



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

John Marin, Agency Director

**PLANNING**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP  
Planning Director

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Michael Johnson, Planning Director

**DATE:** March 6, 2007

**SUBJECT: APPEAL – PLANNING COMMISSION DENIAL OF MODIFICATION TO  
A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (PCMP 2004 0013) SAFE N SOUND  
STORAGE**

---

---

**ACTION REQUESTED**

The Board is being asked to consider an appeal from Mark Correnti of denials by both the Planning Commission and the Zoning Administrator for a Conditional Use Permit Modification requesting that Conditions 13 and 16 of application PCMP 2004 0013 be modified as follows: 1) removal of the requirement that an easement be created for the access and maintenance of stormwater collection facilities (Condition 13); and 2) a modification of the frontage improvements requirement to reduce the sidewalk width from six feet to four feet (Condition 16).

This item was considered by the Board on December 5, 2006 and was continued to January 23, 2007 to allow the appellant and the County additional time to resolve outstanding issues related to site access, frontage improvements and tree replacement. These issues were resolved through negotiations with Risk Management, and a Letter of Agreement between the appellant and the County was drafted and signed by both parties on February 2, 2007. The appellant also submitted a Withdrawal of Appeal on this same date. On February 23, 2007, the appellant requested that both the Letter of Agreement and Withdrawal of Appeal be rescinded and that his appeal of the Zoning Administrator's and Planning Commission's denial of his request for a Use Permit modification be considered by the Board of Supervisors. The appellant has once again requested that the Board delay taking action on this appeal.

As the issues associated with this appeal have been ongoing for numerous years, staff has concluded that there is no merit in continuing this action. It is staff's recommendation that the Board deny the appeal and uphold the actions by the Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission.

**BACKGROUND**

The Safe N Sound RV and boat storage facility is located on the north side of Locksley Lane, approximately one-half mile east of the State Route 49/Locksley Lane intersection in an industrially-zoned area in North Auburn. The project parcel is irregularly shaped and surrounds an industrial parcel (T J Enterprises) on the west, north and east. The western portion of the

parcel is a narrow flag section; the greater part of the parcel is located north and east of the T J Enterprises site. A driveway access located within the flag section connects Locksley Lane to the storage facility.

#### Entitlement Process

On May 11, 2001, the Planning Commission approved a one-year Temporary Conditional Use Permit (CUP-2526) for a storage yard for recreational vehicles and boats. The next year, the applicant submitted an Environmental Questionnaire (EIAQ) as the first step towards obtaining a permanent Conditional Use Permit. In May 2003, the EIAQ was deemed withdrawn because of unreasonable delay (i.e., non-action/non-response from the applicant). A new EIAQ was submitted in June 2003, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (EIAQ-3702) was prepared in August 2003. The following month, the applicant filed an appeal of staff's proposed mitigation measure to install a sidewalk in the Locksley Lane frontage. The Planning Commission heard and denied the appeal in November 2003.

Although the Mitigated Negative Declaration was revised to remove the sidewalk as a mitigation measure, language was included to note that the Street Improvement Ordinance would require the construction of frontage improvements as a condition of a permanent Conditional Use Permit. The applicant signed the Mitigated Negative Declaration in January 2004, thereby accepting all mitigation measures.

On July 1, 2004, the Zoning Administrator approved a Conditional Use Permit and a Variance to fence height (PCUP 2004 0013) to allow for the operation of a boat and recreational storage yard. The permit was approved with 34 conditions that addressed issues such as the approved use of the site (outdoor storage), design review issues (landscaping, fencing), drainage, frontage improvements, improvement plans and the prohibition against hazardous materials. Subsequent to that hearing, the Code Enforcement Division determined that the applicant was in non-compliance with the conditions of the permit and issued a Notice of Code Violation.

The Zoning Administrator held hearings on August 4, 2005, and again on November 3, 2005, to consider the revocation of the Use Permit. At the November hearing, the Zoning Administrator took action to suspend the revocation action in order to allow the applicant the opportunity to bring his project into compliance with the approved conditions. The Zoning Administrator's primary direction to the applicant was to submit Improvement Plans to the Engineering and Surveying Department to address specific requirements contained in the conditions of the Use Permit. The applicant's engineer prepared Improvement Plans and submitted them to ESD in February 2006.

