Attachment E

This page intentionally left blank.

MINUTES
Toro Land Use Advisory Committee
Monday, October 26, 2015

1. Site visit at 3:15 PM at the END OF WOODRIDGE CT SALINAS [OFF OF RIVER RUN RD] (RIVER VIEW AT LAS PALMAS LLC)

ATTENDEES: Elaine Dawson, David Nordstrand, Mary Koch, Julie Sutliff, Nancy Iverson, Eleanor Lynch, Jim Lynch, John McCormack, Daniel Pinto, Mary Lynn Pinto, Ray Harrod, Jr, Anthony Lombardo (applicant's attorney), Gary Shingu, one of the property owners

LUAC members: Weaver, Keenan, Varney, Rieger, Vandergrift, Baker, Bean.

Additional public attendees at 4:00 p.m. meeting: Nancy Montana, Maurice Mathewson, John Haupt, Jason Clarke, Andrea Zulberti

Also attending from the County: Amy Roberts (Planning Commissioner), Luke Connolly, Monterey County Management Specialist, (for associate Planner Steve Mason), Ramon Montano, Assistant Planner, Planning Dept (Toro LUAC Planning liaison).

2. Meeting called to order by Weaver at 4:04 pm

3. Roll Call

Members Present: Weaver, Keenan, Vandergrift, Varney, Rieger, Baker, Bean (7)

Members Absent: Mueller, Kennedy (2) [Both excused]

4. Approval of Minutes:

A. July 13, 2015 minutes

Motion: Varney (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: Vandergrift (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: Weaver, Keenan, Varney, Vandergrift, Rieger, Baker, Bean (7)

Noes: 0

Absent: Mueller, Kennedy (2)

Abstain: 0

5. **Public Comments:** The Committee will receive public comment on non-agenda items that are within the purview of the Committee at this time. The length of individual presentations may be limited by the Chair.

Mike Weaver reported that he received a phone call from a homeowner living on Mesa Del Sol in Corral de Tierra. This is a subdivision adjacent to, and overlooking the Corral de Tierra Country Club golf course. This person called and was upset because she had not received notice of a field trip and LUAC meeting regarding the proposed Verizon Cell Tower to be located on the golf course property. She said she looks right over the spot where it is proposed to be located. She has visual concerns as well as health concerns. Further she said she talked to her neighbors and said they hadn't received notice either.

Mike Weaver said that he understood the Planning department mailed 130 notices out to those within 300 feet. He can't say it would have changed the vote. However, he said he found it disturbing and told the homeowner that the LUAC welcomes public input/comments regarding a project under review.
Weaver also explained that the LUAC is an advisory body, in this case to the Zoning Administrator.
The homeowner said the Planner told her they were mailed, but questioned why she and her neighbors never got notice. The homeowner said she was going to take it up with the Country Club and with the County.

6. **Scheduled Item(s)**

7. **Other Items:**

A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects (Refer to pages below)

None

B) Announcements

None

8. **Meeting Adjourned:** **5:29** pm

Minutes taken by: Bean

Minutes received via email October 29, 2015

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County RMA Planning
168 W Alisal St 2nd Floor
Salinas CA 93901
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: **Toro**

Please submit your recommendations for this application by: **October 26, 2015**

Project Title: RIVER VIEW AT LAS PALMAS LLC
File Number: PLN150372
Planner: MASON
Location: END OF WOODRIDGE CT SALINAS
Project Description:
Use Permit and Design Approval for the development and operation of an approximately 70,000 square foot assisted living facility consisting of multiple structures and associated site improvements on an approximately 15.74 acre site. The facility would provide residences and services for a range of seniors requiring varying levels of assistance. The property is located at the end of Woodridge Court, Salinas [No address assigned to parcel] (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-211-035-000), Las Palmas Subdivision, Toro Area Plan.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative present at meeting? Yes X No _____

Gary Shingu and Andrea Zulberti, applicants
Attorney, Tony Lombardo (for project attorney Dale Ellis)

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? Luke Connolly (for Steve Mason) & Ramon Montano

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Nancy Montana	**X**		No notification, light pollution
Mary Lynn Pinto and Daniel Pinto	**X**		No notification, no record of HOA Board approval in their minutes, no representative present from Las Palmas Board proposal is above his home and in his view; use permit is the issue: the proposal is not just residents, as developer estimates 92-96 employees
Jim Lynch	**X**		He does not like tone of LUAC comments=NIMBY; plan can be worked out with county regarding ambulance sirens; no Las Palmas Board present; residents not notified; does proposal have signed agreements with Las Palmas for road use, security, etc.

PUBLIC COMMENT CONTINUED:

Mary Koch	**X**		Change project name due to confusion with similar road names; security and traffic concerns; no representation of HOA at meeting; large increase in number of people using security gate; proposal affects more people than those within 300 ft of proposal. Work shift changes at facility at 3 p.m. would conflict with school Traffic.
Eleanor Lynch	**X**		Inadequate notice.
Stuart Burbank (via email)			E-mail from Stuart Burbank, Las Palmas Property Manager; sent to Varney and read by Varney "Las Palmas Board supports the general concept and has been working for over one year with developer"
Gary Shingu			Gary Shingu, developer says he will make presentation to Las Palmas HOA Board on Nov 12, 2015.

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN:

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	**Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)**	**Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)**
Light pollution, noise pollution (emergency vehicles)		
Ridgeline construction, sensitive viewshed area	Scenic Highway Recommendations	Preserve hilltop views
Berms, fence around property, soil analysis for road relocation Total mass of proposal on hilltop area		
The Las Palmas Ranch was approved as an Area of Development Concentration (ADC) With a Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan calling for no more than 1,031 single family residences With associated EIR (1982, adopted 1986)	Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan	Project Initial Study not done yet. Level of environmental review not known yet by County County Planning representatives at the LUAC meeting do not know how many SFD's have been built at Las Palmas Ranch thus far.

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS

The total number of single family dwellings allowed under the Las Palmas Specific Plan is 1,031 and according to testimony heard by the Toro LUAC at the 2006 meetings on this APN, 1,030 single family dwellings have already been built on Las Palmas.

Following the two Toro LUAC meetings in year 2006 on this same APN: 139-211-035-000, the Zoning Administrator approved (same APN) one large single family dwelling plus SFD accessory structures, PLN060121

This proposal adds 142 beds in numerous structures. Rest home buildings plus administration, kitchen, dining, maintenance support staff. The conditional use as a rest home was not anticipated in the specific plan.

General Plan Consistency checklist provided by applicant has a number of questionable items.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Baker (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Vandergrift (LUAC Member's Name)

_____ Support Project as proposed

_____ Recommend Changes (as noted above)

_X_ Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: incomplete proposal, many unanswered issues, neighbors insufficiently notified

Continued to what date: CONTINUE TO DATE CERTAIN, November 16, 2015 @ 4:00 P.M.

AYES: Weaver, Baker, Vandergrift, Keenan, Rieger, Bean (6)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: Varney [left at 5:05 p.m., excused, prior commitment] & Kennedy, Mueller [Excused absent] (3)

ABSTAIN: 0

Submitted at 10/26/15 Toro LUAC meeting

MINUTES

Toro Land Use Advisory Committee
Monday, June 26, 2006

1. Meeting called to order 3:04 pm

2. Members Present: Mueller, Varney, Hughett, Vandergrift, Baker, Marvin

3. Members Absent: Grant, Weaver

4. Approval of Minutes: Motion: Varney (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: Mueller (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: Mueller, Varney, Hughett, Baker

Noes: 0

Absent: Marvin (late) Grant, Weaver

Abstain: Vandergrift

5. Public Comments: None

6. Other Items: A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects/Applications

None

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Planning & Building Inspection Department
168 W Alisal St 2nd Floor
Salinas, California
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Toro

Please submit your recommendations for this application by Monday, June 26, 2006.

Project Title: PERSALL SAMUEL & LINDA
File Number: PLN060121
File Type: AP
Planner: MURPHY
Location: 9999 (NO ADDRESS ASSIGNED AT THIS TIME)
Project Description:
ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT AND DESIGN APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 9,940 SQ. FT. SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ATTACHED 1,076 SQ. FT. FOUR-CAR GARAGE, AN ATTACHED 1,053 SQ. FT. CARETAKER'S UNIT, AND AN ATTACHED 3,617 SQ. FT. GYM. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED ON PARCEL Q IN THE LAS PALMAS SUBDIVISION, SALINAS (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 139-211-035-000), SOUTH OF RIVER ROAD AND WEST OF LAS PALMAS ROAD, TORO AREA.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative Present at Meeting? Yes _____ No ___X_____

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Nine neighbors present. Their comments are listed below.

