees are in addition to the other trees required on the site. However, this conflicts with other landscape sections that state that parking lot trees and landscaping can be counted toward the overall required landscaping.
- The prohibited tree list refers to trees in the ROW. Clarify if this applies to all trees on the site.
- Table 1.17 states “New Land Use” in the first column. Shouldn’t this be considered from zone to zone and not be based on use? A use is far more temporary than a zoning designation. Further, you may not know a particular
mix of uses until well after a development is built. This language should be changed to “Zoning District of New Development.”

**Fencing**
- This whole section can be simplified by being placed in a simple graphic.
- Why does Section 14.18 exist? Can that be eliminated and replaced with this section?
- Fencing in front yards should be reduced to 36 inches in height. 4.5 feet is too tall.

**Site and Building Design Standards – Residential**
- Section 18.04.803(a)(1)(b)(1) should be more direct. The current wording is too subjective and does not provide clear direction.
- Section 18.04.803(a)(2)(a) is duplicative of a number of sections. Is this necessary? Is it for cross-reference only?
- Sections 18.04.803(a)(2)(b and c) are duplicative of the landscape section and can be merged. What remains can serve as a cross-reference. With it separated it may be missed by applicants. Additionally, Sections 18.04.803(a)(3) can be merged with the parking section of code.
- Requiring a parkway strip in all residential developments has a wide ranging impacts, particularly when it comes to the placement of utilities. We suggest coordinating with AT&T, Charter, and NV Energy.
- Section 18.04.803(a)(3)(c) discourages 3-car garages by limiting the driveway width in the front yard setback to 24 feet in width. This needs to be modified.
- The building orientation section is problematic and appears to eliminate numerous innovative development designs such as paseo/green belt development, certain types of apartments, agrihoods, etc. This section should be revised completely.
- The setbacks and building location section would be well-suited with a graphic.
- The infill development standard should be simplified to fall within the predominant setback range on their block.
- Limiting the number of cul-de-sacs seems unnecessary, particularly in gated communities. We agree with pedestrian and/or bicycle and pedestrian connectivity from the subdivision to surrounding trails, parks, and/or neighborhoods.
- The section governing density transfers should have more detail on how that will function. Can the density be transferred across zones similar to the County? Can open space area be built on in order to preserve something of greater value? More detail is needed.
- The section governing parcel size matching uses the connective “or” but does not contain anything following the “or.” Is another exhibit supposed to be referenced?
• Unique architectural design should be considered an exception under Section 18.04.803(c)(4). Some of the design standards, particularly roof planes, can have a detrimental impact to certain unique architectural styles.

• The criteria for which the Administrator makes their determination to provide an exception should be provided to reduce arbitrary decisions.

• It should be clearly noted that the standard street image features apply to single family detached structures. Currently, it just lists single family. These standards cannot be met with attached single family homes and should not be applicable.

• The enhanced landscaping feature references “code size tree.” It does not indicate whether this is large or small. This has led to conflicting information in the past and should be updated.

Site and Building Design Standards – Mixed Use

• Section 18.04.902(c)(1) discusses exemptions from discretionary review. These should be related to physical development. However, several uses were exempted. The use table should govern whether a particular use requires a discretionary action. This section referenced should govern exemptions from discretionary applications related to physical development.

• We are supportive of the minimum densities language as it encourages adaptive reuse of existing structures, which will be helpful to redevelopment efforts in Downtown.

• Section 18.04.903(b)(1) mentioned “off-street connections.” Based on the text of this section, this should be modified to read, “off-street vehicular connections.”

• The Sustainable Elements section is much more strict than current standards and would be an impediment to any development in a large number of the zoning designations in the City. While BANN supports incorporating sustainable design elements into development projects, these will have large cost impacts. We would recommend adding more options and lessening the requirements.

• This section discusses the ability to use the special use permit process to modify development standards. This is the incorrect process. A deviation of some sort should be used. Please see the comments about process above.

• The blank wall limitations referencing first floor transparency maintains the 50% of width standard from the current code. This has been a problematic requirement in the past particularly with first floor residential. The width portion has also been exploited leading to windows that don’t necessarily achieve any purpose just to simply meet the requirement. This standard should be revised to better achieve the goal of vibrant ground floor space on vertical mixed use. It should also include provisions that exempt the provision for particular types of development.

• Section 18.04.904(d)(2)(d)(6) allows for design features to protrude into the right of way. In the past, this has required a permanent easement since an occupancy
permit is for temporary occupancy of public right of way. If this will be allowed, then this section should note that an easement into the ROW will be required.

- Section 18.04.905(d)(4)(c) governing hours of operation are more related to use and not design standards. Hours of operations should be under additional use regulations.
- The applicability of the Large Retail requirements should be clearer. It is not currently clear when these requirements apply.
- Additionally, the Large Retail standards should prohibit the division of land that would extend into parking lots, required landscape areas, sign areas, etc. These areas should be seen as common areas shared amongst all owners. The division of land can occur but should be for the footprint of a building or a condominium map. This will prevent one property owner monopolizing parking or removing landscaping that impacts all other property owners in a center.

Site and Building Design Standards – Nonresidential

- Section 18.04.1003(a)(1) states that buildings shall be organized to “frame streets.” This is a vague requirement and we are not sure how this will be implemented.
- Section 18.04.1003(e)(1) requires a building separate loading docks from abutting residential zones. An effective buffer can occur without a building separation. This would cause many issues necessitating variances.
- The Boynton Slough is specifically referenced, but there is nothing in the city maps that specifically references it. If a specific geographic area or feature is referenced in the code, there needs to be something clearly mapped.

Improvement Standards

- Section 18.04.1102 requires City Council to determine the timeline at which developer-installed utilities would be installed. This should be tied to the associated decision-making body. Why would everything need to go to City Council?
- We suggest that the Improvement Plan Submittal requirements section reference a separate set of guidelines or internal policy rather than being codified. As the City explores electronic document review and other emerging technologies, this section codifies a processing requirement that may be dated. By making an internal policy, the City is able to change without a text amendment.
- Section 18.04.1102(b)(2)(b) references City Council conditions of approval. This should reference whatever decision-making body approves an application. Further, this should reference the entitlement project number too. This makes it easier to conduct research going forward.
- Section 18.04.1102(c)(3) that governs the timing of site improvement completion states that offsite improvements shall be completed and operational prior to the certificate of occupancy for any structure within a development. This could be
problematic if the off-site improvement is associated with a phase that is significantly later in the project (e.g. upsizing of sewer at 200 units). The timing of this should be determined with each project.

Residential Adjacency and Skyways

- Both sections reference the SUP process. As referenced throughout this letter, that is not the correct process to govern physical development. Please see the process comments above.

Land Division

- Section 18.06.302(b)(2)(a) references the UBC. We suggest checking with the Building Division and the Fire Department to reflect the correct codes. Additionally, we suggest referring to code names in general and not to specific sections to reduce the need for text amendments every time the referenced section changes.
- Section 18.06.302(b)(3) states that all Townhomes are required to comply with Title 14. This is not necessary. Not only does this section refer to townhomes in a section dedicated to condominiums, it goes without saying that the building code needs to be met. We recommend removing this line.

Sincerely,

Don Tatro
CEO
Builders Association of Northern Nevada
July 29, 2019

Arlo Stockham & Calli Wilsey
City of Reno

Dear Arlo and Calli,

The Housing Task Force Subcommittee has reviewed the Issue Sheet #2B and the group provided the following comments for your review.

Similar to the group’s comments for Issue Sheet 2A, there are not many specific standards to offer support or criticism. As such, the comments are general in nature and focused primarily on the organization and the overall topics anticipated to be covered in each section. The Subcommittee welcomes the opportunity to comment further when detailed standards are proposed.

Overall, it is still not clear how these standards will lie in the code. Will there be overlays or will all the design standards be applicable to each of the applicable zoning designations? How will that geography be defined clearly? Will it be a separate map in the zoning maps?

**Regional Centers**

- What qualifies as a pedestrian amenity should be better defined. Additionally, it should be clearer on what the development costs that the 1% is based on (it should not include soft costs). There may be a better system of obtaining pedestrian amenities as well. Cost does not always equal scale.

- Varied Building Heights/Forms – The Subcommittee supports transition of building massing at district boundaries. However, it should be consistent and based on location, not dependent on existing adjacent property conditions (for example, properties located within one block of a specific boundary v. the structure cannot be taller than 2 stories when the adjacent property is a single story). There should be room for progress and growth as a neighborhood character shifts.

- The transparent storefronts standards need a bit of work. The current wording has been manipulated because it only deals with width. It should also be noted when it is applicable. Maybe it is not smart to be in the general column. The storefront may not be appropriate for certain residential forms or in the Powning district due to the historic nature for example.

- The Subcommittee generally feels it is still good practice to keep parking to the side or rear of structures in the downtown area. This may not necessarily be beneficial as one leaves the downtown area. Further, design exceptions should still be allowed. For example, this may disproportionately impact the Keystone Avenue area.
With regards to pedestrian connectivity, there should be an incentive to vacate alley if there will be an activation with storefronts, lighting, artwork, etc. This will create an opportunity for more small leasable space, while also allowing for more pedestrian connectivity. Alley activation has been successful in many major metro areas.

The Builders Association of Northern Nevada (BANN) always supports the opportunity to use incentives over regulatory requirements to encourage redevelopment. The opportunity to use a fleet of incentives for adaptive reuse projects in downtown is a great idea.

The Subcommittee completely agrees with the shadowing requirement. This has a converse impact on areas that are desired for densification. Further, what qualifies as a park, plaza, etc. should be clarified further.

**Entertainment District**

- If community amenities are required, there needs to be a defined way to determine how many community amenities and alternatively the amount required for an in-lieu fee (similar to the 1% of project cost for pedestrian amenities).

**Innovation District**

- This section discusses adjacent use types. There was some thought that uses were being handled under a different section of the code. What is the thought process to bringing them into the design standards? Shouldn't use and physical form be separate issues?

**Riverwalk District**

- The Subcommittee would support re-doing the Downtown Riverfront Design guidelines. There are some principles, particularly when it comes to architecture, that are dated and discourage new architectural styles. If updated, there should be one set of standards for the entire Riverwalk District to make things more simplistic.

**Community/Neighborhood Center**

- Applicability - Will these standards apply to all the GC, NC, and PO zones or just those that fall within the Community/Neighborhood Center designation in the structure plan? If it is the latter, how will that manifest itself geographically in the zoning code? There's not much of a specific geographic delineation in the structure plan beyond dots.

- How does this work with residential in these areas?

- Varied Building Heights/Forms - The Subcommittee supports transition of building massing at district boundaries. However, it should be consistent and
based on location, not dependent on existing adjacent property conditions (for example, properties located within one block of a specific boundary v. the structure cannot be taller than 2 stories when the adjacent property is a single story). One property owner should not gain benefit that another property owner cannot enjoy if they are similarly zoned. This creates situations ripe for variance requests.

- Similar to the Regional Center comment for adaptive reuse, BANN encourages incentives to be used for reuse and rehabilitation of existing commercial centers.
- There is a requirement to place higher intensity uses adjacent to BRT stations. Shouldn't this be limited to form and development intensity rather than use? Limiting uses based on specific transit locations seems difficult.