#### Improvement Plans

The Engineering and Surveying Department received the second submittal of the applicant's Improvement Plans on February 8, 2006 and forwarded Plan Review comments to the applicant on March 6, 2006. The applicant reviewed the Engineering and Surveying Department response to these Plans and took exception to two of the comments in the Engineering and Surveying Department review. Specifically, that he: 1) provide an Irrevocable Offer of Dedication (IOD) easement dedication to the County for the proposed stormwater collection facility and record this easement prior to Improvement Plan approval [consistent with Condition 13]; and, 2) change the

width of the proposed sidewalk along the Locksley Lane frontage from four feet to six feet [consistent with Condition 16].

Mr. Correnti submitted an application to modify the conditions of the Conditional Use Permit, requesting that Conditions 13 and 16 be modified to remove the access easement requirement and to allow for a four-foot sidewalk along his frontage.

#### Zoning Administrator Hearing

The Conditional Use Permit Modification was heard by the Zoning Administrator on May 4, 2006. At the hearing, Mr. Correnti stated that he was more than capable of maintaining his property as he had extensive experience as a maintenance mechanic, and that the imposition of an easement to access the required detention facility would put a cloud on his title of the property. He also stated that if a six-foot wide sidewalk was installed along the Locksley Lane frontage, four trees that he planted in conformance with an approved Design Review Agreement would be lost. He was also concerned about the fact that there is no sidewalk in front of a business across the street, and his liability would increase as pedestrian traffic would be forced to use his sidewalk.

The Zoning Administrator stated that the approval of entitlements on a property, such as a Use Permit, actually increases the value of the property and that entitlements come with a certain set of parameters that are based upon public health and safety protections. He further stated that in order to preserve water quality, it is necessary to provide the County access to the property and that frontage improvements, such as sidewalks, ensure public safety.

The Zoning Administrator considered both Mr. Correnti's testimony and information provided by Development Review Committee staff and denied Mr. Correnti's request to modify the two conditions. The Zoning Administrator found that Condition 13 represented an "appropriate imposition of requirements" to ensure water quality and that Condition 16 was the "appropriate documentation of standards that are approved on a routine basis".

On May 12, 2006, Mr. Correnti appealed the Zoning Administrator's decision to the Planning Commission.

#### Planning Commission Hearing

The Planning Commission heard Mr. Correnti's appeal on September 28, 2006. His appeal focused on the two conditions of the Use Permit (Conditions 13 and 16) and presented his rationale for modifying the two conditions.

#### Discussion of Issues

Following is a summary of the issues contained in the appeal, additional discussion at the hearing and staff's response to these issues.

##### *Condition 13*

Mr. Correnti stated that he has an extensive background and experience in maintenance and would provide all scheduled repairs and maintenance to the water quality facilities required on his property and that all the maintenance and repair of these facilities would be conducted

to the manufacturer's (Jensen) specifications. He proposed that Jensen conduct annual inspections of the facilities and equipment at the County's expense.

Staff response: Condition 13 is a standard condition required of all commercial development where on-site impervious surfaces are developed. This condition is also a mitigation measure include in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project to preserve water quality.

The project location is within the Placer County Phase II portion of the Federal Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. It is the County's policy to require that easements be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to the water quality facilities to insure that the County would have access should the State or Federal government ever mandate that the County be responsible for the maintenance. At this time, the County does not maintain water quality facilities on private property, maintenance of these facilities (BMPs) is the responsibility of the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance.

#### *Condition 16*

Mr. Correnti stated that the installation of a six-foot-wide sidewalk would result in the removal of the conifers that were planted per the direction of Planning Department staff. He added that the trees are flourishing and that they provide the desired screening of the Locksley Lane portion of the business frontage.

Staff response: Until such time that plans are submitted that show a six-foot sidewalk, it is difficult to ascertain the potential impact of sidewalk installation on the trees that are growing in the frontage area. It is entirely possible that a six-foot sidewalk will have little or no effect on the trees. Should relocation of the trees prove problematic and tree removal be required, staff has assured Mr. Correnti that the County will provide replacement trees of comparable size to be planted at locations he has prepared in the frontage area.

Furthermore, adjacent properties have six-foot-wide sidewalks in accordance with County specifications. A reduction to four feet along the Safe N Sound frontage could compromise pedestrian safety and convenience.

