John B. Rhodes 511 Rhodes Road P.O. Box 18191 Reno, NV 89511 (775) 849-2525

April 4, 2017

## Hand-Delivered

Washoe County Planning Commission 1001 E. Ninth street Reno, NV 89512

Re: Development Code Amendment Case No. WDCA 16-0001 (Wholesaling, Storage and Distribution – Heavy)

Chairman Barnes and Members of the Commission:

I am a lifelong resident of Steamboat Valley and am familiar with all development that has occurred, and proposals for development in Pleasant and Steamboat valleys throughout the last sixty years. Please be advised that substantially the same issues involved in the above Application were presented by the same applicant, on the same property (APN 17-430-01) in Special Use Permit Case No. SPB11-19-97, heard and decided by the Board of Adjustment, and on appeal by the County Commission on April 8, 1998. At that time, Mr. Willey sought a Special Use Permit for a "wholesale nursery with incidental retail sales". Concerned citizens, including myself, argued that the real intent of the application was to conduct a commercial landscape business, including wholesale and retail sales of stone and rock – which constitutes a heavy industrial use wholly incompatible with surrounding residential development and not eligible for a special use permit in a General Rural (GR) regulatory zone. County staff, the BOA, and the County Commission all agreed, and the Permit was granted but with a specific condition that the sale of rock and stone not be allowed.

Now, 19 years later, Mr. Willey seeks to obtain the same entitlement, by amending the Development Code to allow a heavy industrial use such as monument sales, stone yards, and open storage in a GR zone. I completely understand that the proposed amendment would apply county wide, and is not technically site-specific. However, as applied to this particular applicant, his Pleasant Valley property, and the foregoing history, the requested relief is totally site-specific.

PC 4/4/17

The issues presented here have been previously and thoroughly debated, heard, considered, and decided. A clear precedent has been set: rock and stone sales and storage are not compatible uses in a GR zone, and should not be allowed, even by way of special use permit. That precedent is even more valid than it was in 1998, due to significant residential growth throughout the County in the interim period.

The Commission should follow established precedent to ensure that future applications, with similar issues and facts, will result in the same and predictable outcome. Please do not allow this applicant to make an "end run" by amending the Development Code to accomplish now what he could not do in 1998. What was a bad proposal then, is a worse proposal now. Should the Commission disagree, please retain Staff's recommendation for a 40-acre minimum lot size. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

John B. Rhodes