AREAS OF CONCERN (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, visual impact, etc.):

Nine neighbors present. Zone concern —MDR 2.61

Don Meister: Site supposed to be condos; developer changed to single family homes; all permits used so only one left.

Virginia McDonald: Asked about zoning restrictions; concerned about almost commercial-sized gym and fears home and other buildings will be used as adjunct to Corey House; stated Persalls have refused to pay Homeowners Association fees.

William Hearst: lives near Corey House; one wedding there produced terrible noise; Persalls have no consideration for neighbors; fears use of new site as adjunct to Corey House will increase noise, traffic, and danger to small children.

Nancy Montanna: looks out kitchen window at site and will lose privacy; feels everyone entitled to build, but fears these buildings will be adjunct to Corey House.

Mary Caldwell: lives at end of River Run, heard noise from wedding at corey House; feels this homesite is a ruse to enlarge Corey House functions; much larger than any other buildings around it.

Dave Nordstrom: out of scale with everything; will be visible from 68 bridge; you can see water tower and where house will be from there and house will loom far above tower.

Karen Nordstrom: felt no one on Planning Commission could see how Persalls were circumventing the process before and this is another ruse.

Nancy Iverson: house is ten times as big as neighborhood homes; time to go back to Planning Commission as many new commissioners now on; read article from magazine regarding sign of resistance in country to building McMansions in neighborhoods. Persalls plans not in keeping with the rest of Las Palmas.

Caldwell: Persalls got variance on zoning. Neighbors could protest their violations but would have to go through lengthy process.

Iverson: County has been trying to phase out septic systems; sewer goes to Persall property; why are they going to use a septic system?

[PLN060121 PERSALL CONTINUED]

RECOMMENDED CHANGES/CONDITIONS (e.g. reduce scale, relocate on property, reduce lighting, etc.):

None at this time

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS:

Vandergift: Persalls show no respect for LUAC by not showing up. **Made motion to deny** because it is out of scale to community. Hughett seconded.

Varney wants to give them hearing.

Mueller: our history is we do not act when applicnt does not show.

Marvin: LUAC should be able to hear from applicant; their objective and how this all ties in to that objective. He lives in the neighborhood.
—asked of Mrs. Montanna how it affects their view.
—Mrs Montanna said she objects to magnitude of the building.
—Marvin feels trees will soften impact and the slope will help hide it. He feels breaking large structures into smaller structures would make the whole site look more rural.

Motion to deny failed:
Ayes: Vandergift, Baker
Noes: Mueller, Varney, Marvin, Hughett

Varney: concern over real intended use of facility.

Vandergift: nothing can be said to mitigate size of it.

McDonald: Persalls have used technique of not showing up or cancelling a meeting for a long time, hoping postponements will make opponents lose interest.

Nordstrom: land forms an ampitheater so noise is amplified and noise is a big concern.

Discussion re: possible schedule

Hughett suggested public contact County planner

Calwell: Can LUAC get word to Planning Commission that we want to see this again?

Marvin wants LUAC to stress that we got project based on scope and we want to give impact. We want another meeting with applicant present.
—need clarification of sewage system, and car turn-around, and opening in wall which will cause noise for neighbors; feels berm is only designed to partially hide structures; feels Persalls cannot be denied if they insist it is a single family residence.

RECOMMENDATION (e.g. recommend approval; recommend denial; recommend continuation):

Marvin: Motion to continue the item to the August 14th meeting since most LUAC members can be here then. The LUAC wants information on sewer, water, intent of motor court, use of property, height of berms, zoning and what it means because of controversy.

Mueller seconded.

CONCUR WITH RECOMMENDATION:

AYES: Marvin,Varney, Mueller, Hughett, Baker

NOES: Vandergrift

ABSENT: Grant, Weaver

ABSTAIN: 0

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Planning & Building Inspection Department
168 W Alisal St 2nd Floor
Salinas, California
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Toro

Please submit your recommendations for this application by Monday, June 26, 2006.

Project Title: EVERS JEFFERY H & ROSEMARY L
File Number: PLN060213
File Type: PC
Planner: AMADOR
Location: 26535 COVEY LN SALINAS

Project Description:
COMBINED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CONSISTING OF: 1) A USE PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT ON SLOPES IN EXCESS OF 30%; 2) A VARIANCE TO ENCROACH INTO FRONT SETBACK; AND 3) A DESIGN APPROVAL FOR A NEW SINGLE STORY 3,172 SQ. FT. SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ATTACHED 612 SQ. FT. GARAGE, COVERED PORCH, DECKS AND RETAINING WALLS; REMOVAL OF TWO (2) 10 INCH IN DIAMETER OAK TREES. THE PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED WITHIN AN EXISTING BUILDING ENVELOPE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 26535 COVEY LANE, SALINAS (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 416-447-002-000), SOUTH OF SAN BENANCIO ROAD, TORO AREA.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative Present at Meeting? Yes _____ No __X__

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Two neighbors present: both are uphill neighbors; no objection to house being built. Their comments are listed below.

AREAS OF CONCERN (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, visual impact, etc.):

Al Friedrich: concern road is only one lane.

Joel Erickson: worried about fire and ability of fire department to get in and turn around.

[PLN060213 EVERS CONTINUED]

RECOMMENDED CHANGES/CONDITIONS (e.g. reduce scale, relocate on property, reduce lighting, etc.):

None

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS:

None

RECOMMENDATION (e.g. recommend approval; recommend denial; recommend continuation):

Vandergift made motion to continue the item until August 14th

Varney seconded

CONCUR WITH RECOMMENDATION:

AYES: Marvin, Mueller, Varney, Hughett, Vandergrift, Baker

NOES: 0

ABSENT: Grant, Weaver

ABSTAIN: 0

Mueller made motion to adjourn
Varney seconded

MEETING ADJOURNED AT: 4:20 pm

Sent by Bonnie Baker, Acting Secretary of the Toro LUAC
Received via email on July 6, 2006
Michele Friedrich, LUAC Contact

Submitted at 10/26/15 Toro LUAC meeting

MINUTES

Toro Land Use Advisory Committee
Monday, August 14, 2006

1. Meeting called to order 3 PM by Chair Rich Hughett

2. Members Present: Marvin, Varney, Baker, Vandergrift, Hughett, Mueller, Weaver

3. Members Absent: None

4. Approval of Minutes: Motion: Varney (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: Vandergrift (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: Marvin, Varney, Baker, Vandergrift, Hughett, Mueller, Weaver (7)

Noes: 0

Absent: 0

Abstain: 0

5. Public Comments:

Hughett announced that LUAC Member Michael Grant has retired

Also, there will be a special meeting August 28th to be held at Cypress Community Church regarding the Toro Area Plan. The LUAC can make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

6. Other Items: A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects/Applications

None

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Planning & Building Inspection Department
168 W Alisal St 2nd Floor
Salinas, California
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Toro

Please submit your recommendations for this application by Monday, August 14, 2006.

Project Title: PERSALL SAMUEL & LINDA
Item continued from 6/26/06 meeting
File Number: PLN060121
File Type: AP
Planner: MURPHY
Location: 9999 (NO ADDRESS HAS BEEN ASSIGNED TO DATE)
Project Description:
ADMINISTRATIVE PERMIT AND DESIGN APPROVAL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 9,940 SQ. FT. SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ATTACHED 1,076 SQ. FT. FOUR-CAR GARAGE, AN ATTACHED 1,053 SQ. FT. CARETAKER'S UNIT, AND AN ATTACHED 3,617 SQ. FT. GYM. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED ON PARCEL Q IN THE LAS PALMAS SUBDIVISION, SALINAS (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 139-211-035-000), SOUTH OF RIVER ROAD AND WEST OF LAS PALMAS ROAD, TORO AREA.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative Present at Meeting? Yes X No _____

John Matthams, architect, and Anatoe from Mattham's office

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chair Hughett read the project application description into the record.
Location is to the right of the Corey House, on a bluff above it. The LUAC members were all familiar with the location
In attendance at the hearing were a dozen or more residents of Las Palmas.
Architect Matthams presented several photos and sketches of the road to the site, the building site, the location of the house on the site, and photos of the site, shot from a distance.
Matthams also presented the plan for screening the entirety of the proposed project. The proposal is for 6 feet to 7 feet of berms with 14 feet of vegetation above the berms. The architect stated the objective is to hide the development totally. It is to be hidden both from Highway 68 and screened from view from the houses below.
The house is to have a maximum height of 24 feet and be painted in earthtone colors similar to the colors of nature around it.

AREAS OF CONCERN (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, visual impact, etc.):

Rick Marvin asked about the concern of the view from Highway 68, Matthams stated that the intent was to hide ridgeline and buildings completely

Monterey County Planner, Annie Murphy, was in attendance at the hearing and responded with Monterey County General Plan Policy 26.1.6.1. The Toro Area Plan calls for sensitive site design.