#### *Additional Issues*

Mr. Correnti discussed two additional items with the Commission regarding the type of curb along the Locksley Lane frontage and the construction of a handicap ramp. The Engineering and Surveying Department's Improvement Plan comments require a vertical curb along the length of the sidewalk and a handicap ramp at an existing curb return and sidewalk segment located at the eastern end of the property. These comments were generated based on the Conditions of Approval of the Use Permit requiring frontage improvements. The existing curb return and sidewalk has a vertical curb and was installed as part of the Mountain Peoples Warehouse project. In order to construct a sidewalk access ramp, a portion of the existing curb return and sidewalk would have to be removed and a ramp constructed. Mr. Correnti proposed a rolled curb for the sidewalk along his property, a design that would be

consistent with the curbing installed by the adjoining property owner as part of his frontage improvements.

There was some discussion regarding the location of the sidewalk segment in relation to the property line. Michael Johnson, the Planning Director, pointed out that Mr. Correnti would not be responsible for off-site improvements. It has since been determined that most of the existing curb return and sidewalk is on Mr. Correnti's property frontage.

#### Commission Comments

Following is a summary of comments from the Commissioners specific to the appeal issues:

Commissioner Forman: Stated that he supported the need for an easement, as such, and the access easement will prevent future development over the stormwater detention facility.

Commissioner Stafford: Stated that the easement is to protect access to the stormwater facility for maintenance and service activities and that such an easement does not preclude the use of the property. He also stated that, although several trees may be removed, the County's offer to pay for replacement trees is in excess of what is normally offered.

Commissioner Denio: Stated that the water quality controls are State-mandated and that Mr. Correnti could go to the State for an individual water quality permit.

Commissioner Burris: Stated that she noticed that almost every sidewalk in the area is on the north side of Locksley Lane. She also stated that Mr. Correnti planted the trees in good faith and that these trees would be impacted by a six-foot sidewalk. She also thought that the County's stormwater ordinance should be more in line with State requirements.

#### Planning Commission Action

The Commission, on a unanimous vote (7:0), denied the appeal. The Commission unanimously approved a one-year Extension of Time on the Use Permit for the storage facility.

#### Appeal

Mr. Correnti appealed the Commission's action on October 5, 2006. (Exhibit 4)

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors deny the appeal, thereby upholding the previous actions by the Zoning Administrator and the Planning Commission, based upon to the following Findings.

## **FINDINGS**

1. The proposed revision to conditions is not consistent with applicable requirements for commercial projects in the County, specifically Plate R6 of the Land Development Manual and the Highway Deficiency Report.
2. The proposed revisions to the project would, under the circumstances of this particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare of people residing in the neighborhood of the proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the County in that the County would not receive the necessary drainage access easement to insure proper maintenance which could compromise public safety and that the reduced sidewalk width would not match the sidewalk width of adjacent parcels.
3. The proposed project revision would not be consistent with the character of the immediate neighborhood and would be contrary to its orderly development.

Respectfully submitted,



MICHAEL J. JOHNSON, AICP  
Planning Director

### **EXHIBITS:**


- Exhibit 1 - Vicinity Map
- Exhibit 2 - Site Plan
- Exhibit 3 - Photos
- Exhibit 4 - Board of Supervisors Appeal
- Exhibit 5 - Revised Conditions of Approval (PCUP 2004 0013)

cc: Mark and Kathy Correnti – Appellants

### **Copies Sent by Planning:**

- Phil Frantz - Engineering and Surveying Department
- Dana Wijniger - Environmental Health Services
- Brent Backus - Air Pollution Control District
- Christa Darlington - County Counsel
- Michael Johnson - Planning Director
- Michael Wells - Supervising Planner
- Subject/chrono files


# Safe N Sound




Placer County Map Disclaimer. The features on this map were prepared for geographic purposes only and are not intended to illustrate legal boundaries or supersede local ordinances. Official information concerning the features depicted on this map should be obtained from recorded documents and local governing agencies. This map is a conceptual tool utilized for project development only. This map is not self-executing or binding, and does not otherwise affect the interests of any persons including any vested rights or existing uses of real property.

37






East view. Locksley Lane from TJ Enterprises. Note the frontage improvements that were installed by TJ Enterprises along the north side of Locksley Lane, per the conditions of CUP-2144. These improvements include a 6' sidewalk with curb and gutter; the applicant also installed landscaping in the area between the sidewalk and his business.