**Neighborhood**

- Relationship to roadways orient buildings and lots to minimize impact of streets on neighborhood character. What does this mean exactly? Increased setbacks, buffers from Collectors, arterials, highways, etc.?
- Minimize the use of walls that hinder pedestrian/bicycle connectivity - The type of walls should be clarified. Retaining walls are often necessary to accommodate topography. How will that work?
- Secondary street access in secondary neighborhoods - how does this differ from secondary access in all other neighborhoods? What happens as we start to go up into the canyons and get into difficult topography (think later phases of Northgate in the NW). Can we do fire sprinklers in lieu of secondary access?

Please feel free to reach out to us if a separate meeting is needed to discuss any of this input.

Regards,

Don Tatro  
CEO  
Builders Association of Northern Nevada (BANN)
The One Truckee River (OTR) Management Plan was unanimously approved by the following municipalities in 2016 by the City of Sparks on September 26, 2016, Washoe County on September 27, 2016, and City of Reno on September 28, 2016.

How can the City of Reno Zoning Code RENOvation work connect with the One Truckee River Management Plan to ensure a healthy, thriving, sustainable river connected to the hearts and minds of its community?

The City of Reno is part of the Truckee Meadows region at a population of over 500,000. The Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) forecasted 120,000 new residents and 50,000 more housing units to come to Washoe County by 2035. The Truckee River is an irreplaceable natural resource that provides 85% of the region’s drinking water.

In reviewing both documents (the City of Reno, NV Annexation and Land Development Code Targeted Assessment Report and the One Truckee River Management Plan Phase 1 – West McCarran to Sparks Boulevard) these specific items come up:

How can specific OTR Action Items be included and/or supported in the City of Reno, NV Title 18 Annexation and Land Development Code?

- 1.1.c - Implement Best Management Practices to improve quality of water flowing into the Truckee River from contributing watershed areas
- 1.4.b - Create an approved vegetative species list to increase biodiversity and shading on lands along the Truckee River
- 1.5.c - Support existing officially designated wildlife corridors
- 1.6.b - Review existing development codes among jurisdictions, and provide guidance and direction for low impact development (LID) and river enhancement
- 1.6.f - Identify historic and existing river boundaries to help identify acquisition opportunities in undeveloped areas to support goals of ecosystem health
- 2.3.e - Make public access a condition of approval for new development fronting the Truckee River
- 2.5.c - Create development standards that could be adopted that identify public amenity requirements specific to the Truckee River

How can the specific codes within the City of Reno, NV Title 18 Annexation and Land Development Code be updated to increase protection to the Truckee River and 85% of the region’s drinking water?

- Section 18.12.105 - Setbacks from the Truckee River
- Chapter 18.12, Article XVIII - Wetlands and Stream Environment Protection Standards
- Section 18.12.1804. - Applicability and Exemptions
- Section 18.12.1805. – No Net Loss Standard Adopted
- Section 18.12.1807. - Technical Survey Requirements/Waiver
- Chapter 18.12, Article XIX Drainage Way Protection Standards
July 14, 2019

City of Reno - Zoning Code Renovation
Comments from: One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator

Dear City of Reno,

One Truckee River (OTR) is a collaboration of public and private partners focused on the implementation of the OTR Management Plan Phase I unanimously adopted by the three local jurisdictions in 2016. With a collaborative partnership of diverse perspectives, comments provided are not of OTR as a whole but are OTR Partnership Coordinator with OTR mission in mind, to ensure a healthy, thriving, sustainable river connected to the hearts and minds of its community. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments:

Summary Table A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment Topic</th>
<th>Background and Code Update Recommendations</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Staff recommends that the code update focus on targeted amendments to a variety of development requirements to support more affordable housing opportunities. Amendments related to parking, grading, sidewalks, and landscaping should help reduce housing costs while maintaining requirements for quality design.</td>
<td>What would these amendments include? Parking requirements could be revised to discourage impermeable surfaces. They could also consider incentives for LID paving options. Sidewalks should generally be required, with the option to waive only if adding the sidewalk would not provide any true benefit to pedestrian circulation. Landscaping should prioritize street trees to meet ReLeaf Reno goals. What are staff thoughts on tree well filters? By decreasing impermeable surfaces, encouraging sustainable transportation options, increasing tree cover, and using LID strategies, the codes would help achieve OTR Management Plan Objective 1.1 – assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street Parking and Loading</td>
<td>Changes to parking requirements have been identified as an effective way to reduce development costs and utilize land in a more sustainable manner.</td>
<td>Can it also be used to reduce impermeable surfaces? By decreasing impermeable surfaces, the codes would help achieve OTR Management Plan Objective 1.1 – assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening | Modest amendments are recommended to streamline and refine the current code | Maybe consider a River-Friendly or water efficiency landscape ordinance?  
https://my.spokanecity.org/smc/?Chapter=17C.200  
Water-efficient landscapes not only conserve water but also reduce nuance flows and nps pollution inputs into storm drains. This would help achieve OTR Management Plan Objective 1.1 – assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river. |
| Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening | Adjustments to landscape area requirements are also recommended for mixed use districts. Changes would consolidate and refine current standards that require less landscaped area and a greater focus on street trees for moderate to high intensity infill development projects. Tree protection ordinances are addressed separately. | How will landscape codes address stormwater quality? Are there stormwater utility fees based on the amount of impermeable surfaces the development creates? Are they required to keep a certain percentage of runoff onsite? This would help achieve OTR Management Plan Objective 1.1 – assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river. |

Summary Table B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</th>
<th>Comment/Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Scale Targeted Public Engagement Efforts. Issue sheet 1C outlined a process to review zoning maps at the neighborhood scale following adoption of the code update. This issue sheet recommends the process be expanded to also include sidewalk and trail plans for each neighborhood, as well as a review of existing neighborhood overlay district standards in applicable areas.</td>
<td>Could stormwater infrastructure be included? My understanding is that existing infrastructure is not mapped. Should this be handled on a neighborhood scale? This would support OTR Management Plan objective 1.1a – identify location of all high-volume storm drains and largest storm water contributions to the Truckee River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iris Jehle-Peppard, Partnership Coordinator, One Truckee River - (775) 450-5489  
<iris@onetruckeeriver.org>
August 3, 2019

Attention: City of Reno - Zoning Code Renovation
Worksheet Comments: Zoning Code Update Issue Sheet #2B, Module 2: Development Standards Topic B: Site and Building Design Standards
Comments from: One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator

Dear City of Reno,

One Truckee River (OTR) is a collaboration of public and private partners focused on the implementation of the OTR Management Plan Phase I unanimously adopted by the three local jurisdictions in 2016. With a collaborative partnership of diverse perspectives, comments provided are not of OTR as a whole but are OTR Partnership Coordinator with OTR mission in mind, to ensure a healthy, thriving, sustainable river connected to the hearts and minds of its community. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Section of Memo</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Applicable City of Reno Master Plan Section</th>
<th>Applicable OTR Management Plan Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summary page 2 there is a list of staff recommendations for setback / coverage standard adjustments. Item #1 lists the following: “Building coverage standards that currently apply in the SF-4, SF-6 and SF-9 districts (40%) would be expanded to include all of the large lot and single family districts. This is common in land development codes.....”</td>
<td>Could the building coverage standards be expanded to also include impervious cover standards?</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Principles SD.12: Stormwater Management, SD.13: Stormwater Infrastructure, and SD.15: Low Impact Development.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1. – Assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 3, Regional Center standard (B)(iv)(b) - Utilize shared parking where feasible.</td>
<td>This standard could decrease impermeable surfaces supporting protecting the Truckee River.</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Principles SD.12: Stormwater Management, SD.13: Stormwater Infrastructure, and SD.15: Low Impact Development.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1. – Assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 3, Regional Center standard (B)(vii)(a) - Maintain, standardize, and clarify current streetscape standards</td>
<td>Revised streetscape standards could consider, where feasible, Green Street strategies for incorporating LID stormwater infrastructure into streetscapes. This could be a city-wide code.</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Principles SD.12: Stormwater Management, SD.13: Stormwater Infrastructure, and SD.15: Low Impact Development.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1. – Assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 4, Regional Center standard (C)(v)(b) - Ensure Truckee River Esplanade setbacks are easy to find in the code, either here or in the dimensional standards chapter</td>
<td>Are there ways that the code and setbacks can encourage and facilitate continued connectivity of river walk/esplanade? There are currently gaps on the river's north bank between Lake Street and 2nd Street (which could provide great pedestrian access from the city center to the ballpark) and on the south bank between Lake Street and Brodhead Park (while there is trail connectivity, this section of the Riverwalk does not have attractive water-front amenities characteristic of other sections).</td>
<td>Development Principle 3.2D: Truckee River</td>
<td>Objective 2.1.e – Enhance Truckee River visitor safety, access, public facilities (bathrooms) and education and Objective 2.1.f – Work with local jurisdictions to coordinate efforts and identify parcels along the river with potential for public/private partnerships that can increase access to the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 5, Community/Neighborhood Center standard (B)(iii)(c)(b) – Screen parking along street edge (will be a citywide parking design standard).</td>
<td>While we understand that these site and design standards are in the conceptual phase, as these standards are developed with more detail, could the City consider incorporating LID parking options in the revised parking design standards.</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Principles SD.12: Stormwater Management, SD.13: Stormwater Infrastructure, and SD.15: Low Impact Development.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1. – Assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 6, Corridor standard (B)(ii) (a)(i) – Design streets with multiple travel modes in mind (continue current general citywide street design standards). Increasing sustainable transportation options for the City could also reduce non-point source pollution to the Truckee River. In addition the City could consider within the multi-modal transportation work to incorporate Green Street standards, where feasible, into the citywide street design standards, as a complete street should not only consider transportation but also its impacts to flooding and water quality (see <a href="https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-stormwater-guide/streets-are-ecosystems/complete-streets-green-streets/">https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-stormwater-guide/streets-are-ecosystems/complete-streets-green-streets/</a>).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 7, Corridor standard (C)(iv) – Greenway Corridor Has the City considered overlay zoning for the Truckee River Greenway? Other cities, such as Boise, have implemented overlay districts to protect waterways and their natural resources while still allowing for public access, green space, and recreational uses.</td>
<td>Plan Design Principle N-G.8: Streetscape Design Sustainable Development Principles SD.12: Stormwater Management, SD.13: Stormwater Infrastructure, and SD.15: Low Impact Development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objective 1.1. – Assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river Goal 1: Ensure and protect water quality and ecosystem health in the Truckee River and Goal 2: Create and sustain a safe, beautiful and accessible river connecting people and places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 7, Corridor standard (C)(iv) (b) – Truckee River: Maintain 50-foot setback on either side of river (GC-4)</td>
<td>The City will need to clarify in the code where the 50’ setback is being measured from. Will it be OHWM? Top of bank? Edge of established riparian vegetation? Clarity within this code section would be beneficial.</td>
<td>Greenway Corridors C-4 and 3.2D: Truckee river, 7.1B: Development Constraints Area, 7.1C: Environmentally-Sensitive Areas, 7.1D: Hydrologic Resources, 7.1E: Major Drainageways, 7.1F: No Net Loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 7, Corridor standard (C)(iv) (b) – Truckee River: Maintain 50-foot setback on either side of river (GC-4)</td>
<td>The City could consider increasing the setback to 100 feet to ensure greater protection of the Truckee River, an ecological and recreational assets to the region. Riparian setbacks vary greatly across the US with usual range from 25-300 feet. To allow flexibility within this increased setback, an exception review process could be incorporated that allows for a lesser setback if the proposed development will not contribute to stream bank erosion, or negatively impact the riparian or wetland habitat. If an increased fixed-width is not feasible, a graduated setback policy could be considered, such as maintaining the 50-foot setback in the urban core while expanding it to 100 feet in currently undeveloped areas.</td>
<td>Greenway Corridors C-4 and 3.2D: Truckee river, 7.1B: Development Constraints Area, 7.1C: Environmentally-Sensitive Areas, 7.1D: Hydrologic Resources, 7.1E: Major Drainageways, 7.1F: No Net Loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 11, Neighborhood standard (B)(vii)(c)(b)(ii) – Utilize fire-resistant vegetation and landscaping materials</td>
<td>LID design features can be incorporated into a <em>firescaping</em> design to serve dual functions of reducing non-point source pollution while making the property more fire-resistant. The code could encourage the incorporation of LID features that keep water onsite, such as rain barrels, dry swales and permeable paving.</td>
<td>Principles SD.12: Stormwater Management, SD.13: Stormwater Infrastructure, and SD.15: Low Impact Development.</td>
<td>Objective 1.1. – Assure that storm drains are delivering the cleanest water into the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clarion memo, page 11, Neighborhood standard (C)(iii)(b)(c) – Preserve and incorporate existing drainages. (N-FN6)</td>
<td>Similar to comment 7, the City could consider overlay zoning for existing drainages. Within that overlay district, they could consider setbacks and vegetation management ordinances (i.e. no lawns with fertilizer and pesticide inputs), and impervious cover maximums, while still allowing for trails and recreational uses.</td>
<td>Greenway Corridors C-4 and 3.2D: Truckee river, 7.1B: Development Constraints Area, 7.1C: Environmentally-Sensitive Areas, 7.1D: Hydrologic Resources, 7.1E: Major Drainageways, 7.1F: No Net Loss</td>
<td>Goal 1: Ensure and protect water quality and ecosystem health in the Truckee River and Goal 2: Create and sustain a safe, beautiful and accessible river connecting people and places.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Iris Jehle-Peppard, One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator
iris@onetruckeeriver.org
December 2, 2019