Marvin pointed out that the maximum structural height allowed is 30 feet. He pointed out that although the proposed house is 24 feet high, the proposed caretaker's quarters is 30 feet high

Annie Murphy pointed out the property is zoned MDR 2.61, medium density residential, 2.61 units per acre. It isn't zoned visually sensitive. The area zoned open space is not being developed.

Ron Vandergift asked about water supply and who the water purveyor was? The architect didn't know who the water system owner was but stated the amount of water use would be for a single family dwelling, and caretaker's quarters. There would be one bathroom in the gym area of the house. It would be used for basketball games by the owner's children.

How may people were proposed to live in this large house. The architect answered that there would be four people, including children, plus a caretaker's.

[PLN060121 PERSALL CONTINUED]

AREAS OF CONCERN CONTINUED:

Mueller asked how large the parcel was. The Parcel is 15.67 acres.

Don Meister of the Las Palmas Homeowner's Assn. asked from the audience if he could add clarification to this. He explained the zoning on the property and the house potential is different as the devleloper, the Fletchers, build Phase 1 and Phase 2 out leaving one remaining house to be built, thus there was one permit left. This was the permit the Persall's wished to use on this piece of property that they purchased from Jim Fletcher.

Annie Murphy explained that the proposed landscaping nmust be maintained. The scenic easement and landscaping maintenance could be made a condition requirement.

Rich Hughett asked if there was a wildlife corridor on this property.

Bonnie Baker asked if the proposed project would be on a septic system? It was answered that the project would be on the same sewer system that the other Las Palmas houses are on. Baker asked if the sewer treatment plant was adequate to to take on this project It was answered that yes, the sewer treatment plant would be adequate with modifications.

Kerry varney's concern was what was the purpose of the house? Would it ba a family home and not a back up to the Corey House B&B or activities at the Corey House? The architect responded and said the owner's state that this project will be 100% a single family dwelling.

Ed Gould of Woodridge Court expressed skepticism about the berming of the proposed project asking if it wouldn't limit the view of the Persall's? The architect responded that they would essentially be living in a compound.
Gould then asked what was the purpose of the proposed 3,600 sq. ft. gym? The response from the architect was that it was to be used by the Persall children for basketball.
Gould asked about how much parking would be avaialable on site? The architect responded that there would be a total of 4 parking spaces for the Persall's and three guest parking spaces for a total of seven parking spaces.

Nancy Montana of Country Park Road lives below the proposed project. She suggested parking be on the other side, away from her being able to hear it below. She questioned the 5 foot to 6 foot berms with twelve foot Live Oak Trees being planted on top of them for screening.
She had a concern about drainage. Would there be problems below the project at her house and her neighbor's houses?
And she asked about the access road to the project. Is it an easement? Would there be heavy trucks using it?
She expressed concern about the existing trees on the slopes. Would therebe damage to these trees? The architect suggested perhaps a condition could be written protecting these trees.

Karen Lukas of Old Ranch Court expressed concerns about the location of the proposed berming. She stated that people can see orange flagging now.

Ann Sanchez, who lives below the proposed project expressed concerns about the proposed screening. In reality, she stated, it looks different as one can clearly see the orange netting now.
She has concerns about the stability of the hill as there have been bad landslides on the hill previously. The hillsides are at risk.
She also expressed concern over the size of the current project. It is 8 times larger than the current homes nearby. the square footage of the proposed project totals 16,000 square feet. It is out of character with the surrounding community.

Janet Fay, who owns a ranch nearby, asked if there were no screening, would it be considered ridgeline development? The architect answered no. Fay said her concern is that it might take 5 to 10 years to establish the Oak Tree screening. She believes it is ridgeline development.
She expressed concerns that when the applicant's, the Persall's, purchased the Corey House below they told the neighborhood they were going to live in the Corey House. Now they have gotten permits to turn the Corey House into a B&B, and with events, and they are not going to live in it. This proposed Persall house and caretaker's quarters are adjacent to a Planned Unit Development, i.e., Las Palmas. The size of the proposed house is a problem as it is out of character with the neighborhood.

Fred Radda, who live in Las Palmas says his concern is that guests of the Corey House becoming "friends" of the project up above. His concern is that the two projects merge somehow.

Nancy Iverson, who lives in Las Palmas, pointed out that in past conversations with Jim Fletcher, the Las Palmas developer, she had expressed concerns about the nearby Eucalyptus trees and the potential for fire danger. She said Mr. Fletcher told her that these trees would be taken care of. More recently, she said she had an opportunity to talk to Jim Fletcher and again asked about the Eucalyptus trees. Jim Fletcher's response, she said, was, "Oh, I didn't say when I was going to take care of it."
Nancy Iverson also said she had water use concerns about the large proposed project.

[PLN060121 PERSALL CONTINUED]

AREAS OF CONCERN CONTINUED:

Planner Annie Murphy said she would ask the local Salinas Rural Fire Departmne about the Eucalyptus trees.

Virginia McDonald, a Las Palmas neighbor had concerns with the geology of the place. There are steep banks and she questioned the wisdom of adding berms to the top of it. They are currently using part of the property for spray fields and there are pipes that are leaking. The weight of the berms and the water for the trees may cause excessive sliding. The architect responded that they were planning to import the berming material and have a stabilization plan.
Neighbor McDonald continued stating that there was currently water running down the slopes. The architect stated that there would be a plan for collection tanks for irrigation. McDonald stated that she was not talking about that.

Annie Murphy said that once the screening is established it would take very little water.

Another Las Palmas neighbor asked if the proposed project would be using the same water and sewer facilities that Las Palmas neighborhoods use? The architect responded yes, but it could have been more houses. The Las Palmas spray fields are part of this 15 acre property.

Jean Albright, a Las Palmas neighbor, stated that there are a number of Las Palmas Ranch houses nearby for sale. These are owner's who are upset with the Corey House and the uses to be allowed. She said apparantly the Corey House owns the nearby sidewalks, and the locals can't use them. She doesn't like it.

Karen Lukas asks how the Oak Tree trunks are going to block this project. How will the trunks being spread apart about ten feet screen it? The architect responds that there will be bushes planted between the trees.

Janet Fay asks if the Persall's would be liable for any damage to the houses below them? Annie Murphy responds that she doesn't know about that.

LUAC member Mike Weaver said a concern is whether 5 or 15 gallon Oak trees would be used for the proposed screeningon the berms. It was a dilemma because the 5 gallon trees are more hardy and grow much better. However, their small initial size would not accomplish the stated goal of the architect which is total screening. And it would take years to accomplish this. On the other hand imported Oak trees approaching ten feet in height, referred to as 15 gallon trees, do not grow well at all. Approximately half die, they need a lot of care, and even after ten years, they are not much taller or bigger than when they started out. So, again, this would not accomplish the stated goal of screening. Lastly, Weaver pointed out, if it was so easy to screen things, why then is the large Las Palmas water tank on the top of the hill still visible? The visibility of this water tank has been a subject of Monterey County Planning Commission hearings for several years. Trees have been tried to be planted around it. It seems the Planning Commission has just thrown up their hands in resignation over this water tank screening issue.

LUAC Member Weaver asked Planner Annie Murphy if the current County Planning policy called for 5 gallon Oak Trees, as at one time, they had discovered that the 15 gallon Oak trees would not grow well. This was in regard to the proposed total screening. Annie Murphy responeded that she would have to check on this back at the office.

LUAC member Baker asked about lighting, she had concerns about how many lights and howbright they would be?
She was told they would be unobtrusive. Baker had an additional concern regarding the proposed gym. How many bathrooms?
The architect responded that there was only one small bathroom planned for the gym.

LUAC member Marvin asked about parking, only 7 parking spaces? He asked if parking would/could be done in the motorcourt? Could not owner's find more space for parking than the 7 spaces stated as the limit? He asked if the access point to the garage could be changed? He also stated that the covered walkeways, the pergola, arches, create and accentuate a size issue with this.

Baker asked if there would be a wall or a fence? The architect responded no. Baker asked who would be doing the landscape plan. The response was Flora Vista, Landscape Architect.

LUAC member Mueller stated that we are here for the design, a lot of what he has heard he doesn't think is under the LUAC jurisdiction. LUAC Chair Hughett responds that the LUAC can review pretty much all of it.

Mueller asks what is the use of the property in terms of County review?
Planner Annie Murphy said it is slated for Administrative review and would need an Administrative Permit, unless there is a request for a Planning Commission Hearing, in which case it would go to the Planning Commisssion.