The 6' sidewalk installed by TJ Enterprises terminates at the Safe n Sound parcel on Locksley Lane. The sidewalk seen in the top center of the photo is a 6' sidewalk that is in front of the now vacant Mountain Peoples Warehouse building. This sidewalk was required as a condition of approval for CUP-2231.



East view. The Locksley Lane frontage of Safe n Sound storage.



West view. The Locksley Lane frontage of Safe n Sound storage. Note 6' sidewalk with curb and gutter in foreground.



West view. Locksley Lane frontage improvements in front of old Mountain Peoples Warehouse building (6' sidewalk with curb and gutter). Sidewalk section in center of photo is that shown in previous photo.



North view. Driveway entrance to Safe n Sound storage facility off of Locksley Lane. TJ Enterprises parcel is on the right side of photo. Note sidewalk in bottom right corner of photo



PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Reserved for Date Stamp

AUBURN OFFICE

11414 B Avenue

Auburn, CA 95603

530-886-3000/FAX 530-886-3080

Web page: www.placer.ca.gov/planning

TAHOE OFFICE

565 W. Lake Blvd./P. O. Box 1909

Tahoe City CA 96145

530-581-6280/FAX 530-581-6282

E-Mail: planning@placer.ca.gov

RECEIVED

OCT 05 2006

CDRA

PLANNING APPEALS

The specific regulations regarding appeal procedures may be found in the Placer County Code, Chapters 16 (Subdivision), 17 (Planning and Zoning), and 18 (Environmental Review Ordinance).

-----OFFICE USE ONLY-----

Last Day to Appeal (5 pm) Appeal Fee \$ 425
Letter Date Appeal Filed 10/5/06
Oral Testimony Receipt # 06-32573
Zoning EMP-DX Received by B Inoa
Maps: 7-full size and 1 reduced for Planning Commission items Geographic Area Auburn/Summit

-----TO BE COMPLETED BY THE APPLICANT-----

1. Project name Santa N Sand Storage
2. Appellant(s) Mark Carcenti (530) 888-0600
Address 12381 Locksley Lane Auburn 95602
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 052-020-047

4. Application being appealed (check all those that apply):
Administrative Approval (AA- ) Tentative Map (SU B- )
Use Permit (CUP/MUP- ) Variance (VAA- )
Parcel Map (P- ) Design Review (DSA- )
General Plan Amendment (GPA- ) Rezoning (REA- )
Specific Plan (SPA- ) Rafting Permit (RPA- )
Planning Director Interpretation (date) Env. Review (EIAQ- )
Minor Boundary Line Adj. (MBR- ) Other: Minor Modification Denial

5. Whose decision is being appealed: Planning Commission Board

6. Appeal to be heard by: Board of Supervisors




7. Reason for appeal (attach additional sheet if necessary and be specific):
Denial of minor modification of conditions #13 & #16
of PCPM 20060229 / PCAM 20040013
(If you are appealing a project condition only, please state the condition number)

Note: Applicants may be required to submit additional project plans/maps.

Signature of Appellant(s) [Handwritten Signature]

cc: MICHAEL JOHNSON
MICHAEL WELLS
CHRISTA DARRINGTON, CO. COUNSEL
FILE EXHIBIT 4

RECEIVED  
 OCT 05 2006  
 CDRA



MINOR MODIFICATION TO SUPPLEMENT DRAWINGS  
 FOR SITE PLAN AND LOCATION OF WHEELCHAIR BANK  
 SAN FRANCISCO BOAT & RV STORAGE  
 SAN 051010-04 (COP-128VVA 1410)  
 OWNER/DRAWN BY: MARK A. CADDY CORP/ENR  
 POC: 391, AUBURN, CA 95604 (510) 848-0000  
 SHEET 1 OF 1

SWIFT ENGINEERING  
 FOR 5141, AUBURN, CA 95604  
 530-876-6732

## MODIFIED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

PCUPT20040013, SAFE N SOUND BOAT AND RV STORAGE/MARK CORRENTI

### CEQA FINDING:

1. The Mitigated Negative declaration prepared for the Safe N Sound Boat and RV Storage Yard (EIAQ-3702) satisfies CEQA requirements for this project in accordance with Section 31.510 of CEQA. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been considered and is found to be adequate in addressing the environmental impacts and mitigations for the project (PCUPT20040013) in accordance with Section 31.540 of CEQA.