Attention: City of Reno - Zoning Code Renovation
Worksheet Comments: Development Standards: Draft Code
Comments from: One Truckee River Partnership Coordinator

Dear City of Reno,

One Truckee River (OTR) is a collaboration of public and private partners focused on the implementation of the OTR Management Plan Phase I unanimously adopted by the three local jurisdictions in 2016. With a collaborative partnership of diverse perspectives, comments provided are not of OTR as a whole but are OTR Partnership Coordinator thoughts toward achieving OTR mission, to ensure a healthy, thriving, sustainable river connected to the hearts and minds of its community. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments below related to the Draft Code presented by the City of Reno in November 2019.

Section 18.02.501 - PG: Parks, Greenways and Open Space:
Comment: The parks special use districts could consider incorporating drainageway setbacks. The current draft only includes building setbacks from property lines. The intent would be to avoid situations like Caughlin Ranch where lawns are placed in natural drainageways. This contributes to runoff pollution from synthetic fertilizer use.
Applicable OTR Management Plan Action Item 1.1.c) Implement Best Management Practices to improve quality of water flowing into the Truckee River from contributing watershed areas.

Section 18.02.506(e)(2) - Common Open Space-Management
Comments: Have PUDs include a submittal of a maintenance management plan to use Integrated Pest Management practices to limit the use of pesticides and synthetic fertilizers. These non-point source pollutants impact the river, and large PUD developments have the potential to impair water quality with their management practices, if they don’t use chemicals responsibly.
Applicable OTR Management Plan Action Item 1.1.c) Implement Best Management Practices to improve quality of water flowing into the Truckee River from contributing watershed areas.

Section 18.02.506 (d) 18.02.506 (d) - PUD: Planned Development
Comments: There is no mention of LID requirements. There could be a reference to LID standards in the engineering requirements.
Applicable OTR Management Plan Action Item 1.6b) Review existing development codes among jurisdictions, and provide guidance and direction for Low Impact Development (LID) and river enhancement.

Section 18.02.601 - Overlay Districts
Comments: There could be consideration to establish an overlay district for the Truckee River and adjacent parcels up to a determined setback from the river's bed and banks, similar to the Boise River and Greenbelt Overlay District established in Boise, ID. Provisions in this district could be to regulate appropriate uses (allow for open space, recreation and public access), decrease erosion, protect sensitive habitat and riparian vegetation and limit impermeable surfaces.
Applicable OTR Management Plan Action Item 4.1.e) Continue to work on advocacy for enabling Park District legislation that would provide a sustainable funding source for all parks, open space, fire adapted communities and natural resources in the Truckee Meadows Region in the future. Conduct a study to examine feasibility of a linear park concept for the Truckee River in the short term.
and OTR Action Item 2.3.e) Make public access a condition of approval for new development fronting the Truckee River.
Section 18.02.704(f)(2) - Setbacks from the Truckee River - General River Setback Required
Comments: The 50' setback applies, unless otherwise approved by the Administrator or a "major" special use permit. Who is the Administrator? Could an exception to this setback rule be open to public process and comment, not just one individual Administrator? It is important to maintain a public and transparent process, especially when dealing with such a vital community resource.

Section 18.02.704(f)(2) - Setbacks from the Truckee River - General River Setback Required
Comments: The term "structure" includes all decks, patios and parking areas. This term could be expanded to include all other impermeable surfaces, such as roads.
Applicable OTR Management Plan Action Item 1.1.c) Implement Best Management Practices to improve quality of water flowing into the Truckee River from contributing watershed areas.

Section 18.02.603(c)(7) - Mortensen-Garson Neighborhood Plan Overlay - Significant Hydrologic Resources
Comments: These standards for critical and sensitive stream zone buffer areas are very comprehensive. Consider using these not just for this specific neighborhood/overlay district but also city-wide.
Applicable OTR Management Plan Goal 1) Ensure and protect water quality and ecosystem health in the Truckee River

Section 18.04.103(e) - No Net Loss Standard Adopted
Comments: What mitigation ratios will be required?

Section 18.04.103(e) - No Net Loss Standard Adopted
Comments: A mitigation monitoring plan could be required to ensure that mitigation either on-site or off-site are successful. There could be follow-through to ensure that there is no net loss of wetland or riparian habitats.

Section 18.04.103(f) - Waiver of Technical Surveys
Comments: In addition to designating wetland and stream environments as open space, the waiver could also include documentation that proposed development will not negatively impact those protected resources. For example, a developer’s ability to designate a drainageway as open space but then increase stormwater flows into that drainage could still cause incision and channel degradation.

Section 18.04.103(g) - Mitigation Required
Comments: The mitigation plan could include monitoring protocols and required reporting. If enforcement is left to City officials, they may not have the resources and time available to ensure mitigation is achieved. The onus could be put on the developer to report and document compliance.

Section 18.04.104(d)(2) - Generally, Application Protection Standards
Comments: Weeds could be defined to be state-regulated noxious and invasive weeds. It could be clear that removal of native riparian vegetation is not allowed.

Section 18.04.104(f)(1) - Additional Standards for Disturbed Major Drainage Ways
Comments: Only native riparian vegetation could be allowed within these drainage ways. Excluding any other ornamentals including drought-tolerant ornamentals to be planted in drainage ways could be considered.

Section 18.04.105 - Tree Protection
Comments: Additional protections could be considered for existing riparian trees within drainageways and wetlands, excluding invasive species.

Section 18.04.202(e)(6) - No Tracking of Grading Material onto Streets or into Storm Drains
Comments: How will this be enforced? Will there be fines associated with non-compliance?

Section 18.04.204(a)(2) - Post-Construction Storm Water Quality Management
Comments: Incorporating LID into every design within the watershed is key to protecting the Truckee River and regional water quality.

Section 18.04.204(b)(1)(a)(4) - Applicability
Comments: Why are single-family homes over one acre to be exempt? They could potentially have just as large an impact as multi-family homes. Consider linking it to total impermeable surface coverage rather than land-use type.

18.04.703(d)(1) - Landscape Plan Submittal Requirements
Comments: There is no requirement for impermeable surface limits on landscape plan submittals. The City could consider implementing a requirement to report % of impermeable surface and require limits. Impermeable surfaces increase surface water flow and heat island effect and more progressive policies to limit them would support the OTR Management Plan and the COR Sustainability and Climate Action Plan.

18.04.703(d)(2)(c) - Final Landscape Plan Submittal Requirements
Comments: The City could consider requiring a setback from impermeable surfaces for spray irrigation and turf installation. Carson City has a requirement that turf be offset 3’ from hard surfaces (Division 3, turf ordinance 3.6). This reduces runoff and non-point source pollution because turf maintenance often uses synthetic fertilizers and pesticides that have potential to be washed into the storm drain with spray irrigation.

18.04.703(d)(2)(c)(6) - Living and non-living ground cover within landscape areas
Comments: The City could consider incentivizing the use of living and organic groundcovers, such as wood chip mulches. These mulches support the development of healthy soils, which help retain moisture (conserving water for irrigation and reducing runoff), and also reduce heat island effect. In contrast, rock and decomposed granite mulches do not support healthy soils, increase runoff and heat island effect, and are standardly installed with pre-emergent herbicides, which can wash off and pollute our waterways.

18.04.704(d)(3) - Credits Toward Landscaping Requirements- Wetlands/Stream Environments
Comments: The code reads that within Wetland and Stream Environments enhancement may not include new plantings of Populus and Salix without approval of the urban forester. Why would the City discourage the use of appropriate, native riparian tree species within wetland and stream environments? The Truckee River is impaired per EPA standards for temperature, and plantings of native riparian trees could be encouraged to help enhance these areas.

18.04.704(d)(3) - Credits Toward Landscaping Requirements- Wetlands/Stream Environments
Comments: Ulmus pumila, the Siberian elm, is considered invasive and should be discouraged within wetland and stream environments in the Truckee Meadows. Native species of Populus and Salix should be prioritized.

18.04.704(e)(2)(a)(5) - Parking Lot Edge
Comments: Parking lot edges usually are adjacent to impermeable surfaces, and as such, lawn and spray irrigation should not be allowed in these areas. Lawns maintenance often includes the use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, and when installed next to impermeable surfaces, these chemicals have high potential to runoff into our storm drains and pollute our waterways.

18.04.704(f)(1)(c)(1) - Street Tree Requirements - Mixed Use Downtown Districts
Comments: All median planting requirements could explicitly state that lawn/turf and spray irrigation are not allowed. This reduces runoff and non-point source pollution.
18.04.705(c)(2) - Ground Cover
Comments: The City could consider incentivizing the use of living and organic groundcovers, such as wood chip mulches, on flat slopes and in areas not subject to high fire danger. These mulches support the development of healthy soils, which help retain moisture (conserving water for irrigation and reducing runoff), and also reduce heat island effect. In contrast, rock and decomposed granite mulches do not support healthy soils, increase runoff and heat island effect, and are standardly installed with pre-emergent herbicides, which can wash off and pollute our waterways.