[PLN060121 PERSALL CONTINUED]

RECOMMENDED CHANGES/CONDITIONS (e.g. reduce scale, relocate on property, reduce lighting, etc.):

None

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS:

LUAC Member Ron Vandergift said he feels that the proposed project is too large and out of character with the adjacent homes and neighborhood

RECOMMENDATION (e.g. recommend approval; recommend denial; recommend continuation):

Vandergift makes a motion to recommend denial of the project
Weaver seconds the motion

CONCUR WITH RECOMMENDATION:

AYES: Baker, Vandergrift, Hughett, Marvin, Weaver (5)

NOES: Mueller, Varney (2)

ABSENT: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee
Project Referral Sheet

Planning & Building Inspection Department
168 W Alisal St 2nd Floor
Salinas, California
(831) 755-5025

Advisory Committee: Toro

Please submit your recommendations for this application by Monday, August 14, 2006.

Project Title: EVERS JEFFERY H & ROSEMARY L — Item continued from 6/26/06 meeting
File Number: PLN060213
File Type: PC
Planner: AMADOR
Location: 26535 COVEY LN SALINAS
Project Description:
COMBINED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CONSISTING OF: 1) A USE PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT ON SLOPES IN EXCESS OF 30%; 2) A VARIANCE TO ENCROACH INTO FRONT SETBACK; AND 3) A DESIGN APPROVAL FOR A NEW SINGLE STORY 3,172 SQ. FT. SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ATTACHED 612 SQ. FT. GARAGE, COVERED PORCH, DECKS AND RETAINING WALLS; REMOVAL OF TWO (2) 10 INCH IN DIAMETER OAK TREES. THE PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED WITHIN AN EXISTING BUILDING ENVELOPE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 26535 COVEY LANE, SALINAS (ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER 416-447-002-000), SOUTH OF SAN BENANCIO ROAD, TORO AREA.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative Present at Meeting? Yes __X__ No _____

Jeffrey Evers

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The applicant described the project as a single family dwelling to be 17 feet high, single story, with a basement garage at one end. It is to be painted in earth tone colors.

Vandergift asked about grading, cut and fill? The response was a proposed 1,300 yards to be removed offsite to a neighbor.

Evers stated he attempted in his plan to blend the house into the hill. There will be 2 foot to 4 foot retaining walls. Not much of a backyard, about 14 feet or so, as there is not much room for it.

His property is 4.5 acres with a building envelope.

The exterior of the house will be board and batten.

AREAS OF CONCERN (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, visual impact, etc.):

Neighbor Joel Erickson lives at the top of the hill above the proposed site has a concern about the narrow shared road. Will concrete and delivery and construction trucks block his access to his house?
Erickson is responsible for maintenance of the narrow steep road. There is a potential to have traffic turning around at his house at the top.

Neighbor Al Friedrich likes the project and said it had been helpful for he and Erickson and Evers to review and discuss it while the LUAC was hearing the earlier Persall proposal.

[PLN060213 EVERS CONTINUED]

RECOMMENDED CHANGES/CONDITIONS (e.g. reduce scale, relocate on property, reduce lighting, etc.):

Weaver asked if Evers would be willing to schedule delivery and construction trucks during non peak hours?
For example 10 am to 11 am, so the neighbors can get to work or shopping. Evers expressed a willingness to do this.

The neighbors and Evers felt a small driveway cut, some light grading in front of the proposed project would be helpful for the workers to park so as to leave the common shared roadway/ driveway clear.

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS:

Varney suggested amending the grading permit if possible to allow for the widening of the share driveway in front of the project, for passing purposes while construction is going on.

Weaver said he liked the project. The style fit with the surrounding neighborhood and the 17 feet high proposal above average natural grade was further reason to like the project.

Mueller asked where the project would go from here?
The Planner said that it would probably go to the Planning Commisssion.

There was discussion amongst the LUAC members about how it seemed strange that a project like his would go to the Planning Commission while the former Persall project was destined for an Administrative Permit?
The planner responded that it had to so with some setbacks, however, it was possible that this project could be handled at the Administrative Permit level. There was concurrence amongst the LUAC that it be treated this way.

RECOMMENDATION (e.g. recommend approval; recommend denial; recommend continuation):

Weaver made a motion to recommend approval
Mueller seconded the motion.

CONCUR WITH RECOMMENDATION:

AYES: Weaver, Mueller, Baker, Vandergrift, Marvin, Hughett, Varney (7)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

MEETING ADJOURNED AT: 5:00 pm

Sent and prepared by Mike Weaver, Secretary of the Toro LUAC
Received via email on August 24, 2006
Michele Friedrich, LUAC Contact

Submitted at 10/26/15 Toro LUAC meeting

MONTEREY COUNTY ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Meeting: October 26, 2006 Time: 9:50 AM	**Agenda Item No.:**
Project Description: Administrative Permit and Design Approval for the construction of a 9,940 square foot single family dwelling with an attached 1,076 square foot four-car garage, an attached 1,053 square foot caretaker's unit, an attached 3,617 square foot gym and associated grading (350 cubic yards cut and 350 cubic yards fill). The property is located on parcel "Q" in the Las Palmas Subdivision, Salinas (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-211-035-000), south of River Road and west of Las Palmas Road, Toro Area.	
Project Location: Parcel "Q" in the Las Palmas Subdivision, Salinas	**APN:** 139-211-035-000
Planning File Number: PLN060121	**Name:** Samuel and Linda Persall
Plan Area: Toro Area Plan	**Flagged and staked:** Yes
Zoning Designation: **:** MDR/2.61-D & O-D: Medium Density Residential, 2.61 units/acre with Design Control, and Open Space with Design Control	
CEQA Action: Categorically Exempt per Section 15303 (a)	
Department: RMA - Planning Department	

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Zoning Administrator approve the Persall Administrative Permit and Design Approval based on the Findings and Evidence **(Exhibit C)** and subject to the recommended Conditions **(Exhibit D)**.

PROJECT OVERVIEW: This project involves the construction of a single family dwelling, with an attached caretaker unit, garage, and gym. With a combined total of 15,686 square feet of structures, the project is larger than existing residential development on other properties in the Las Palmas Subdivision. The 15.67 acre lot is also considerably larger than other residential lots in Las Palmas, which average 6,000 square feet. The project meets all zoning requirements, including lot coverage, height and setbacks. The project is not located on the crest of a hill, and therefore would not result in ridgeline development. The staking for the proposed project is visible behind the existing Eucalyptus grove when viewed from the Highway 68 Scenic Corridor. The parcel is designated in the Toro Area Plan as visually sensitive. Monterey County policies require architectural and landscaping controls and sensitive site design to protect the scenic qualities of area. To conform to County policies, the project has been modified extensively. Design modifications include lowering the building pad for the proposed residence by six feet, lowering the building pad for the proposed gym by ten feet, and using earth tone materials and colors. The project would be screened with multi-level landscaping. Several large landscaped berms would be installed and planted with shrubs native to the Toro area. Large 24" box live oaks, 15 gallon oaks, 5 gallon oaks, and other native trees would be planted behind the berms. Once installed, the proposed landscaping would screen the majority of the project from view from Highway 68, and should completely screen the proposed project from view from Highway 68 within 10 years. The landscaping would be monitored on an on-going basis to ensure its long-term health and survival. The planted area between the project and River Road would be placed in a scenic easement to ensure permanent screening for the project, permanently protect additional contiguous open space, and potential wildlife habitat. Those portions of the property where the slope exceeds 30%, primarily in the eastern portion of the lot, would also be placed in a scenic easement. The project, as described and conditioned, is consistent with the Toro Area Plan, the Las Palmas Specific Plan and all applicable County of Monterey policies and regulations. No unusual circumstances, unresolved issues, or adverse environmental impacts were identified during project review.

CEQA Guidelines §15303 (a) categorically exempts the new construction of small structures, including one single family residence and accessory structures in a residential zone. The geotechnical investigation prepared for this project, the site visit by planning staff on May 24, 2006, and review of the project by planning staff did not identify any unusual circumstances that would indicate any potential adverse environmental impacts. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the Las Palmas Specific Plan on December 7, 1982. The proposed project complies with all mitigation measure and standards within the EIR. The geotechnical investigation prepared for this project, the site visit by planning staff on May 24, 2006, and review of the project by planning staff did not identify any unusual circumstances that would indicate any potential adverse environmental impacts. No unresolved issues remain.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

✓ Salinas Rural Fire Protection District
✓ Public Works Department
✓ Environmental Health Division
✓ Water Resources Agency

The above checked agencies and departments have reviewed this project. Conditions recommended by Water Resources Agency, Salinas Rural Fire Protection District, Environmental Health and the Planning Department have been incorporated into the recommended conditions of approval **(Exhibit D)**.

The project was referred to the Toro Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC). On August 14, 2006 the Toro LUAC recommended denial of the project on a 5 to 2 vote **(Exhibit E).** The LUAC expressed concerns regarding the size of the proposed project, the effectiveness of the proposed landscape screening, potential problems with drainage, erosion, landslides, fire, lighting, potential ridgeline development, and concerns that the project would be used as an adjunct to the Corey House. See the discussion section for an analysis **(Exhibit B)**.