### MINOR USE PERMIT FINDINGS:

1. The project is consistent with all applicable provisions of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.
2. The proposed use is consistent with applicable goals and policies of the Placer County General Plan and the Auburn Bowman Community Plan.
3. The establishment and operation of the proposed use will not, under the circumstances of this particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare of people residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the county.
4. The proposed use is consistent with the character of the immediate neighborhood and will not be contrary to its orderly development.
5. The proposed project will not generate a volume of traffic beyond the design capacity of all roads providing access to the project.

### VARIANCE FINDINGS:

1. Special circumstances related to the shape of the parcel and a use, which requires screening, deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification.
2. The variance authorized does not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon the properties in the vicinity and in the same zone district.
3. The variance does not authorize a use that is not otherwise allowed in the zoning district.
4. The granting of the variance does not, under the circumstances and conditions applied in this particular case, adversely affect public health or safety, is not materially detrimental to the public welfare, nor injurious to nearby property or improvements.

5. The granting of the variance is consistent with the Placer County General Plan and the Auburn/Bowman Community Plan.
6. The variance is the minimum departure from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance necessary to grant relief to the applicant.

#### CONDITIONS:

1. CUPT20040013 is approved to allow for the operation of a boat and recreational vehicle storage yard with 24-hour controlled access on APN 052-020-047. This approval does not include office use, construction of structures, occupancy of any vehicles, or any other type of on-site habitation. This Use Permit shall expire on ~~July 12, 2006~~ **September 27, 2007** unless compliance with all conditions is achieved, including specified timeframes, and including acceptance of all required on-site and off-site improvements by the County. Timeframes may be extended by the Zoning Administrator for a reasonable length of time due to unforeseen circumstances.
2. If any of the timeframes specified in project conditions are not met by the applicant or extended by the Zoning Administrator, the project will be referred directly to the Code Enforcement Division for removal of the use from the site.
3. Pursuant to Article 17.62.100, formerly Section 35.160 of Chapter 30, of the Placer County Code, the applicant shall pay all costs associated with any code enforcement action which is directly related to this project or the property upon which the project is located (reference File No. I/02-259). The code enforcement reimbursement fee in the amount of \$423.93 shall be reimbursed to the Code Enforcement Division no later than 10 days after the approval of this Minor Use Permit. No other County permits shall be issued until these costs have been paid to the satisfaction of the Code Enforcement Division. The project approval is not considered valid until the costs are reimbursed in full.
4. The project is subject to review and approval by the Placer County Design/Site Review Committee (D/SRC). Such a review shall be conducted prior to the submittal of the Improvement Plans for the project. Design/Site Review for the project shall include, but not be limited to: Landscaping, irrigation; signs; exterior lighting; pedestrian and vehicular circulation and fences and walls. Special attention shall be given to the area between Locksley Lane and the storage yard. In this area, landscaping shall include supplemental plantings including evergreen trees, shrubs and ground cover and shall be installed with the intent to achieve complete screening of the storage yard from Locksley Lane and the southeast corner of the site. A Design Review application shall be submitted to the Planning Department by July 22, 2004, and all information necessary to deem the application complete shall be provided to the Design/Site Review Committee by September 22, 2004.
5. Improvement Plans for the project shall be submitted to the Department of Public works by October 7, 2004.

6. All boats and recreational vehicles shall be stored in a manner that screens them from adjacent properties and roads. This may be accomplished by fencing or landscaping or by a combination of the two. Complete screening of vehicles and boats from Locksley Lane is required.
7. Fifteen feet of periphery landscaping shall be provided along the project's southern property line to provide screening of the storage yard from the adjacent property to the south.

As an alternative to installing landscaping in this area, the applicant may provide payment to the adjacent property owner to the south to provide for offsite landscaping along this project's southern property line to accomplish the same purpose. The alternative payment shall be based on a landscape plan and estimate prepared by a landscape architect or designer and shall include plant materials and as approved by the D/SRC, all preparation work, irrigation, installation, and a minimum two-inch layer of wood chip or bark mulch to retain water, inhibit weed growth, and moderate soil temperature. In the event the payment alternative is chosen, the applicant shall provide the plan and estimate for approval of the D/SRC. Evidence of the payment shall be provided to the Planning Department prior to completion of the Design Review process.