18.04.707(a)(2) - Maintenance - Irrigation Plans
Comments: The City could consider requiring a setback from impermeable surfaces for spray irrigation. This reduces runoff and non-point source pollution being washed into the storm drain with spray irrigation.

On November 21, 2019 the Truckee Meadows Stormwater Monitoring Annual Report Fiscal Year 2019 was presented to the Truckee Meadows Stormwater Permit Coordinating Committee. The draft Report findings state in summary:

“the Truckee River through the Truckee Meadows has impaired water quality from high water temperature, excessive nutrients, and increased total dissolved solids (TDS). Water quality is of particular concern because the river has a number of beneficial uses including aquatic habitat, recreation, and potable water.”

It was noted, 2019 was a high storm event year and this contributes to increase TDS. Yet, it shows that there is more work to be done to protect the Truckee River and the Truckee Meadows watershed as a whole. City codes have a vital role in this work. Specifically, reducing impermeable surfaces throughout the watershed, incentivizing Low Impact Development, and promoting landscaping practices that conserve water and reduce pesticide and synthetic fertilizer use play a critical role in the reduction of non-point source pollutants into our waterways.

Sincerely,
Iris Jehle-Peppard, Partnership Coordinator for One Truckee River
iris@onetuckeeriver.org
Nathan,

Thank you for sending this to me. I have gone through this once from a high level review because I don’t have the background for the building standards etc. and am more focused on the uses and conformance with state law. I have copied Stephen Ascuaga from the Peppermill who will be looking at these documents as well and providing feedback. At this point, I only have a couple of comments and suggestions.

In the cover memo, you address that Section 18.08.502 (d)(3) will remain unchanged. It addresses nonconforming property or business displaced by Retrac. I agree that this is important to keep as the Turf Club entitlement is still floating. I understand that language isn’t going to be inserted in the code specific to the Turf Club, but I ask that the memo be updated to add the Old Reno Casino entitlement to the memo so its clear that there are two floating licenses that came out of the Retrac displacement. I’m happy to discuss that with your further but as the public looks at the City’s memo and explanation, I think its very important that the Old Reno Casino entitlement not get lost in the discussion.

Along that line of discussion, may I suggest that there be a note or revisers note or something to qualify the termination that the gaming uses only allow “hotel with nonrestricted gaming” . . . This came up during the process by which Station Casinos applied for and obtained a special use permit on S. Virginia Street for a hotel with nonrestricted gaming license that didn’t include a hotel. Claudia provided an administrative interpretation that because the nonconforming entitlement didn’t require
hotel rooms, it should be considered to qualify as an acceptable use, it just doesn’t sound right. Given that there are two floating licenses, it seems there should be some kind of notation in the code that a nonconforming license that has been displaced by Retrac (i.e. a floating license) meets the definition of a hotel with nonrestricted gaming or something that clarifies that it is an allowed use if it obtains its approvals.

Happy to discuss that as well.

Also, section 18.02.102 provides that the minimum number of rooms is 201. I understand that the 201 room requirement is not a change. However, state law has changed and requires 301 rooms in Washoe County in order to obtain a nonrestricted gaming license from the Commission. See NRS 463.01865 (1) (b).

This is really addressing new construction of a hotel with nonrestricted gaming and the room requirement in the City for the casino to have 37,500 sf of gaming space. It seems it should conform to the state requirement because no one will be able to build a casino with less than 301 rooms.

I will review again and provide additional comments if I have them and I will coordinate with Stephen.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Mike

Michael G. Alonso
Manager
775.683.9407 office
Housing Taskforce Subcommittee Meeting Update

Angela Fuss, AICP <afuss@lumosinc.com>            Tue, Jul 2, 2019 at 3:29 PM
To: "Calli Wilsey (wilsey@reno.gov)" <wilsey@reno.gov>, Arlo Stockham <stockham@reno.gov>
Cc: "dont (dont@thebuilders.com)" <dont@thebuilders.com>, Melinda Smith <melindas@thebuilders.com>

Hi Calli and Arlo,

The Housing Task Force Subcommittee has reviewed the Issue Sheet #2A and the group provided the following comments for your review. Please let us know if a separate meeting is needed to discuss any of this input.

Housing Taskforce Subcommittee
Issue Sheet #2A - Development Standards

In general, the group supports making the code more user friendly and modifying standards to reduce development costs that ultimately get passed on to the consumer. However, this particular issue sheet does not offer many specifics about the changes that will be made. As such, it is difficult to offer much support or suggestions for change. The comments below reflect our initial response to the Development Standards Issue Sheet.

* User-friendly amendments

  o We are generally supportive of streamlining the code and making it simpler to use. However, this is a fairly general statement. Without any specifics, it is difficult to determine whether the code changes will result in an end product that is easier to use. Prior to adoption, the Technical Working Group should have an opportunity to review the changes to ensure that they truly are easier to use for the general public.

* Incentives for affordable housing

  o We are in support of increasing the incentives to offer affordable housing.

  o We understand the immediate need for affordable housing, but also understand the delicate nature of the affordable housing issue. It deserves to be considered as separate item with input from all stakeholders. We ask that you include BANN and the Housing Task Force Subcommittee at the table during those discussions to ensure the builder’s perspective is taken into consideration.

* Sustainable Development

  o What building and site development standards could arise out of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan are still unclear. While the Housing Task Force Subcommittee supports incorporating sustainable elements into building and site designs, the level of sustainability and types of sustainable elements are unclear. We would like to see more specifics about what requirements are proposed to implement both the Master Plan and Sustainability and Climate Action Plan prior to standing we are in full support of the City’s proposed modifications. As mentioned above, BANN and the Housing task Force Subcommittee would like to be involved in reviewing any detailed outlines and draft provisions that are developed by the City to provide more detailed feedback.

  o While it appears that the VMT reduction program is geared toward businesses, it is not clear if it will be applicable to all developments. The regulations should be clear as to who this is applicable to.

* Site and Building Design Standards

  o These are extremely important for us. We welcome the opportunity to weigh in on the future issue sheet.

* Residential Adjacency Standards

  o We agree that Special use permits should be eliminated for residential adjacency. However, that does not necessarily mean we are opposed to any discretionary action being associated with residential adjacency. In some circumstances, it is a good idea to ensure neighbors are notified and a public process is had. We simply think that residential adjacency should be tied to a process that is better tailored to physical development with associated findings that are more related to physical development. The issue is not necessarily the discretion, but the findings. We do, however, believe that the definition of residential adjacency should be better defined. When a lot is considered adjacent, but is separated by a 100 foot right-of-way, major highway, significant natural feature, etc. there is not likely an impact. At that point, a discretionary process seems like more of a process burden than a community benefit.

  o It seems appropriate that the compatibility of potentially offensive uses can be handled during a use permit process...
with use compatibility findings thereby focusing the residential adjacency standards less on the use, but the appropriateness of the physical development on adjacent residential properties.

* Infill Design Standards

  o The issue memo states that these standards would borrow from existing neighborhood overlay standards, but does not clarify which overlay standards. There are good and bad code standards in the various overlays, but it would be interesting to know which one that the consultants and staff think are the best. Given that the City Council and Regional Planning seem to be pushing for more infill development, this code should be simple, flexible, and allow for creative development solutions that are respectful of the surrounding neighborhood scale. The standards should not be so restrictive to eliminate infill potential or force variances like many of the setback standards currently do.

  o This is something that would greatly benefit from more detail on what is being considered.

* Grading and Drainage

  o As was mentioned in the residential adjacency standards above, special use permits should be tied to the use table and not to physical developments. It is understandable that discretionary review be required for projects with large impacts resulting from grading or modifications to drainageways. However, these should be tied to a different type of application (e.g. Major Site Plan Review) with findings that are tailored toward determining the impacts of physical development.

  o We agree that reducing the amount of discretion and placing standard conditions into development standards will help streamline the process while still achieving the same goals. We are supportive of this general concept. However, we need to see specifics on the standards before we can state that we are in full support of the standards over the creativity that can come out of a discretionary process without specific standards.

* Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety

  o Not requiring sidewalks on both sides of the street for every project in favor of a pedestrian connectivity approach is supported by the development community. In some communities, sidewalk does not necessarily make sense along the street. Maybe they have paseos. Maybe the grading would be significantly worsened with sidewalks along the street, but could be supplemented with trails. We agree with the intent of providing bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and realize that this can be achieved in other ways beside a street. We are looking forward to working with the City to determine the details of these standards.

* Off-Street Parking and Loading

  o Allowing the free market to determine parking in Downtown and generally reducing parking ratios throughout the rest of the City seems appropriate. We would like to explore the parking maximum requirements that are currently in place. There are certain circumstances where the parking requirements are too low in the eyes of the operator (e.g. Assisted Living/Skilled Nursing) and consistently require more parking, which impacts the landscaping requirements and ultimately impacts the overall site design. This should also be explored.

  o Increased parking permit programs in favor of reduced parking in infill areas is generally supported in theory, but we would like more details on how that would work.

  o The way parking is measured should be revised as well. Parking is currently measured on an incremental basis, but should follow traditional rounding principles. As should number of units.

* Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening

  o We agree that mixed use districts would benefit from a better landscape section of code. Further, the landscape section and Downtown Streetscape standards should be explored together to eliminate inconsistencies. We recommend eliminating the downtown streetscape standards and incorporating them into Title 18.

  o The parkway strip standards should be clarified. We support parkway strips on collector streets and greater, but this standard should be reexamined for local streets.

  o There should be a better organization and simplification of standards through the use of tables.

  o It is often unclear what areas need formal landscaping and what ones do, particularly in residential subdivisions. This should be refined and clarified.

* Exterior Lighting

  o Please provide more details. The standards now do not state much and many lighting standards are done through project conditions. We support a standardization of lighting requirements.

* Historic Resources

  o Please provide more details.
* Food Access

- It is not clear whether any changes are proposed with this update. It seems like the existing standards for urban farming will remain and a separate process will be undertaken later. While we may seem like an unlikely stakeholder, there have been recent projects that have been denied or recommended for denial due to access to potential commercial or future unknown grocery stores. BANN and the Housing Task Force Subcommittee would like to be a part of any discussions related to food access.

- Tree Protection

- We support taking this through a separate process and understand that the contentious nature of this subject could cause a delay to the overall code update if it were to be lumped in with the other immediate changes.

- As an advanced comment on this subject, we generally feel that some trees are more important than others. Further, safety should play a part in the ordinance as well. If there is an imminent threat to life and safety as determined by an arborist, there should be no penalty. Additionally, we believe that tree preservation incentives should be more detailed than currently outlined in code.

- Flood Hazard Areas

- We agree that an additional 25% volumetric mitigation is warranted and will assist in resiliency. We also agree that this should be taken as a separate process. However, this should be prioritized and should have the scientists, engineers, and other professionals that understand and work with floodplains regularly inform the regulations. Floodplain management is not something that should be left to discretion. It should be informed by the professionals and not based on feelings.

- We do not agree with any provisions that exceed 125% volumetric mitigation.