Note: The decision on this project is appealable to the Planning Commission.

Annie Murphy
(831) 755-5228, murphya@co.monterey.ca.us
September 28, 2006

cc: Zoning Administrator; Salinas Rural Fire Protection District; Public Works Department; Environmental Health Division; Water Resources Agency; Bob Schubert; Annie Murphy; Carol Allen, Linda and Samuel Persall (Owners); Anatoly Ostretsov (Agent); Planning File PLN060121.

Attachments:

Exhibit A	Project Data Sheet
Exhibit B	Discussion
Exhibit C	Recommended Findings and Evidence
Exhibit D	Recommended Conditions of Approval
Exhibit E	LUAC minutes
Exhibit F	Public Comments
Exhibit G	Site Plan, Elevations, Floor Plans
Exhibit H	Proposed scenic easement

This report was reviewed by Bob Schubert, Acting Planning and Building Services Manager

EXHIBIT B
DISCUSSION
PLN060121/ Persall
October 26, 2006

Proposed Project
The owners of the property, Samuel and Linda Persall, are requesting permits to construct a new two-story 9,940 square foot single-family residence with an attached 590 square foot garage, an attached 1,053 square foot caretaker's unit, an attached 3,617 square foot gym; and associated grading required for constructing the building pad below grade (350 cubic yards cut and 350 cubic yards fill). Monterey County Code (Title 21) requires an Administrative Permit and Design Approval for the caretaker unit, and Design Approval for the residence and gym. A significant area of the parcel would be dedicated as a scenic easement. Due to public controversy, the project was referred to the Zoning Administrator for a public hearing per Title 21.

Site & Setting
The subject parcel is a 15.67 acre lot located in the Las Palmas Subdivision (parcel Q). The parcel is located approximately 100 feet southwest of River Road, and approximately 1/2 mile southeast of the intersection of Highway 68 and River Road. Residential lots within Las Palmas border the property to the east, open space parcels border the southern property boundary, an open space parcel borders the parcel to the north between the parcel and River Road, and open space land borders the western property boundary. There is an existing access road on the property. The parcel is located on a north-facing hillside. The parcel is not located on the crest of a hill. The central portion of the lot where the majority of development would take place is relatively flat. West of the flat area the land slopes upward with 20% to 25% slopes, and slopes steeply downward to the east, with slopes ranging from 30% to 50%. Approximately 65 clusters of Eucalyptus trees occur on the surveyed portions of the property, with the majority of Eucalyptus occurring on the northern and western portions of the property, between the proposed development and River Road and Highway 68. Other than the Eucalyptus and one large Monterey cypress, the vegetation on the parcel consists primarily of non-native annual grasses. The EIR prepared for the Las Palmas Subdivision did not identify any sensitive habitat on the site. The vegetation surrounding the parcel consists primarily of grassland, with native vegetation consisting primarily of a large grove of live oaks and California buckeye to the north and northwest of the parcel.

Toro Land Use Advisory Committee
The Toro LUAC initially considered the project on June 26, 2006. The project was continued to the LUAC hearing on August 14, 2006 when the applicant could be present. The LUAC recommended denial of the project on a 5 to 2 vote at the August 14th hearing. Planning staff recognizes that there is considerable public controversy regarding this project. However, as outlined below, staff has evaluated the LUAC concerns and determined that the project as described and conditioned is consistent with Monterey County policies. Where supported by County policies, the project has been modified or conditioned to respond to LUAC concerns.

1) The size and scale of the proposed project is not proportionate to other homes in Las Palmas.
Staff Response:
The size and scale of the proposed project, with a total of 15,686 square feet of structures, is considerably larger than existing residential development on other lots within Las Palmas. However, the 15.67 acre subject parcel is approximately 113 times larger than the average 6,000 square foot Las Palmas lot. With an overall lot coverage of approximately two percent, the scale of the proposed project is in proportion with the 15.67 acre lot size. Historically, Monterey

County has regulated the size of residential projects by limiting overall lot coverage, and evaluating the project for consistency with other County policies. Lot coverage for the proposed project is well below the allowed lot coverage of 25% for Medium Density Residential zoning districts. The project meets all other zoning requirements, including setbacks.

2) Views of the project from the Highway 68 scenic corridor
Staff Response: See the discussion under "Visual Analysis".

3) The effectiveness of the proposed landscape screening
Staff Response:
Once installed, the proposed landscaping would screen the majority of the project from view from Highway 68, and should completely screen the proposed project from view from the Highway 68 corridor within 10 years. As required by condition #6 (Exhibit D), a mix of native oaks and other native trees and shrubs would be planted to provide dense coverage from ground level to ultimately reach a height of 25 feet when viewed from the Highway 68 scenic corridor. The existing eucalyptus would provide additional screening. Several large landscaped berms would be installed and planted with native shrubs. Large 24" box live oaks, as well as smaller 5 gallon and 15 gallon oaks, would be planted between the berms and the proposed project. Planting a variety of trees sizes would allow for the survival of those trees best adapted to site conditions. The landscaping would be monitored on an on-going basis to ensure its long-term health and survival. After a period of five years, replanting would be required for any shrubs or trees that fail to survive or remain healthy. The planted area between the project and River Road and Highway 68 would be placed in a scenic easement to ensure permanent screening for the project, permanently protect additional contiguous open space and potential wildlife habitat.

4) Potential fire danger posed by Eucalyptus trees
Staff Response:
Salinas Rural Fire has determined that the project as conditioned meets all fire requirements. Paul Pilotte with the Salinas Rural Fire Department visited the site on October 4, 2006, and determined that the eucalyptus trees on the property do not present any additional fire hazard.

5) Potential for erosion and landslides related to location of berms adjacent to hillside and placement of trees on berms
Staff Response:
Condition #6 (Exhibit D) requires that the landscape berms be a located a minimum of 20 feet from the hillside, and that berms be planted with shrubs rather than trees to maintain berm stability. Berms must be designed by a civil or geotechnical engineer. Condition #3 requires that all slopes exposed during the course of construction be covered, seeded, or otherwise treated to control erosion. Condition #12 requires a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer or architect addressing on-site and off-site impacts.

6) Lighting
Staff Response:
Condition #7 (Exhibit D) requires that all exterior lighting be downlit amber bulbs, and that the number of lighting fixtures be limited to that required for safety only.

7) Potential ridgeline development
Staff Response:
The hills to the south of the parcel provide a backdrop for the proposed project when viewed from Highway 68. The parcel is located on a north-facing hillside, with a large relatively flat area in the center portion of the parcel where the proposed development would be located. The project is not located on the crest of a hill, and the staking for the proposed project does not silhouette

against the sky. The project would not be considered ridgeline development, pursuant to the definition of ridgeline development in Title 21.06.950.

8) Concerns that the project would be used as an adjunct to the Corey House
Staff Response:
The proposed development could not be used as an adjunct to the Corey House, because public events are not an allowed use within Medium Density Residential Zoning Districts under the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 21, Chapter 21.12). Any public events would be a violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

Visual analysis
While traveling on the Highway 68 scenic corridor on the Salinas River Bridge between River Road and Speckles Lane, portions of the staking for the proposed residence are visible through groves of Eucalyptus trees on the property. Portions of the staking for the project are also visible from River Road. The Toro Area Plan Visual Sensitivity Map (Figure 9) indicates that the parcel is located in a visually sensitive area. The hills to the south of the parcel provide a backdrop for the proposed project when viewed from Highway 68. The project is not located on the crest of a hill, and the staking for the proposed project does not silhouette against the sky. The project would not be considered ridgeline development, pursuant to Title 21.66.010.

The General Plan, the Toro Area Plan, and the Las Palmas Specific Plan contain policies to protect the scenic quality of areas visible from the Highway 68 scenic corridor and areas that are visually sensitive according to the Toro Area Plan. As outlined below, the project complies with all policies in the General Plan, the Toro Area Plan, and the Las Palmas Specific Plan for reducing visual impacts.