8. Razor wire shall be removed from the fence or placed where it is not visible to the street on the interior side of the fence.
9. This variance is approved to allow solid fencing at a minimum height of six feet and a maximum height of eight feet to be placed at 40 feet from centerline of Locksley Lane, with the intent of allowing for complete screening of the site through the use of fencing and landscaping.
10. The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the DPW for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the DPW prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

ADVISORY COMMENT: Conceptual landscape plans submitted prior to project approval may require modification during the Improvement Plan process to resolve issues of drainage and traffic safety. (SR/CR/MM) (DPW)

11. All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, formerly Chapter 29), Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and DPW concurs with said recommendation.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans/Grading Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the DPW.

Submit to the DPW a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/DPW for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/DPW to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body. (SR/CR) (DPW)

12. Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the DPW for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall address storm drainage during construction and thereafter and shall propose "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, etc. Said BMP measures for this

project shall include (but are not limited to): Minimizing drainage concentration from impervious surfaces, construction management techniques, erosion protection at culvert outfall locations, straw bale sediment barriers, silt fencing and/or fiber roll wattles at the toe of all slopes, spreading of topsoil, netting, tackifiers, seed, mulch to promote revegetation, oil/sand separators, and vegetated swales. (CR/MM) (DPW)

13. Storm drainage from on-site impervious surfaces shall be collected and routed through specially designed catchbasins, vaults, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases as approved by DPW. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the project owners/permittees unless, and until, a County Service Area is created and said facilities are accepted by the County for maintenance. Contractual evidence of a monthly catchbasin, etc. cleaning program shall be provided to DPW upon request. Failure to do so will be grounds for Use Permit revocation. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, easements shall be created and offered for dedication to the County for maintenance and access to these facilities in anticipation of possible County maintenance. (CR/MM) (DPW)
14. **ADVISORY COMMENT.** This project is subject to construction-related storm water permit requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. Any required permits shall be obtained through the State Regional Water Quality Control Board or EPA. (FR/SR) (DPW)
15. Construct a public road / driveway entrance onto Locksley Lane to a Plate 22, LDM standard. The improvements shall begin at the outside edge of any future lane(s) as directed by the DPW. An Encroachment Permit shall be obtained by the applicant or authorized agent from DPW. (CR) (DPW)
16. Construct one-half of a 32' road section plus curb, gutter, and a 6' concrete sidewalk, or an alternative design approved by DRC, where the project fronts Locksley Lane, as measured from the existing centerline thereof or as directed by DPW. Additional widening and/or reconstruction may be required to improve existing structural deficiencies, accommodate auxiliary lanes, intersection geometrics, signalization, bikelanes, or for conformance to existing improvements. The roadway structural section shall be designed for a Traffic Index of 9.0, but said section shall not be less than 3" AC/8" Class 2 AB unless otherwise approved by DPW. (CR) (DPW)
17. **ADVISORY COMMENT:** This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Auburn/Bowman), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to 8/6/04.

A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code

The current estimated fee is \$118. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

18. Storm water run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of DPW. No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals. (CR/MM) (DPW)

19. Provide the DPW with a letter from the appropriate fire protection district describing conditions under which service will be provided to this project. Said letter shall be provided prior to the approval of Improvement Plans, and a fire protection district representative's signature shall be provided on the plans. (CR/MM) (DPW)

20. Submit to DPW, for review and approval, a geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall address and make recommendations on the following:

- A) Road, pavement, and parking area design
- B) Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable)
- C) Grading practices
- D) Erosion/winterization
- E) Special problems discovered on-site, (i.e., groundwater, expansive/unstable soils, etc.)

Once approved by the DPW, two copies of the final report shall be provided to the DPW and one copy to the Building Department for their use. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide for engineering inspection and certification that earthwork has been performed in conformity with recommendations contained in the report. (SR/CR/MM) (DPW)

21. Submit, for review and approval, a striping and signing plan with the project Improvement Plans. The plan shall include all on- and off-site traffic control devices and shall be reviewed by the County Traffic Engineer. A construction signing plan shall also be provided with the Improvement Plans for review and approval by the County Traffic Engineer. (CR/MM) (DPW)

22. Prior to Improvement Plan approval, the applicant shall submit an engineer's estimate detailing costs for facilities to be constructed with the project which are intended to be County-owned or maintained. County policy requires the applicant prepare their cost estimate(s) in a format that is consistent with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, 34th Standard (GASB 34). The engineer preparing the estimate shall use unit prices approved by the DPW for line items within the estimate. The estimate shall be in a format approved by the County and shall be consistent with the guidelines of GASB34. (CR)(DPW)