- Source Water Protection

- The info sheet suggests an overlay be used. Would this be a standard zoning overlay? If so, would that mean that a zoning map amendment would need to be required if the use were changed to something with no potential impact to source water? We think another mechanism for tracking would be better.

- Wetlands and Streams

- See flood hazard comments above.

- Wildland Interface/Fire Safety

- We support taking this through a separate process and understand that this subject could cause a delay to the overall code update if it were to be lumped in with the other immediate changes.

- Signs

- We support taking this through a separate process and understand that the contentious nature of this subject could cause a delay to the overall code update if it were to be lumped in with the other immediate changes.


Angela Fuss, AICP
Planning Group Manager
Engineering Division
9222 Prototype Drive
Reno, NV 89521
775.827.6111
afuss@LumosInc.com
[cid:image003.jpg@01D53094.F1275F00]
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Fwd: FW: Boise v Martin - U.S. Supreme Court will not take up Boise’s controversial homeless camping case

1 message

Arlo Stockham <stockham@reno.gov>  Thu, Dec 26, 2019 at 11:59 AM
To: Michelle Fournier <fournierm@reno.gov>

Hi,

Could you please also add this to the code update comment tracking spreadsheet. Thanks,
Arlo Stockham, AICP, Director
Community Development Department
Cell: (775) 224-6099
1 East First Street, 2nd Floor
Reno, NV  89501

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Bill Thomas <thomasb@reno.gov>
Date: Tue, Dec 24, 2019 at 4:12 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Boise v Martin - U.S. Supreme Court will not take up Boise’s controversial homeless camping case
To: Mike Kazmierski <kazmierski@edawn.org>
Cc: newbys@reno.gov <newbys@reno.gov>, Arlo Stockham <stockham@reno.gov>

Thanks Mike. There was significant community push back on accessory dwelling units so we are on to other strategies for now. Arlo is doing a comprehensive code update and will look at the other tools from the Boise approach.

Bill Thomas, AICP
Assistant City Manager
Office of the City Manager
1 E. First Street
Reno, NV 89501

For immediate assistance or meeting requests, please contact Kim Cuara, Administrative Secretary at cuarak@reno.gov or 775-334-2002. Thank you.

On Thu, Dec 19, 2019 at 5:34 PM Mike Kazmierski <kazmierski@edawn.org> wrote:

Sabra

Most communities are struggling with housing like we are. Here is what Boise is doing and we could implement something similar to help. Increasing density is a critical factor.

Boise has created a “Grow Our Housing” effort
Thanks

Mike

Maximize Land Use Allowances

This tool would allow the city to modify the standards in various sections of the zoning code to influence or incentivize housing and change zoning on specific properties to increase allowed density. There are several ways this can be accomplished:

- The City of Boise recently voted to approve modifications to accessory dwelling units.
  - Increase maximum size allowance to 700 square feet or 10 percent of the parcel size (currently limited to 600 square feet)
  - Allow two-bedroom ADUs (currently limited to one bedroom)
  - Clarifying that two-bedroom ADUs must have at least one dedicated parking space on-site or on an immediately adjacent street with no exceptions (current requirements of one parking space per ADU can be waived depending on individual situations)
- Decrease minimum lot size and increase maximum density in most common residential zones.
  - R-1C: Reduce minimum lot size and increase density from 8 to 10 units per acre.
  - R-2D: Reduce minimum lot size and increase density from 14 to 20 units per acre.
- Small footprint housing density bonus
  - Grant 50% density bonus for small footprint housing developments in single-family residential zones (smaller than 700 square feet).
- Eliminate conventional residential density allowances
  - Base some residential density allowances on Floor Area Ratio rather than units per acre.
- New zoning classifications
  - Create new mixed-use and other urban zones that emphasize higher residential densities.
October 30, 2019

Arlo Stockham, AICP, Director  
City of Reno  
Community Development Department  
1 East First Street, 2nd Floor  
Reno, NV 89501

RE: DTRC-PD.1:

Dear Arlo:

I am writing to you regarding the map that you sent me in mid-September as part of the document titled, "Master plan Powning page [5]." That map appears to show Arlington Avenue as the eastern boundary of the Powning District – the District then heads west.

Other than the 21st Century Building and the McKnight House there in NOTHING east of Ralston Avenue that could remotely be deemed historic. Many of the parcels in the two square blocks between 1st and 2nd Streets are vacant lots. There are also a couple of old, C class apartments.

The St. Thomas Aquinas Cathedral and school is not going anywhere. The 20th Century Club building is already listed on the National Register of Historic Places in Washoe County, National Register #83001113.

As part of the City of Reno master plan update please move the eastern boundary of the Powning district to Ralston. This is the perfect eastern boundary.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Floyd Rowley, CPA, CCIM  
Manager

18124 WEDGE PARKWAY, SUITE 110, RENO, NV 89511  
775-224-3183  
ROWLEYFLOYD@GMAIL.COM
I would like to thank you for your efforts in addressing our city's intensifying housing crisis. Today I read an RGI article about your efforts to spark 1,000 homes in 120 days, and I really appreciate the urgency with which you are approaching this problem.

However, I believe the city can do more with their plan that both incentivizes developers and helps build a strong, stable, and financially resilient city. Waiving fees is one approach, but there are numerous others that do not cost the city anything and are likely to have a positive impact. Here are a few ideas:

1. Adopt an nonrestrictive ADU ordinance.

Please please please do this. I watched the City Council meeting from November 2018 where the council discussed a proposed ordinance to allow accessory dwelling units. It was both enlightening and disheartening. Allowing accessory dwellings feels to me like an obvious first step in increasing housing stock within the city's core. The benefits of ADUs go beyond increasing housing availability. For my family, we could build a unit for my disabled mother that respects her independence and ours and no longer have to struggle with the unpredictable and expensive rental market. Retirees running low on savings could rent a unit to a college student and utilize their most major asset while remaining in the community they love. Allowing homeowners to build ADUs helps our neighborhoods be financially resilient with the lowest impact infill development possible. It is also development that is accessible to not only large corporate developers, but independent local developers (as small and independent as me and my family).

I understand the primary concern with the ordinance was preserving privacy and neighborhood character. I was very surprised that the whole Newlands neighborhood showed up to oppose the ordinance. Especially as a portion of the Newlands Historic district is already zoned MF14, making these units already essentially legal. I personally know people who have rented ADUs in the St Lawrence alley, yet the neighborhood remains gorgeous and historic as ever. If specific neighborhoods do wish to voluntarily restrict ADUs, they may do so through the process of adopting CC&Rs. As a city, we should give people the flexibility to decide for themselves.

In the meeting you had mentioned that you didn't understand why the issue of ADUs kept coming back after it had been shot down again and again. It keeps coming back because it's something we want and something we need. It's something that makes too much sense to ignore. What if we made a different decision this time?

2. Eliminate parking requirements and other restrictions on housing.

Especially in the downtown and midtown areas, we shouldn't assume that every bedroom comes with 1.25 cars. Let developers decide if they need off-street parking in order to attract tenants. If they can't find tenants who are ok with no parking, the price drops, which is exactly what we are going for. Maybe we can even expand the number of people who are living car-free. If we are worried about new units flooding on-street parking, let's use tools like time-limited parking and expanding metered parking to mitigate that. From personal experience, I used to live next to Brothers BBQ (back when it was off Wells Ave) and because of this there was typically no
parking near my house. You know what? It was completely fine, because I was happy to live in that area for the price I paid - no parking included. Eliminating parking requirements is just one way we reduce the cost to build housing - we can do this in other ways, too, by examining development requirements that don't match the needs of the times (aka lot-size restrictions in the age of the tiny house, setbacks etc). .."

3. Allow duplexes and triplexes in single family zones.

I know, I know, we felt like we were really living on the edge when discussing ADUs, but if we want to get serious about growing our city more up than out, the key is allowing single family zones to densify. This is the way cities have grown for thousands of years. Most of our city is single family housing, and by making incremental development extremely restrictive if not outright illegal in most of our city, we have created the crisis we are experiencing. We have made it illegal for most of the city to respond to the market pressure to house more people.

I understand, people want stability in their neighborhoods, that's why we have zoning- for predictability. I don't want to buy a cozy single family house just to have someone come build a five-story apartment complex right next door. I also don't want my city to grow exponentially outward, amassing infrastructure liabilities and intensifying traffic, just to avoid the perceived discomfort of having a few more neighbors. We can use incremental development to make sure our neighborhoods don't change drastically overnight, but still allow our city to grow upward, every so slightly, bit by bit. No one should have to undergo drastic change, but no one should be exempt from it either. If we return to the memory of the Newlands neighbors in November 2018, who were so afraid of something that is literally already in their backyard, we can see that this small change is really not so bad after all.

(And we won't be the first to allow this - Minneapolis changed their zoning last year to allow triplexes in every neighborhood.)

If you want to know more about these ideas, I learned all of this through an organization called Strong Towns. Their mission is to help towns and cities become more livable, financially resilient, strong places, and I think their non-partisan, common sense approach is really what we need in these times. As our city's leader, I strongly encourage you to check out their mission at strongtowns.org/about.

Thank you so much for reading this super long email. I wrote it because I really care about this city and I really believe these things will have a positive impact on our community. I also really appreciate your efforts and hope you will keep working towards building the best biggest little city yet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date posted</th>
<th>User name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 8:08pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Why not allow for single-car garages that face the street, as long as the garage face is set back from the front face of the house?</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 8:04pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>This whole section is difficult. The ordinance is trying to quantify &quot;good design&quot; rather than having subjective language about fitting into a neighborhood. I don't know what the right solution is, but I don't think this is it. Dictating roof pitches, building length, or steps back in the elevation doesn't allow for creative solutions that still work with the fabric of the existing neighborhood.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:59pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>What is the intent of this rule? It doesn't encourage good design, nor help in encouraging design that suits the neighborhood.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:53pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>I'd like to see this built into the main body of the text rather than a note below. Put it right in the chart where the setback is defined. Don't make people go searching for the rules.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:51pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Is there any allowance for phasing of projects to meet minimum densities? A minimum density can actually discourage development of a vacant or blighted site, as the developer has to have funds to a larger sized project. Phasing could allow for a portion of a dense project to be built - take steps toward increasing density rather than require it happens all at once.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:48pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>have a 10' separation (5' setback at each side).</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:45pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Why a 1/2 story limitation? Not either 2 or 3?</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:44pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Is there any allowance for phasing of projects to meet minimum densities? A minimum density can actually discourage development of a vacant or blighted site, as the developer has to have funds to a larger sized project. Phasing could allow for a portion of a dense project to be built - take steps toward increasing density rather than require it happens all at once.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 7:35pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>units per building and the 20' separation would inhibit that design option.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 6:51pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Isn't this redundant? Already spelled out within the previous sections.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 6:44pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>clarify that this is an existing single-family lot with an existing single-family structure built on it</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 6:32pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Need some clarification if this 20' setback applies to the entire parcel, or just a proposed structure. For example, if a property has an existing building with 10' side yard and wants to add a new separate building with a 20' side yard and can achieve the 400 sf useable area, can the 10' rear yard be applied?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 6:26pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>I like this clarification for garage setbacks at alleys.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11/2019 - 6:18pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>I don't like the idea of multiple zoning designations for one parcel. Too confusing, too much gray area as to which set of rules applies.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears the planned new code may have an unintentional limitation due to definitions. In Reno’s Master Plan there are goals to promote ‘Retention of Existing Housing’ and ‘Infill and Redevelopment.’ The new Zoning Code 18.03.207 Table of Allowed Uses does expand Residential Living options with the addition of Duplex, Triplex and Fourplex to some Zoning Districts, such as PO. However, for example, current Code (Section 18.24.203.1850. - Dwelling, Duplex) narrowly defines Duplex as ‘A type of multi-family dwelling in which one unit is attached to one other dwelling unit located on the same lot for a total of two dwelling units on one lot. Each dwelling has its own front and rear access, no unit is located over another unit, and each unit is separated from the other unit by one or more vertical common walls.’ I believe this narrow definition is too restrictive and conflicts with Zoning Code Change goals by eliminating the majority of existing, separate, detached, multi dwelling(less than four) housing configurations in older neighborhoods throughout Reno. It is my recommendation to update the definitions of Duplex, Triplex & Fourplex to include both attached and DETACHED configurations. Alternatively, if the strict narrow definition of Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex needs to be preserved, a new Residential Living option could be created to support Lot configurations with four or less

10/03/2019 - 11:04am Terry Schmidt  Suggestion  SEPARATE/DETACHED dwellings.

