

Public Comment #67  
BOS RCVD 6/19/2026

**From:** [danderly@comcast.net](mailto:danderly@comcast.net)  
**To:** [BOS-Clerk of the Board](#)  
**Subject:** Comments re Appeal of Application for "Open Storage"  
**Date:** Friday, June 19, 2026 2:59:52 PM

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Design Review Permit DR24-001/Business Drive Open Storage Lot

As presented, the project should not be relieved of environmental review (CEQA Exemption) at this time due to the following reason:

**The project has not been adequately defined. What is being stored? What is temporary open storage? Exceptions to standards? All this information is missing! Therefore, how can one determine if the project is subject to CEQA without adequate information about the project. *What is the project?***

The project was approved at the staff level, and notice of the approval of “temporary open storage” in the Industrial District was sent to surrounding property owners. The notice failed to mention any foreseeable landscaping variances or define the project other than “open storage.”

The obvious omission in describing the project was defining “temporary.” Was the land to be used only for a limited amount of time? Was “temporary” to mean that goods would be stored temporarily but that there would never be an end to using the land for “temporary storage”?

Another omission was the type of material to be stored on the property, e.g., trash left over from other projects? uranium? cow manure? garbage? wrecked automobiles? toxic chemicals?

An obvious oversight/omission is that a variance was not indicated.

Landscaping is required along EVERY roadway, and it was missing from at least one of the roadways.

Would the storage material be screened?

What are the impacts on nearby residents and the adjacent business park, such as visual, hours of operation, noise, dust, odor, etc.? No representative of the project and no staff member had the answer to that question.

Why should exceptions to development standards be made for “open storage” when:

*The number of employees typically employed on a 4.5-acre parcel with industrial buildings might number about 40 and open storage – zilch.*

*No increase in property tax is foreseen when no structures are built, and*

*Without time limits on storage, opportunities for superior industrial endeavors could be lost to the County indefinitely.*

There is already a business park adjacent to the project site, which is what contributes more to our community than dead storage seeking exceptions, that is., landscaping.

Personally, as a professional planner, depending on the location and the need for open storage, there should be a time limit established so as to provide for industrial opportunities that would be of greater benefit to the community in the future.

Regards,

Dyana Anderly, AICP (American Institute of Certified Planners);

Master's Degree, Planning, University of Southern California;

Member of Association of Environmental Professionals.