23. Water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction and for New Development / Redevelopment (or other similar source as approved by the DPW) (CR/MM)(DPW)

24. All on-site parking and circulation areas shall be improved with a minimum 6" AB over double chip seal capable of supporting anticipated vehicle loadings, including a 40,000 lb. fire truck.  
ADVISORY COMMENT: It is recommended that the pavement structural section be designed in accordance with recommendations of a soils/pavement analysis and should not be less than 2" AC over 4" Class 2 AB, or the equivalent. (CR) (DPW)
25. Dedicate to Placer County one-half of a 60'-wide highway easement (Ref. Chapter 12, Article 12.08 (formerly Chapter 4, Subchapter 5, Placer County Code) where the project fronts Locksley Lane, as measured from the centerline of the existing roadway, plan line, or other alignment as approved by the DPW. (CR) (DPW)
26. Any gated entry feature proposed by the applicant shall be returned to the Zoning Administrator for approval of a modification of the Use Permit. (CR) (PD)
27. During project construction, staking shall be provided pursuant to Section 5-1.07 of the County General Specifications (CR) (DPW)
28. An Encroachment Permit shall be obtained from DPW prior to Improvement Plan approvals for any landscaping within public road rights-of-way. (CR) (DPW)
29. The applicant shall submit to Environmental Health Services, a solid waste management plan for review and approval within 2 weeks from the date of approval, a plan form specifying required information can be obtained in the Environmental Health Services office.
30. Portable toilets are not allowed on the project site.
31. The discharge of fuels, oils, or other petroleum products, chemicals, detergents, cleaners, or similar chemicals to the surface of the ground or to drainage ways on or adjacent to the site is prohibited.
32. No wrecked or inoperable vehicles may be stored on site.
33. Vehicle cleaning and maintenance shall not occur on site.
34. The storage or introduction to the premises of any hazardous materials in excess of those amounts allowed by the California Code of Regulations, Title 22 is prohibited.
35. **The applicant shall submit Improvement Plans that are consistent with the Conditions of Approval to the Engineering and Surveying Department within 60 (sixty) days, or no later than November 28, 2006. Staff shall review these Plans and respond within 30 (thirty) days of their receipt of the Plans.**

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2007  
VIA FAX  
CLERK OF THE  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA ITEM  
DATE: Jan 23, 2007  
Appeal Safe-N-Sound Storage  
Correnti  
TIME: 11:30 am 1-12-07

MARK AND KATHY CORRENTI

SAFE-N-SOUND BOAT & RV STORAGE

P.O. BOX 3293

AUBURN, CA 95604

(530)888-0600

DATE 1/16/07  
 Board of Supervisors - 5  
 County Executive Office  
 County Counsel  
 Administrative Assistant Mike Boyle  
 Planning FAX


TO: HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
RE: APPEAL HEARING, 23 JANUARY 2007

DUE TO A RECENT CHANGE OF EVENTS AND RECENT  
ADDITIONAL PERTINENT INFORMATION TO OUR CASE BECOMING  
AVAILABLE, WE ARE REQUESTING A 30-DAY CONTINUANCE OF OUR  
APPEAL HEARING.

THIS TIME EXTENSION IS NEEDED FOR ADDITIONAL  
INVESTIGATION AND PREPARATION, AS WELL AS TIME TO SEEK  
LEGAL COUNSELING AND/OR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.

WE SINCERELY APPRECIATE ALL TIME TAKEN IN THESE  
MATTERS.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



MARK AND KATHY CORRENTI

Mark and Kathy Correnti  
Safe-N-Sound Boat & RV Storage  
1041 Sierra View Circle  
Auburn, CA 95604

2-23-07

RECEIVED

FEB 23 2007

PLACER COUNTY  
ASSESSMENT APPEALS BOARD

Scott F.  
Tony L.

Dear Honorable Board Members,


We are writing to request a minimum of a 30-day continuance of our appeal hearing scheduled March 6, 2007, at 10:00 a.m.

In addition, we are at this time requesting the report done by Terry Butrym, a private investigator hired by Mr. Kranz's office. This investigative report addresses some important issues to be raised at our appeal hearing.

Should we be denied access to this report, we request that Mr. Butrym's report, at the least, be provided to all Board members, as to be implemented into the decision-making process.

We appreciate the time taken in these very important matters.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Correnti

- AH
- MB
- TM
- JM
- MJ
- MEP

1  
via email

55