09/17/2019 - 9:52am Ken Lund  Suggestion  This is fine so long as it can't be interpreted as restricting temporary "for sale" or "open house" signs to allow owners to advertise their property for sale.

09/17/2019 - 9:50am Ken Lund  Suggestion  This looks good so long as it can't be interpreted to restrict temporary "for sale" or "open house" signs to allow owners to advertise their property for sale.

09/17/2019 - 9:45am Ken Lund  Suggestion  Recommend adding language to make it more clear that temporary "for sale" or "open house" signs to allow owners to advertise their property for sale are allowed. I am concerned sub-section 7 could be interpreted as restricting them.

09/17/2019 - 12:55am Jenny Brekhus  Suggestion  These are public works specificities that probably should be adopted by reference as the urban design specifications are adopted street by street. Overly prescriptive and may not be realistic.

09/17/2019 - 12:52am Jenny Brekhus  Question  Do we really think that we are still street widening in the urban core?

09/17/2019 - 12:51am Jenny Brekhus  Suggestion  May be over complicating

09/17/2019 - 12:48am Jenny Brekhus  Suggestion  Page 83 of the Master Plan identifies the conservation and historic districts as: The Powning Conservation District, the Wells Avenue Neighborhood Conservation District, and the Newlands Heights Historic District. This draft code, in section 18.604, includes the overlay districts for Powning and Wells Avenue, but left out the Newlands Heights. It should be added, perhaps in 18.606 Historic Overlay Districts, even if it acts as a placeholder so the Code is consistent with the Master Plan.

09/17/2019 - 12:50am John B. Hester, AICP  Suggestion  It would be super helpful if there was some sort of link to the zoning map. Several districts reference sub areas within districts (like on a corridor e.g.,) and without the map it is difficult to conceptualize the regulation.

Attachment: Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment (11936 : RENOvation Development Code Update)
Building separation on same lot is greater than side yard setback? Seems unreasonable in a district with 85 ft height allowance.

Is this a down zoning in this area?

What about when the University plan is amended? Does this city get noticed? Can the U plan be unilaterally amended and city binds itself to implementing that each time without any consideration. Can the U plan for lands that they do not own?

Why is this its own district? Why isn’t this a form based district now that there is so much vacant land?

In reflection of the downtown action plan “university town” concept, I think that this purpose statement should also reference college supporting uses in this district.

What public benefits are achieved by cluster developments?

Contemplating a front or rear setback? If front, are driveways on arterial even allowed?

Does this sentence then promote/justify mass grading?

29 ft height for an detached accessory structure seems high

Will schools be site plan controlled (and expansions)?

Is the code going to recognize that lots in common ownership are recognized as one parcel if minimum lot size or other site standards depend upon that lot’s presence for compliance?

Perhaps it would be easiest if city administers county zoning. To translate it to city zoning that may never be put into place due to annexation not occurring is not sensible. Also, has city builds annexation program, possibly less SOI administration going forward

All applications for annexation should also involve a zoning request. Most times a property owner wants a rezoning anyway and it is appropriate upon incorporation. This is streamlining and gets rid of the sometime unclear annexation translation.

Thought these were called secondary uses?

As site plan reviews increase in #, what is the difference between a site plan review and a building permit submittal?

There needs to be a district specific for mapping purposes for distribution/warehouse facilities. These are mega foot prints, truck traffic intensive generators, demand 24 hour operations & have long build out periods. They need to be mapped in a separate district.

A “particular” to prevent change from one PF to another without review like Wildcreek golf course

Or in a “reserved rural state” due to environmental sensitivity

PC & Council approve PUD as zoning maps and should also retain authority to allow smaller, not bifurcated authority to the administrator.

This undeveloped land should be base zoned
09/17/2019 - 1:14am Jenny Brekus Suggestion Time to expire this. Base zoning district standards cover the addresses issues.

09/17/2019 - 1:13am Jenny Brekus Question Where is this area? Need zoning code link!

09/17/2019 - 1:09am Jenny Brekus Suggestion I don’t believe these incentives are necessary but should be base allowances provided/available to all.

09/17/2019 - 1:07am Jenny Brekus Suggestion Is this new related to d misty bonus? I don’t feel that clustering should allow any density bonus at all as it is employed in WUI primarily where dwelling units should be lower to place fewer people at risk.

09/17/2019 - 1:06am John B. Hester, AICP Suggestion Change to Conservation and Historic Overlay Districts

09/17/2019 - 1:04am Jenny Brekus Vague

09/17/2019 - 1:02am John B. Hester, AICP Suggestion Correction and edits to above comment: The Section 18.02.604 title is Conservation Overlay Districts. After reviewing I see that Newlands is also listed. I suggest instead on adding an 18.02.604 as proposed above, the title of 18.02.604 be changed to Conservation and Historic Overlay Districts like the title in the Master Plan.

09/15/2019 - 6:22pm Jonathon Iller Suggestion Please work with local mountain biking groups to build new trail networks and trail heads. Reno and the surrounding mountains have a lot of potential to have great trails that could attract people from all over.

09/14/2019 - 6:10pm Trevor Burmester Suggestion You stated above the "Accessory Dwelling Units" are NOT allowed. Here, though under home occupations an employee is allowed to live on the premises, if they live in an ADU.

09/14/2019 - 2:26pm Beth Dory Question Will kitchens (sink, stove) for "guest quarters?"

09/14/2019 - 2:19pm Beth Dory Question What's the difference between "Caretaker's Quarters" and ADUs?

09/14/2019 - 1:50pm Beth Dory Question Is this a backdoor way of increasing density without informing the folks who live in Single Family neighborhoods of the zoning change? The council voted down ADUs, and now you're going to allow 4plexes on super small lots in single family neighborhood. I now see why key City officials who are spearheading these changes don't live in the City. This won't affect them at all. If you work in the kitchen you don't want to eat at the restaurant, I guess.

09/13/2019 - 11:17am Elana Ketchian Suggestion Source Water Protection is very important to me. In order to protect our current drinking water supply I feel it is important to consider potential contaminants in Source Water Protection Areas before construction. I encourage coordination between developers and TMWA, so we can protect our vital source of drinking water. Thank you.
There are a few 8 unit apartment buildings existing on 7,000sf lots in the MF-14 zoning district which has set a precedent to a much higher density than the zoning allows by right. Specifically in the wells avenue neighborhood. Form based code should be considered for more walkable/inner core neighborhoods.

5 feet for stories must be a typo. Should be left blank?

Please do address the possibility of a lot near residential (including, but not limited to mixed use),

parking lots near residential is a beacon to potential crime,, additional lighting or security or something would be apropos.

Are accessory dwelling units going to be allowed in MF zoned property? If not, than the only thing that the alley zero lot line does is facilitate accessory structures such as garages and does not provide for additional living quarters. MF zoned property should not have a 20/10 foot yard setback from alleys for additional dwelling units. This yard setback is severely limiting adding density in the Midtown/Old Southwest area of town.

This document is almost impossible to navigate online. The scrolling works poorly and the 'NEXT' and 'PREVIOUS' buttons do not behave as expected.

This document is hard enough to read and understand without the navigation problems mentioned.

I've had to download the document and browse it using the PDF controls, which are also clumsy.

If you truly want feedback, then you need to do a better job of making the information available. It would be helpful to highlight the areas where changes are being proposed, for example.

With today's land prices we need more density, would we be able to exceed 45' with a SUP?

Why 80'? What if the architecture is strong enough to justify a longer building? 80' is an arbitrary number.

What is so magic about 10'? Where are the figures?

My favorite "articulation." Who determines this?

Similar? or the Same? Split zoning is a disaster, there should be an incentive to clean up the zoning or let the property owner determine which zoning to comply with.

The city should have housing developers be financially responsible for infrastructure to accommodate additional traffic from their housing projects. The roads should be in place prior to development as well as freeway on and off ramps with impact projections that are independently verified, and public meetings that are announced no less than 1 year prior to any work moving forward or being approved.
See comments in the additional use section. These should not require a special use permit process based on number of units. That is more of an impact based on site development more than anything.

This is duplicative and is already required by NRS. This should be removed as it serves no purpose.

The number of units has nothing to due with the use. This is more of a site development condition that should be regulated through the site plan review process. The use should be permitted by right.

The TWG overwhelmingly supported moving away from the SUP nomenclature and back to a conditional use permit. Conditionally Permitted Uses are what is typically used in jurisdictions throughout the country.

As I've mentioned in meetings, this section should be removed and changed to another administrative review process. For example, an Administrative Use Permit. Site plan reviews should be limited to reviewing physical development to better align the findings.

Use-related applications should be related to uses.

What is that administrative approval? Is there a specific process? The prior code had a lot of these and this is what created the unequal treatment. There needs to be a method to obtaining this approval outlined in code.

With typical side yards of 5', every HVAC condenser unit will encroach. Consider changing this to be less restrictive.

Front face or back of curb?

Same thing for this one. Most of this area is within a PUD, correct? Why can this one not also be removed?

Why is this staying? Can this be removed and incorporated into general standards? It doesn't appear to serve a substantial purpose.

See prior comments in MFR. These should also be applicable. This seems like it is not consistent with the density encouraged in downtown and should be a little more form specific.

Why is this any different than any other MFR building? Why is MFR requiring a SUP when in a MFR zone? Currently it's triggered by the number of units. That is related to a physical development condition and should be considered less as a use issue and more as a site plan issue. An MFR use should be allowed in an MFR or higher intensity zone by right.

Should this also be applicable to MFR? Do you want garages, carports, sheds, or other structures along the street frontage?

Should this be increased? It's inconsistent with the image in the picture. With parking, landscape, topography, etc., it becomes difficult to actually realize 30 du/ac, especially if garages are required.

