

Comment was read into the record by Tom Courson at the meeting.

Good evening and I would like to thank the board for hearing my concerns.

I am here this evening in regards to the self storage warehouses being built West of the Doral School off Mt Rose Highway. Parcel 144-232-13

Section 110.204.05 Mt Rose Highway Scenic Roadway Corridor Standards cover the special building standards within 500' of Mt rose highway from Virginia Street up to where the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency takes over.

This is a collection of 3 steel building approximately 100' from the centerline of Mt Rose Highway. These are exactly the type of building the ordinance is designed to prevent.

Violation 1.

110.214.05 (h) Architecture. The exterior siding and finishing shall be of wood, stone or stucco. No metal siding option is given. In addition shiny metal roofs are prohibited.

This building is entirely clad in metal siding and the shiny metal roof reflects the sun into Eastbound traffic at certain times in the morning.

Violation 2.

110.204.05 (d) (3) Adjacent to the Mt. Rose Highway, all Delivery bays, loading docks, roll up doors, trash enclosures, heating and ventilation equipment and other accessory equipment shall be located in such a manner as not to be visible from Mt. Rose Highway, or be fully screened pursuant to Article 412, Landscaping, and provision of this section.

Roll up doors are clearly visible though the large corner windows and heating and ventilation equipment are visible between the buildings.

Violation 3 (maybe)

The trash enclosure has a wall more than 4.5' tall in the set back area of 30'

Section 110.204.05 (a) (1) states that no Variances shall be processed or approved.

I initially contacted Mr. Trevor Lloyd on 4/18/22 by email when I noticed the building was being clad in metal siding. I was given the run around about they were looking into it and code enforcement was to look into the matter but never did. At last I was told that Trevor was currently working with the applicant to be in compliance and code enforcement was not involved. During this time no slow down or stoppage has occurred and the buildings are currently in a state of violation. At the time I brought up the concerns someone from the building department should have visited the site and issues a stop order.

I hope no occupancy permit is issues until the violations are corrected and an investigation is conducted on how this building actually got a permit to be built. If it is permitted then you

Comment was read into the record by Tom Courson at the meeting.

might as well just throw out the building ordinance as no law or ordinance is any good if the enforcement is not done.

I have also talked with a couple of inspectors on concerns about violations in the area and was told that they were no longer allowed to investigate violations and that the county has complaint based enforcement and I would have to call into Code Enforcement and complain about violations.

This is in conflict with section 110.910.05 Responsibility for Enforcement and section 110.910.15 (a) Complaints Paragraph 2 states Enforcement officials and County employees who observe or become aware of possible violations of a development regulation shall discuss the possible violation with the Director of Community Development, the Director of Community Services, the Building official, the County Engineer or any of their designees, who may direct enforcement actions.

Nowhere in the ordinance does it state that the county has complaint based Enforcement.

I can email photos of the building and violations at tomcourson1@mac.com
I can also email my prior correspondence with building officials.