Policy 26.1.6.1 in the Toro Area Plan, and Policy 40.2.1 in the General Plan, require that additional landscape controls be implemented for projects within the Highway 68 Scenic Corridor, and encourage the use of native plants. Within the Las Palmas Specific Plan, Design and Sensitivity Policy I.7 requires informal massing or irregularly spaced trees to screen development. Consistent with these policies, this project will include extensive landscaping using native shrubs and trees to screen the proposed development. Condition #6 (Exhibit D) requires the use of native shrubs and the use of at least 50 native trees consisting primarily of 24" box native live oaks to provide immediate screening. In addition, condition #6 and requires locating shrubs and trees a significant distance from the Eucalyptus to avoid interfering with the plant growth and development. Consistent with Design and Sensitivity Policy I.3.D, the project retains the existing significant trees on the site. Condition #8 requires that a monitoring contract be implemented to ensure the long-term health and success of the existing and planted landscape screening. Condition #8 requires placing the landscaped area within a permanent conservation easement. Condition #8 also requires that slopes on the parcel greater than 30% be placed in a scenic easement, consistent with Policy 26.1.10 in the General Plan. The landscape screening should immediately reduce the visual impacts of the proposed project, and screen the majority of the project from view within the Highway 68 corridor within 10 years, thereby protecting scenic resources.

To regulate development and protect visual resources within the scenic corridor, Policy 26.1.6.1 in the Toro Area Plan requires that proposed development in areas of visual sensitivity be reviewed critically for building design and siting. Policy 40.2.1 in the General Plan requires sensitive treatment provisions within the scenic corridor, including the use of architectural controls and siting. Within the Las Palmas Specific Plan, Design and Sensitivity Policy I.4 requires natural materials and earth tone colors on exterior surfaces. Consistent with these policies, the project

incorporates the use of earth tone colors which mimic the color of the natural surroundings. At the recommendation of planning staff, the building pads for the proposed structures were lowered from 5 to 6 feet to reduce the overall height and mass of the proposed structures. The structures are sited away from the portion of the parcel closest to Highway 68, reducing the visual impact of the proposed development from the scenic corridor.

In addition to being consistent with Monterey County policies regulating development within the scenic corridor, the project is also consistent with the visual policies in the EIR for Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan. Parcel Q is designated on Figure E of the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan for medium density residential development. Because the analysis of visual impacts within the EIR were based on a much higher density of development than would occur with this project, the visual impacts of the proposed project would likely be much less than those anticipated in the EIR. The EIR anticipates unavoidable cumulative visual impacts to the rural character of the Toro area as a result of the Las Palmas Ranch. The EIR states: "Highway 68 is a designated scenic route, and River Road passes through a largely rural and open area; conversion of adjacent undeveloped lands to residential use could significantly alter viewsheds." Mitigations for this unavoidable cumulative impact include providing a 50' wide landscaped setback along River Road, and employing architectural controls. Consistent with these mitigations, the project does not disrupt the screening along River Road and in fact adds considerable additional screening that would be placed into a permanent scenic easement. The project has also gone through extensive design modification to reduce visual impacts. The project as conditioned also complies with the Conservation and Open Space policies in the Las Palmas Specific Plan, including informal massing of trees to screen development, the use of unobtrusive building materials and finishes, prohibiting development on ridgelines, and designating a proportionate amount of open space relative to housing.

CEQA

An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the Las Palmas Specific Plan on December 7, 1982. The proposed project complies with all mitigation measure and standards within the EIR. CEQA Guidelines §15303 (a) categorically exempts the new construction of small structures, including one single family residence and accessory structures in a residential zone. The geotechnical investigation prepared for this project, the site visit by planning staff on May 24, 2006, and review of the project by planning staff did not identify any unusual circumstances that would indicate any potential adverse environmental impacts. Grading for this project is limited to that required for the construction of the building pad below grade: 350 cubic yards cut and 350 cubic yards fill. The project complies with Monterey County policies regulating development within the scenic corridor. In accordance with Monterey County policies recommending voluntary dedication of land as open space within the scenic corridor and requiring dedication of scenic easement on slopes greater than 30%, the property owners will dedicate a scenic easement on the property to permanently protect open space. No unresolved issues remain.

EXHIBIT C
RECOMMENDED FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE

1. **FINDING:** **CONSISTENCY** – The project, as described in Condition No. 1 and as conditioned, conforms to the policies, requirements, and standards of the Monterey County General Plan, Toro Area Plan, Las Palmas Specific Plan, and the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 21), which designates this area as appropriate for development.

   EVIDENCE: (a) The text, policies, and regulations in the above referenced documents have been evaluated during the course of review of applications. No conflicts were found to exist. No communications were received during the course of review of the project indicating any inconsistencies with the text, policies, and regulations in these documents.

   (b) The property is located at Parcel "Q" in the Las Palmas Subdivision, Salinas (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-211-035-000), Toro Area Plan. The parcel is zoned MDR/2.61-D & O-D: Medium Density Residential, 2.61 units/acre with Design Control, and Open Space with Design Control. Development will occur only on the portions of the parcel designated as Medium Density Residential. The subject property complies with all the rules and regulations pertaining to zoning uses and any other applicable provisions of Title 21, and is therefore suitable for the proposed development.

   (c) The project planner conducted site inspections on May 12, 2006 and June 19, 2006 to verify that the project on the subject parcel conforms to project plans in file PLN060121.

   (d) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department for the proposed development found in Project File PLN060121.

2. **FINDING:** **SITE SUITABILITY** – The site is physically suitable for the use proposed.

   EVIDENCE: (a) The project has been reviewed for site suitability by the following departments and agencies: RMA - Planning Department, Salinas Rural Fire Protection District, Public Works, Environmental Health Division, and Water Resources Agency. There has been no indication from these departments/agencies that the site is not suitable for the proposed development. Conditions recommended have been incorporated.

   (b) The Geotechnical Report and the Final EIR prepared for the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan indicate that there are not physical or environmental constraints that would indicate that the site is not suitable for the use propose. The following reports have been prepared:

   • "Final Environmental Impact Report for the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan (EIR 80-100), prepared by Grunwald, Crawford and Associates, Hanford, CA, 1982.

   • "Geotechnical Soils-Foundation and Geological Hazards Report" prepared by Grice Engineering, Salinas CA, April 2006.

   (c) Staff conducted site visits on May 12 and June 19, 2006 to verify that the site is suitable for this use.

   (d) Materials in Project File PLN060121.

3. **FINDING:** **CEQA (Exempt): -** The project is categorically exempt from environmental review.

EVIDENCE: (a) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15303 (Class 3) categorically exempts new construction of limited new small facilities, such as the construction of a single-family home in a residential area.

(b) The EIR prepared for the Las Palmas Ranch Specific Plan includes development of the subject parcel in its review. Mitigation measures identified in the EIR for reducing impacts to visual resources and wildlife have been incorporated in the project as designed and conditioned.

(c) No adverse environmental effects were identified during staff review of the development application during site visits on May 12 and June 19, 2006.

(d) See preceding and following findings and supporting evidence.

4. **FINDING:** **NO VIOLATIONS -** The subject property is in compliance with all rules and regulations pertaining to zoning uses, subdivision, and any other applicable provisions of the County's zoning ordinance. No violations exist on the property. Zoning violation abatement costs, if any, have been paid.

EVIDENCE: (a) Staff reviewed Monterey County RMA - Planning Department and Building Services Department Monterey County records and is not aware of any violations existing on subject property.

5. **FINDING:** **HEALTH AND SAFETY -** The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the project applied for will not under the circumstances of this particular case be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the County.

EVIDENCE: (a) Preceding findings and supporting evidence.

6. **FINDING:** **VISUAL SENSITIVITY** – The project as described and conditioned is consistent with Policy 26.1.6.1 in the Toro Area Plan, which requires that development in areas near the Highway 68 Scenic Corridor designated as Visually Sensitive on the Toro Visual Sensitivity map will not adversely affect the scenic beauty of the area.

EVIDENCE: The project has been modified to be consistent with the following policies that require additional land use controls to regulate development within the scenic corridor, and in doing so protects the scenic value of the area.

(a) **Landscaping:** Policy 26.1.6.1 in the Toro Area Plan, and Policy 40.2.1 in the General Plan, requires that landscape controls be implemented for projects within the Highway 68 Scenic Corridor, and encourages the use of native plants. Within the Las Palmas Specific Plan, Design and Sensitivity Policy I.7 requires informal massing or irregularly spaced trees to screen development. The project has been conditioned to require the use of native shrubs and the use of 24" box native live oaks to provide immediate screening, and the locating the plants a significant distance from the Eucalyptus to avoid interfering with the plant growth and development. Consistent with Design and Sensitivity Policy I.3.D, the project retains the existing significant trees on the site. Condition #6

(Exhibit D) requires that a monitoring contract be implemented to endure the long-term health and success of the existing and additional landscape screening. Condition #8 requires placing the landscaped area within a permanent conservation easement. The landscape screening as outlined in condition #6 should when planted immediately reduce the visual impacts of the proposed project, and screen the majority of the project from view within the Highway 68 corridor within 10 years, thereby protecting the scenic resources of the site.