Same comment as before.
I suggest taking a look at this. I think there are good developments with large number of units that can have tighter building separation. It becomes a concern with height to setback. Maybe look at setbacks at third stories or higher. This disproportionately impacts large scale developments that may have the same density as a smaller site simply because of the number of units. Why is the accessory structure treated differently than a principal structure with regards to setbacks from Arterial/Freeways? What is the intent: a landscaped buffer or to reduce the height potential from the street? Would the streetscape be better suited with the main buildings facing the street? The way the standard is written now will encourage garages and carports to be located to the street, which will reduce the street interest. I would suggest reducing the overall setback to 20 feet for all structures from arterial/freeways.

This purpose statement is good and clarifies this as an appropriate zoning designation to use when trying to preserve natural features.

This definition should include a statement of the allowance of Boat and RV storage, which may be either enclosed, open or covered.

there is another listing for outdoor storage two pages below.

another modification should be to address the location of existing shallow utilities and potential conflicts with required street tree planting.

Is this measurement from front face of curb or back face of curb? The past code graphic appeared to show front face of curb, but this could be clarified.

Front setbacks in the MU district have been identified in the existing zoning code to be taken from the "face of curb." this setback reference appears that it could be taken from property line, which runs counter to the goal of intensifying the regional centers and transit corridors. greater clarification is necessary if the intent is retain the front setback starting point in MU zoned districts.

what is the rationale to have an FAR maximum in an area where intensification is encouraged?

This is over-engineered and needs to be simpler.

These requirements are too high for a dense neighborhood with many transit options and bike infrastructure. Requiring this much parking "builds in" the price of parking into development costs. This makes developers and tenants pay for it even when they may not want to use it. A better way to do this is to eliminate or reduce this requirement. This would simplify the development process, reduce the cost of housing, and allow the free market to dictate how much parking there is.

Should there be a section on ETJ? There are a small number of circumstances where the property is in SOI, but not under ETJ. What occurs then?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/26/2019</td>
<td>8:41pm</td>
<td>Jeff Borchardt</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>This gets confusing with residential adjacency requirements. Especially on parcels with commercial on one half and residential on the other. This section should be expanded to consider conflicting zoning designations on the same parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/26/2019</td>
<td>8:36pm</td>
<td>Jeff Borchardt</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>This section mentioned that SUP's are intended to remain for small-lot or cluster development. It was recently discussed during the technical working group meeting on procedures that physical development would be covered under a separate application type (i.e. Major Site Plan Review) in order to better align findings and procedures with the application type. Anything resulting from the development standards should be classified under applications dealing with site improvements or design (i.e. alternative equivalent compliance, major deviation, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date posted</td>
<td>User name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2019 - 12:52pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Same comments here as I made in the Sustainability Elements section for Mixed-Use Development.</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2019 - 12:46pm</td>
<td>Allyson Wong</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Why tinted concrete? Natural concrete is still distinguishable from asphalt drive aisles. It would be nice to see an allowance for variation on the max 40 (within reason) to allow for some flexibility depending on the size and shape of the lot, while still meeting the intent of the rule. Very few projects follow LEED due to the cost of the program. If the City truly wants to encourage sustainable development, this list, or this section of the code, needs to be more thoughtful with a more extensive list of sustainable features that can or should be incorporated into projects. I disagree with this entire section. Why are we ruling out 3 specific materials for use? But &quot;creative incorporation&quot; is allowed? I think this needs to be defined. All of the trees? A percentage of the trees? Does this mean recycling of construction waste? How much? What does enforcement of this requirement look like? Are we just adding notes to our plans during building submittal that say we are going to do x, y, and z? Please add language specifically referencing the RTC's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and RTC's Complete Streets Master Plan, in addition to other applicable City or RTC plans in this section. I disagree with this whole section, aside from screening of rooftop equipment. A certain number of roof planes doesn't equal good design, better development, etc. If the ordinance is going to start to dictate design, then there may have to be a design review committee or something. Quality is difficult to quantify. Why? Low-sloped and flat roof designs can be interesting and well done. This will severely stifle new business and development in Midtown. Very few existing businesses would be able to open today under these rules. Why not let the market decide how much parking to provide? If someone wants parking, they can pay to build it. If they don't want it, then they won't be forced to pay for it. Survey after survey says we want this area to be walkable, bikeable, and conducive to transit. These things cannot coexist with parking levels on par with the suburbs. This will be a boon to development. It is putting the parking amounts in the hands of the market rather than government. This will encourage drivers to pay the true cost of their mode choice, and let others reap the benefits of choosing more efficient and less costly modes. Are there standards for materials allowed to be used for construction of the trash enclosure? Where/how is artificial turf addressed? Weren't many uses previously allowed a 50% reduction? Is this change due to the overall reduction in required parking? Why are bike spaces sheltered? If &quot;sheltered&quot; is required, it should also be clearly defined. Does this mean bike spaces have to have a roof over? Partially enclosed? Again, why? Biking is an outdoor activity - why provide sheltered parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Technical Working Group (TWG)

**December 17, 2019, 8-11 a.m.**  
Reno City Hall, 6th Floor

## Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (Approx)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:10</td>
<td>Welcome and Agenda Review</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10-10:50</td>
<td>Preliminary technical review of draft code beginning with Chapter 18.02:</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham and Nathan Gilbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Goal for 12/17/2019 meeting: <em>Chapters 18.02, 18.03, and 18.04 Articles 1-6</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If time exists, continue review of other articles of 18.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the discussion, the group will also identify follow up items for future meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-11:00</td>
<td>Next Steps for Future Meetings</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Links to applicable supporting documents are available on the calendar of Reno.Gov.

**The next meeting of the technical working group is scheduled for January 7, 2019 at 8 a.m. on the 6th floor at Reno City Hall.

## Discussion Notes

**18.02**

- Accessory garage - Question regarding how standard roof pitches are reviewed. Any changes needed in regard to pitch matching? Consensus that existing/proposed standards adequate.
- MD-ED and other districts. Discussion about minimum building separation and stepback. Maybe a stepback occurs after a certain height (more applicable to high-rises than common five story structures). Revise required building separation from 20ft to 10ft and remove the unit count consideration to accommodate development phasing.
- Support for recommendations in the Powning District. Protects historical nature while allowing flexibility.
- MU - Discussion related to process and flexibility. Requested consideration for planned roadway dimension in development standards.
- Make sure setbacks for garages along streetlines are no less than 20 feet (Public Works). Alleys and side-loaded garages are different.
- MS - Comment related to building separation standard (addressed under MD comments (above).
- PF - Comment regarding minimum lot size and lot width in relation to public utilities. Additional discussion that this would be useful as an allowed exemption for public utilities in all zoning districts as an overall exemption. Consider Washoe County waiver process as an example.

- SPDs - Comment that additional content standards will be necessary. Staff clarification that this will occur subsequent drafts.

- 18.02.706 - Accessory structure height limitations: general discussion. No changes

- Exceptions to height requirements - there are oddities with rooftop decks (story limit requirements). Will happen more, especially on hillsides.

- Staff confirmed that cluster development was removed as a land use type and can be requested with a site plan review.

**18.03**

- Make sure hyperlinks function appropriately in Municode. Critical to using the use table.

- Staff confirmed that site plan reviews still appear on the use table.

- BANN member recommended changing site plan review name to administrative use permit.

- Dwelling, Multifamily - Discussion of language about facing the street. What is purpose? Restriction could limit creative design (e.g. facing paseos).

- Recommendation from ASLA member to remove LID requirements from Truck Stop standards (18.03.304(6)a2f). Staff concurred.

- 18.03.305 “Outdoor storage” - Comment that screening requirement from residential zoning be reduced from 750 to 300 feet. AIA member noted that enhanced landscaping like conifers can have a better aesthetic than a fence and are cheaper to install. Staff discussed continued concerns regarding distinction between screening of inoperable vehicles and stacked inoperable vehicles vs. operable high profile vehicles. Not requiring full screening for operable high profile vehicles.

- 18.03.403 “Accessory Structure Dimensional Standards” - TWG members strongly preferred that accessory structure standards be in one place in code only. Currently referenced in 18.02 summary tables and here

- Live Entertainment - Was the intent to allow this use by right in the entertainment district? Conditions for last several SUPs also include same conditions. Recommended tweaks to this section so that SUP is required for certain aspects (late night, outside, etc.). Staff will evaluate further.

- 18.03.503 “Parking, Open Lot” - How will these permits be tracked?

**18.04**

- Article 1
  - Staff discussed Council policy choices to evaluate substantive changes separately.
  - Language about on-site mitigation requirements. Mitigation at the lake is the preferred option. Detention only works if it rains at the site. During drought, there will be concern that water is not getting to the lake. Needs a more holistic approach to closed basins. Discussion that industry groups may want to propose alternatives to city and county policy makers outside of code update
  
  - 18.04.102(b), Page 13 - references to already-existing FEMA requirements, paper maps and incorrect agency listings (ASCE to review and send specific comments)

- Reference to City of Reno Major Drainageways Plan no longer exists - Reference Master Plan, where it lives now.

- Source water protection - How does this involve detention basins? Staff clarified that the only new standard proposed is notification to TMWA of certain project types.

- Article 2
  - ASCE to assist with additional comments and meeting with CD and PW staff for Articles 2&3 (Grading and Hillside Standards). Side work expected on this to bring back at future TWG meeting for discussion.
  - Clarify language related to access to manholes
Need to ensure no conflicts between Public Works Design Manual and Title 18. Reduce redundancy and potential for conflicts.

18.04.202(e)9 “Limits on Grading Near Residential Properties” - Question about when the plan should be submitted. With building permit? With discretionary application? Should the language be clarified about that process?

- Article 3
  - “Visually Prominent Ridgelines” - Staff distributed 2005 map and requested additional comments. Can make GIS data available.
  - 18.04.202(e)4 “Noxious Weeds” - Clarification that required management plan would live on forever and generally be assumed under common area HOA maintenance responsibility.
  - Hillside architecture - BANN comments related to breaking it out. Also, standards for stepped foundations too grey; if that is required, would need to know up front.
  - Density calculations/unit shouldn’t be the basis (e.g. Studios vs. large 5 bedroom homes). Should be more form-based (lot size, foundation size, etc.).
  - Understanding that additional meetings will be held with staff and subcommittee prior to next TWG. General comments on grading/hillside include:
    - Standards need more nuance when applicable. Not all grading is the same (e.g. what are the impacts on slope no one will see, natural vs. disturbed); 1:1 buttress walls seem to work well in Tahoe and it is still beautiful; balance between reasonable standards and allowing “knocking off the top of a hill” to accommodate a few more lots.

- Article 4
  - Clarify standards to clearly note that allowed modifications to sidewalk standards should be requested at tentative map (for subdivisions).
  - Comment requesting clarification of the rules for sidewalks. Adjust standards to clarify intent and allow for exceptions when consistent with objectives.
  - Rolled curb height discussion for low profile cars and concern that they can “bottom out.” PW is evaluating this and will provide drawings for different options.
  - Support for removing utilities section code as it is covered in design manual/RMC Title 12
  - Public Works Design Manual - PW staff to coordinate with staff and industry groups on proposed design sections

- Article 5
  - Cul-de-sacs are needed in hillside development. Good for connectivity in those settings. Discuss intent - add intent statement. Some of the most desirable neighborhoods in real estate have cul-de-sacs. Command lot premiums and popular with buyers.
  - Traffic study vs. entry access analysis - Seems like some are mismatched.
  - Comment to modify subjective language from code (i.e. “adequate lighting for security, etc.”)
Technical Working Group (TWG)
January 7, 2020, 8-11 a.m.
Reno City Hall, 6th Floor

Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (Approx)</th>
<th>Description*</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:10</td>
<td>Welcome and Agenda Review</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10-10:50</td>
<td>Preliminary technical review of draft code:</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham and Nathan Gilbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recap of 12/17/19 TWG review of development standards (Chapters 18.02, 18.03, and 18.04 Articles 1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of other 18.04 articles including parking, landscaping, general design standards, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If time exists, discussion of outstanding code topics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the discussion, the group will also identify follow up items for future meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-11:00</td>
<td>Next Steps for Future Meetings</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Links to applicable supporting documents are available on the calendar of Reno.Gov.
**The next meeting of the technical working group is scheduled for January 21, 2020 at 8 a.m. on the 6th floor at Reno City Hall.

Discussion Notes

- Upcoming meetings:
  - January 21, 2020 - Special meeting with Planning Commission to discuss big picture items.
  - February 11, 2020 - Special meeting with City Council to discuss big picture items.
  - Staff to meet with BANN and AGC in January
  - Three TWG meetings scheduled in January - 1-7-20; 1-13-20; and 1-21-20. Then back to monthly meetings in February.

18.04
- 18.04.604(e) -
  - New standard inadvertently requires a licenced traffic engineer to prepare alternative parking stuc
This is more restrictive than existing code. Refine to allow the applicant to submit alternatives based on listed nationally accepted standards.
18.04.605 - Off-street Parking Requirements
   - TWG members support discretionary parking downtown.
   - 18.04.605 - TWG members requested a map to clearly note locations of the three parking tiers.
   - Suggestion to incorporate Sparks parking rates. Discussion that this is generally applied in the urban Sparks area, as most Sparks suburbs are in PUDs or feature older overparked centers. May be comparable to Reno Tier 1 parking areas. Staff confirmed that these rates came from APA standards, which are more permissive.
   - TWG comments suggested that there is no value in maintaining maximum “hard cap” parking restrictions.
   - TWG support for transferring much of the technical information (like parking dimensions) to an administrative manual. Caveat that this should be clearly footnoted and/or hyperlinked and made readily available so that it doesn’t get lost.

18.04.606 - Parking Alternatives, Credits, Adjustments
   - 606(b) - TWG recommends a change to the proposed language related to on-street parking. Should note that it must be abutting vs. adjacent so that street parking is not double counted.
   - Clarify that placing required ADA spaces on-street is highly discouraged, and only allowed subject to the approval of the Administrator.
   - 606(e) Trip reduction program for large employers - Staff noted that utilizing the RTC Smart Trips program is not an option at this time. TWG recommended clarifying if the 50 employee threshold total on-site per shift or total employees on site per day. TWG members recommended utilizing VMT vs. total trips. Recommended looking at LA City, SANDAG, SCAG resources for reference.

Article 7 - Landscaping...
   - 702(b)2 - Major improvements to an existing use. TWG discussed that this should be revised to be more equitable and proportionate to expansion instead of total improvements when assessed 40%.
   - 703(a)1b - TWG suggested that required landscape plans not be required for all SUPs and SPRs (e.g. for hours of operation, restaurant with alcohol, etc.)
   - 703(f) - Landscape Plan - Discussion that the increased security from 120 - 125% reflects actual costs and inflation. TWG okay with proposal.
   - 704(e)2 a4 - Parking Area Landscaping - TWG recommends deleting requirement for extra landscaping when parking exceeds 150% of requirement.

Article 8 - Site and Building Standards for Residential Districts
   - 18.04.803a1a - Freeway Frontage - TWG requested additional flexibility, as 30 feet may be too much if there is excess ROW.
   - 18.04.803a2b - Landscape parkways - General discussion on the following:
     - Discussed the possibility of maintaining an option for installation of landscape and sidewalk until the last house closes through bonding (which can be subsequently reduced. Process used in Sparks and many other jurisdictions. Expensive but less wasteful.
     - Request to allow for exemptions (hillside development, narrow lots - less than 50’, etc.). Requested alternatives to achieve objectives like modifications to front setbacks
     - Consensus that parkways should be mandatory on collectors and arterials.
   - 18.04.803.a3 - Parking and garage location - Discussion that language needs to be revisited. Consider increasing the driveway width from 24 to 30’. Lots should not be restricted to a single driveway. Possibly allow additional driveway with a minimum lot width of 80-90’.
   - 18.04.803.a3 - Setbacks and Building Location - Porches and similar features should not be considered front of a building. Allow Administrator to use the dominant plain of a building.
- 18.04.803.a - Site Compatibility and Adjacency Standards - Ensure that the existing CPA grading standards for adjacency remain.
- 18.04.803.a7ab - Adjacency Standards, Density - Clarify how the density transfer works.
- 18.04.803 b1 - Circulation and Access, Cul-de-Sacs - Clarified that this was primarily for vehicles. TWG was not supportive of this provision and recommends deleting. Adding provisions to ensure pedestrian trail (DG) or sidewalk connectivity. Noted that fire code has 600 or 800 foot distance requirement already.
- 18.04.803 b2 - Circulation and Access, Pedestrian and bike connectivity - Supportive of intent. Requested options are made available when impractical or illogical.
- 18.04.803 c - Change name to “Recreation Vehicle Parking.” Consider adding a cross reference in the parking section as well. Noted that proposed driveway language would preclude this section anyway. Conflict.
Technical Working Group (TWG)
January 13, 2020, 8-11 a.m.
Reno City Hall, Council Chambers

Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (Approx)</th>
<th>Description*</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:10</td>
<td>Welcome and Agenda Review</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10-10:50</td>
<td>Preliminary technical review of draft code:</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham and Nathan Gilbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow-up from prior meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of draft ordinances starting with 18.04, Article 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the discussion, the group will also identify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>follow up items for future meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50-11:00</td>
<td>Next Steps for Future Meetings</td>
<td>Arlo Stockham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Links to applicable supporting documents are available on the calendar of Reno.Gov.
**The next meeting of the technical working group is scheduled for January 21, 2020 at 8 a.m. on the 6th floor at Reno City Hall.

Discussion Notes

Chapter 18.04 - Development Standards

Article 9 - Site and Building Standards for Mixed-Use Districts

- 18.04.902 (c) - Applicability - Discretionary Review
  - Changes to Mixed Use Suburban areas (i.e. existing secondary TOD corridors). Hybrid between standard commercial and mixed use zones. Master Plan direction to prioritize primary infill areas. Development incentives like no discretionary reviews removed. TWG expressed no comment on this change.

- 18.04.903 (a) 2 - Site layout and development pattern - setbacks
  - TWG members requested measurement from the back of the curb instead of face for consistency

- 18.04.903 (a) 3 - Site layout and development pattern - Minimum lot sizes
  - Alley access for land divisions under 6,000 square feet. Confirmed with Public Works staff that shared use allows for wider curb cuts to facilitate more use.
TWG members requested that when code references road classifications (e.g. collector, arterial, etc.), that the City uses a consistent designation between the City and RTC. Members preferred that code update incorporate City designations.

18.04.903 (a) 4 - Site layout and development pattern - Density

- TWG members requested clarification that application relates to the entire site area, not just a particular parcel.

18.04.903 (c) 3 - Building Design - Building Massing and Form

- TWG members generally liked the menu of options, compared to existing articulation standards.
- Discussed that required sustainability elements would add cost to projects.

18.04.904 - Supplemental Standards for Downtown Districts

- Discussion of window transparency requirement. Doesn’t always make sense. Recommended that an exemption be included for residential projects on the first floor.
- Discussion revisited comments related to 18.04.101 (c) “Shading of Parks and Residences” in relation to downtown or high intensity projects. Requested amendments to allow for sensible infill development (alternative compliance, etc.). Questioned current prohibition of Solstice shadowing the entire parcel.

18.04.904 - Supplemental Standards for Large Retail Establishments

- Discussion on prohibitions of wholesale division of land (parking and landscaping). Owners want to keep ownership of parking lots. Do not require parceling of individual buildings. Utilize reciprocal parking and access.

18.04.1003 - General Standards for Nonresidential Districts

- TWG comment that Administrative design flexibility may be too broad.

18.04.1003(c) 1 - Building Articulation

- Enhanced discussion regarding mandatory articulation requirements. Comments that it can limit good design and does not guarantee an attractive building. Encourage evaluating other options for large buildings, like enhanced landscaping. Referenced industrial buildings along Longley as examples. Encouraged a focus on streetscape. Requested option for alternative design options.

18.04.1003(c) 3 a - Members did not like prescriptive earth tone color standards. Commented that zoning code should not address this.

18.04.1003(c) 3 c - Noted that provision for fire resistant roof materials (as noted in Master Plan) should be in building code and not zoning.

18.04.1003(e) 1 - Recommended alternatives like enhanced landscaping and other mitigations over requirements to have a building separate residential from truck loading docks and outdoor storage.

18.04.1003(e) 3 - Recommended that the provision for site specific assessment of potential impacts on residential areas (if any) for buildings over 100,000 sq. ft. and sites over ten acres be increased to 150,000 sq. ft. to ensure proportionality.

**Article 11 - Improvement Standards for New Development**

- TWG members referenced many of the comments addressed in the December 2019 BANN letter addressing suggested updates to technical provisions:
  - City Council approval, requirements for hard copy submittals, etc.

**Article 12 - Exterior Lighting**

- Comments on how and where to address obnoxious chasing lights, colored flood lights that change building character, flashing lights, etc. Discussed that this is an ongoing code enforcement and legal issue for further discussion during code update.
• Discussion on consistency with lighting temperature and perceived color. Should there be a consistent application (e.g. sulfur lights dull and yellow, LED bright, RPD suggests specific applications, etc.)? No preference other than standards should be generally unified and probably consistent with street lighting standards.
• Members suggested that a 30 foot light pole height may be too high

**Article 13 - Residential Adjacency**

• 18.04.1302 - Applicability
  ○ Requested that additional exemptions be explored. Proposed language has outright prohibition of certain uses like outdoor storage. Should be allowed under certain situations (e.g. if screened, or across a street, etc.).
• 18.04.1304 - Grading
  ○ Requested additional flexibility such as additional landscaping or other mitigations, rather than prohibitions.
• 18.04.1305 c - Site and Building Orientation, Outdoor Above Grade Spaces
  ○ Group felt this was too restrictive and should allow for alternatives.
• 18.04.1308 - Noise
  ○ Discussion on standards. Many members noted that sound consultants have stated that our standards do not reflect best practice. Will provide staff with examples.
  ○ Noted that there are no acoustical consultants in Northern Nevada and that the nearest are in Auburn, CA. Requested that standards be simplified so that local consultants can do the work.
  ○ Discussion on garbage collection noise impacts (e.g. early morning collection). Can zoning code address or is this restricted in franchise agreement?

**18.07 - Historical Resources**

• General comments
  ○ Better incentives should be added
  ○ HRC approval for painting or minor modifications is not best practice or national standard and may limit applications
  ○ Applications should be enhanced to focus on what is actually historic.