(b) **Siting and Design:** To regulate development and protect visual resources within the scenic corridor, Policy 26.1.6.1 in the Toro Area Plan requires evaluating the siting of buildings, and Policy 40.2.3 in the General Plan requires the use of architectural controls and siting. Within the Las Palmas Specific Plan, Design and Sensitivity Policy I.4 requires natural materials and earth tone colors on exterior surfaces. Consistent with these policies, the project incorporates the use of earth tone colors which mimic the color of the natural surroundings. The building pads for the proposed structures were lowered from 5 to 6 feet to reduce the overall height and mass of the proposed structures. The structures are sited away from the portion of the parcel closest to Highway 68, reducing the visual impact of the proposed development from the scenic corridor.

7. **FINDING:** **OPEN SPACE**– The project is consistent with policy 40.2.2 in the Monterey County General Plan, which states that where land is designated for development at a density which would diminish scenic quality, the owner shall be encouraged to voluntarily dedicate a scenic easement to protect the scenic corridor.

EVIDENCE: Project condition # 8, Exhibit D requires that a scenic easement shall be conveyed to the County over those portions of the property where the slope exceeds 30 percent, and for the northern portion of the property starting 100 feet from the edge of the gym and extending to the Northern property boundary to protect views from the scenic corridor.

8. **FINDING:** **APPEALABILITY** - The decision on this project is appealable to the Planning Commission.

EVIDENCE: Section 21.80.040 B of the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 21).

*Planning and Building Inspection Department Condition Compliance & Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**	*Project Name:* Persall *File No:* PLN060121 *APN:* 139-211-035-000 *Approval by:* Zoning Administrator *Date:* October 26, 2006

**Monitoring or Reporting refers to projects with an EIR or adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration per Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.*

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
1.		**PBD029 - SPECIFIC USES ONLY** The Administrative Permit (PLN060121) and Design Approval allows for the construction of an attached 1,053 square foot Caretaker's unit, and the Design Approval allows for the construction of a 9,940 square foot single family dwelling with an attached 1,076 square foot four-car garage, an attached 3,617 square foot gym; and associated grading (350 cubic yards cut and 350 cubic yards fill). The property is located on parcel "Q" in the Las Palmas Subdivision, Salinas (Assessor's Parcel Number 139-211-035-000), south of River Road and west of Las Palmas Road, Toro Area. This permit was approved in accordance with County ordinances and land use regulations subject to the following terms and conditions. Neither the uses nor the construction allowed by this permit shall commence unless and until all of the conditions of this permit are met to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning. Any use or construction not in substantial conformance with the terms and conditions of this permit is a violation of County regulations and may result in modification or revocation of this permit and subsequent legal action. No use or construction other than that specified by this permit is allowed unless additional permits are approved by the appropriate authorities. **(RMA – Planning Department)**	Adhere to conditions and uses specified in the permit.	Owner/ Applicant	Ongoing unless otherwise stated	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
2.		**PBD025 - NOTICE-PERMIT APPROVAL** The applicant shall record a notice which states: "A permit (Resolution _____) was approved by the Zoning Administrator for Assessor's Parcel Number 139-211-035-000 on October 26, 2006. The permit was granted subject to **20** conditions of approval which run with the land. A copy of the permit is on file with the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department." Proof of recordation of this notice shall be furnished to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection prior to issuance of building permits or commencement of the use. **(RMA – Planning Department)**	Proof of recordation of this notice shall be furnished to PBI.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Issuance of grading and building permits or start of use.	
3.		**PBD011 - EROSION CONTROL PLAN AND SCHEDULE** The approved development shall incorporate the recommendations of the Erosion Control Plan as reviewed by the Soils Conservation Service and the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. All cut and/or fill slopes exposed during the course of construction be covered, seeded, or otherwise treated to control erosion during the course of construction, subject to the approval of the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. The improvement and grading plans shall include an implementation schedule of measures for the prevention and control of erosion, siltation and dust during and immediately following construction and until erosion control planting becomes established. This program shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. **(RMA – Planning Department)**	1) Evidence of compliance with the Erosion Control Plan shall be submitted to PBI prior to issuance of building and grading permits.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Issuance of Grading and Building Permits	
			2) Evidence of compliance with the Implementation Schedule shall be submitted to PBI during the course of construction until project completion as approved by the Director of PBI.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Final Inspect-ion	
4.		**PBD013(A) - GEOTECHNICAL CERTIFICATION** Prior to final inspection, the geotechnical consultant shall provide certification that all development has been constructed in accordance with the geotechnical report. **(RMA – Planning**	Provide certification from geotechnical consultant that all development has been constructed in accordance with the geotechnical report.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Final Inspect-ion	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		Department)				
5.		**PBD014 - GRADING-WINTER RESTRICTION** No land clearing or grading shall occur on the subject parcel between October 15th and April 15th unless authorized by the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. (**RMA – Planning Department)**	None	Owner/ Applicant	October 15th to April 15th	
6.		**PBDSP001- LANDSCAPE PLAN AND MAINTENANCE (SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING ONLY) (NON-STANDARD)** The site shall be landscaped. At least 60 days prior to occupancy, three (3) copies of a landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for approval. A landscape plan review fee is required for this project. Fees shall be paid at the time of landscape plan submittal. The landscaping plan shall be in sufficient detail to identify the location, species, and size of the proposed landscaping materials and shall be accompanied by a nursery or contractor's estimate of the cost of installation of the plan. With the exception of landscaping immediately around the house, the landscape shall consist of entirely native species. At least 50 trees shall be planted. At least 75 percent of the trees shall be live oaks, consisting of 50% 24" box, 25% 15 gallon,	Submit landscape plans and contractor's estimate to PBI for review and approval.	Owner/ Applicant/ Contractor	At least 60 days prior to final inspection or occupancy	
			All landscaped areas and fences shall be continuously maintained by the applicant; all plant material shall be continuously maintained in a litter-free, weed-free, healthy, growing condition.	Owner/ Applicant	Ongoing	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		and 25% 5 gallon trees. Ten percent of trees shall be California Buckeye. All plants and trees shall be located outside of the Eucalyptus tree canopies. A total of 5 landscape berms shall be installed, and planted with native shrubs. Berms shall be designed by a civil or geotechnical engineer. No trees shall be planted on the berms. The berms shall be located a minimum of 20 feet from any hillside, and shall not be located under the Eucalyptus canopies. The landscape shall be designed to provide a solid screen between the structures and views from Highway 68. Before occupancy, landscaping shall be either installed or a certificate of deposit or other form of surety made payable to Monterey County for that cost estimate shall be submitted to the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. All landscaped areas and fences shall be continuously maintained by the applicant; all plant material shall be continuously maintained in a litter-free, weed-free, healthy, growing condition. **(RMA – Planning Department)**	2. Obtain a contract with a certified arborist or ecologist to perform monitoring actions listed under 3 below. Provide copy of contract to the Planning Department for approval.	Owner/ Applicant	At least 60 days prior to final inspection or occupancy	
			3. Submit reports to the Director of Planning and Building Inspection for review. Report shall address progress of planted trees. If any of the required trees fail to survive or maintain a healthy condition at the end of five years, the project arborist shall recommend additional planting. Any replanting shall start a new 5-year monitoring period for the additional trees.	Owner/ Applicant	Annually during required monitoring period.	
7.		**PBD – LIGHTING – EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN (NON-STANDARD)** All exterior lighting shall be unobtrusive, down-lit, harmonious with the local area, and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. Exterior lights shall have recessed lighting	Submit three copies of the lighting plans to RMA – Planning Department for review and approval.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Issuance of Grading and/or Building Permits	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		elements. Exterior lighting shall be limited to that required for safety purposes only. The applicant shall submit 3 copies of an exterior lighting plan which shall indicate the location, type, and wattage of all light fixtures and include catalog sheets for each fixture. The lighting plan shall comply with the requirements of the California Energy Code set for in California code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6. The exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Director of the RMA - Planning Department, prior to the issuance of building permits. **(RMA - Planning Department)**	The lighting shall be installed and maintained in accordance with approved plans.	Owner/ Applicant	On-going	
8.		**PBDSP003 – EASEMENT - SCENIC (NON-STANDARD)** A scenic easement shall be conveyed to the County over those portions of the property where the slope exceeds 30 percent, and for the northern portion of the property as shown on the scenic easement map (Exhibit H). A driveway shall be allowed within the scenic easement. A scenic easement deed shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Director of Planning prior to issuance of grading or building permits. **(RMA - Planning Department)**	Submit scenic easement to PBI for approval.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Issuance of Grading and Building Permits	
9.		**PBD030 - STOP WORK - RESOURCES FOUND** If, during the course of construction, cultural, archaeological, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered at the site (surface or subsurface resources) work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until a qualified professional archaeologist can evaluate it. The Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department and a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Society of Professional Archaeologists) shall be immediately contacted by the responsible individual present on-site. When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation	Stop work within 50 meters (165 feet) of uncovered resource and contact the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department and a qualified archaeologist immediately if cultural, archaeological, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered. When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for the discovery.	Owner/ Applicant/ Archaeologist	Ongoing	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		measures required for the discovery. **(RMA – Planning Department)**				
10		**PBD032(B) – TREE AND ROOT PROTECTION** Trees which are located close to the construction site(s) shall be protected from inadvertent damage from construction equipment by fencing off the canopy driplines and/or critical root zones (whichever is greater) with protective materials, wrapping trunks with protective materials, avoiding fill of any type against the base of the trunks and avoiding an increase in soil depth at the feeding zone or drip-line of the retained trees. Said protection shall be demonstrated prior to issuance of building permits subject to the approval of the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. **(RMA – Planning Department)**	Submit evidence of tree protection to PBI for review and approval. Tree preservation specifications listed in the Forest Management Plan shall be printed on the grading and building permit. Installation of the tree preservation zone and straw bale barricades shall be completed prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits. Submit evidence of tree protection to PBI for review and approval.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to Issuance of Grading and/or Building Permits	
WATER RESOURCE AGENCY CONDITIONS (831) 755-4860						
11		**WR1 - DRAINAGE PLAN** The applicant shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer or architect addressing on-site and off-site impacts. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency. **(Water Resources Agency)**	Submit 3 copies of the engineered drainage plan to the Water Resources Agency for review and approval.	Owner/ Applicant/ Engineer	Prior to issuance of any grading or building permits	
12		**WR40 - WATER CONSERVATION MEASURES** The applicant shall comply with Ordinance No. 3932, or as subsequently amended, of the Monterey County Water Resources Agency pertaining to mandatory water conservation regulations. The regulations for new construction require, but are not limited to: a. All toilets shall be ultra-low flush toilets with a maximum tank size or flush capacity of 1.6 gallons, all shower heads shall have a maximum flow capacity of 2.5	Compliance to be verified by building inspector at final inspection.	Owner/ Applicant	Prior to final building inspect-ion/ occupancy	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		gallons per minute, and all hot water faucets that have more than ten feet of pipe between the faucet and the hot water heater serving such faucet shall be equipped with a hot water recirculation system. b. Landscape plans shall apply xeriscape principles, including such techniques and materials as native or low water use plants and low precipitation sprinkler heads, bubblers, drip irrigation systems and timing devices. **(Water Resources Agency)**				
FIRE AGENCY CONDITIONS **Salinas Rural Fire Protection District: (831) 455-1828**						
13		**FIRE007 - DRIVEWAYS** Driveways shall not be less than 12 feet wide unobstructed, with an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 15 feet. The grade for all driveways shall not exceed 15 percent. Where the grade exceeds 8 percent, a minimum structural roadway surface of 0.17 feet of asphaltic concrete on 0.34 feet of aggregate base shall be required. The driveway surface shall be capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus (22 tons), and be accessible by conventional-drive vehicles, including sedans. For driveways with turns 90 degrees and less, the minimum horizontal inside radius of curvature shall be 25 feet. For driveways with turns greater than 90 degrees, the minimum horizontal inside radius curvature shall be 28 feet. For all driveway turns, an additional surface of 4 feet shall be added. All driveways exceeding 150 feet in length, but less than 800 feet in length, shall provide a turnout near the midpoint of the driveway. Where the driveway exceeds 800 feet, turnouts shall be provided at no greater than 400-foot intervals. Turnouts shall be a minimum of 12 feet	Applicant shall incorporate specification into design and enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permit.	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection.	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		wide and 30 feet long with a minimum of 25-foot taper at both ends. Turnarounds shall be required on driveways in excess of 150 feet of surface length and shall long with a minimum 25-foot taper at both ends. Turnarounds shall be required on driveways in excess of 150 feet of surface length and shall be located within 50 feet of the primary building. The minimum turning radius for a turnaround shall be 40 feet from the center line of the driveway. If a hammerhead/T is used, the top of the "T" shall be a minimum of 60 feet in length. (**Salinas Rural Fire District**)				
14		**FIRE008 - GATES** All gates providing access from a road to a driveway shall be located at least 30 feet from the roadway and shall open to allow a vehicle to stop without obstructing traffic on the road. Gate entrances shall be at least the width of the traffic lane but in no case less than 12 feet wide. Where a one-way road with a single traffic lane provides access to a gated entrance, a 40-foot turning radius shall be used. Where gates are to be locked, the installation of a key box or other acceptable means for immediate access by emergency equipment may be required. . (**Salinas Rural Fire District**)	Applicant shall incorporate specification into design and enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permit.	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection.	
15		**FIRE011 - ADDRESSES FOR BUILDINGS** All buildings shall be issued an address in accordance with Monterey County Ordinance No. 1241. Each occupancy, except accessory buildings, shall have its own permanently posted address. When multiple occupancies exist within a single building, each individual occupancy shall be separately identified by its own address. Letters, numbers	Applicant shall incorporate specification into design and enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of building permit.	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		and symbols for addresses shall be a minimum of 4-inch height, 1/2-inch stroke, contrasting with the background color of the sign, and shall be Arabic. The sign and numbers shall be reflective and made of a noncombustible material. Address signs shall be placed at each driveway entrance and at each driveway split. Address signs shall be and visible from both directions of travel along the road. In all cases, the address shall be posted at the beginning of construction and shall be maintained thereafter. Address signs along one-way roads shall be visible from both directions of travel. Where multiple addresses are required at a single driveway, they shall be mounted on a single sign. Where a roadway provides access solely to a single commercial occupancy, the address sign shall be placed at the nearest road intersection providing access to that site. Permanent address numbers shall be posted prior to requesting final clearance. (**Salinas Rural Fire District**)	Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection.	
16		**FIRE016 - SETBACKS** All parcels 1 acre and larger shall provide a minimum 30-foot setback for new buildings and accessory buildings from all property lines and/or the center of the road. For parcels less than 1 acre, alternate fuel modification standards or other requirements may be imposed by the local fire jurisdiction to provide the same practical effect. . (**Salinas Rural Fire District**)	Applicant shall incorporate specification into design and enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permit.	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection.	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
17		**FIRE017 - DISPOSAL OF VEGETATION AND FUELS** Disposal, including chipping, burying, or removal to a landfill site approved by the local jurisdiction, of vegetation and debris caused by site development and construction, road and driveway construction, and fuel modification shall be completed prior to final clearance of the related permit. . **(Salinas Rural Fire District)**	Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection.	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
18		**FIRE019 - DEFENSIBLE SPACE REQUIREMENTS - (STANDARD)** Remove combustible vegetation from within a minimum of 30 feet of structures. Limb trees 6 feet up from ground. Remove limbs within 10 feet of chimneys. Additional and/or alternate fire protection or firebreaks approved by the fire authority may be required to provide reasonable fire safety. Environmentally sensitive areas may require alternative fire protection, to be determined by Reviewing Authority and the Director of Planning and Building Inspection. **(Salinas Rural Fire District)**	Applicant shall incorporate specification into design and enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permit.	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection.	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection.	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
19		**FIRE024 - FIRE ALARM SYSTEM - (SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING)** The residence shall be fully protected with an approved household fire warning system as defined by NFPA Standard 72. Plans and specifications for the household fire warning system shall be submitted by a California licensed C-10 contractor and approved prior to installation.	Applicant shall enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of building permit.	
			Applicant shall submit fire alarm plans and obtain approval.	Applicant or owner	Prior to rough sprinkler	

Permit Cond. No.	*Mitig. No.*	*Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department*	*Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.*	*Responsible Party for Compliance*	*Timing*	*Verification of Compliance (name/date)*
		Household fire warning systems installed in lieu of single-station smoke alarms required by the Uniform Building Code shall be required to be placarded as permanent building equipment. **(Salinas Rural Fire District)**			or framing inspection	
			Applicant shall schedule fire alarm system acceptance test.	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
20		**FIRE021 - FIRE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS - FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM (STANDARD)** The building(s) and attached garage(s) shall be fully protected with automatic fire sprinkler system(s). Installation shall be in accordance with the applicable NFPA standard. A minimum of four (4) sets of plans for fire sprinkler systems must be submitted by a California licensed C-16 contractor and approved prior to installation. This requirement is not intended to delay issuance of a building permit. A rough sprinkler inspection must be scheduled by the installing contractor and completed prior to requesting a framing inspection. **(Salinas Rural Fire District)**	Applicant shall enumerate as "Fire Dept. Notes" on plans.	Applicant or owner	Prior to issuance of building permit.	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. rough sprinkler inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to framing inspection	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. final sprinkler inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
			Applicant shall schedule fire dept. clearance inspection	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	
			Applicant shall schedule fire alarm system acceptance test.	Applicant or owner	Prior to final building inspection	