

Lenzi, Chelsea

---

**From:** theokracke@gmail.com on behalf of Theo Kracke <theo@paradiseretreats.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 02, 2017 1:44 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Subject:** Important historic STR areas have been excluded from "Attachment 8 Overlay Ordinance Final"  
**Attachments:** Historic STR Property Areas - SB County.pdf  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear SB County Board of Supervisors:

Please find attached a report of areas that have been excluded from "Attachment 8 Overlay Ordinance Final".

Some important areas that have been historically used for Short Term Rentals have been excluded from the Overlay.

Eliminating these areas from the ordinance will reduce the availability of lower-cost visitor accommodations in the Coastal Zone, and therefore should be preserved. The areas are:

- Summerland**
- Padaro Lane**
- Sand Point & Sandyland Cove**
- More Mesa Shores**

Paradise Retreats has been managing properties in these areas since we began in 2007. However many of the properties started renting earlier than the date Paradise Retreats was hired to manage the property.

To visualize the location of these properties, please [Click Here](#) to see a map of those properties, with color-coded pins that indicate the year each property was first rented as an STR by Paradise Retreats.

**REQUEST: Would you please consider directing Staff to add Summerland, Padaro Lane, Sand Point, Sandyland Cove, and More Mesa Shores to the "Attachment 8 Overlay Ordinance Final" document?**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Theo

--

Theo Kracke  
 President  
 Paradise Retreats  
 World Class Vacation Rentals, LLC  
[theo@paradiseretreats.com](mailto:theo@paradiseretreats.com)

## Historic Short Term Rental Property Areas - Santa Barbara County (unincorporated areas)

NOTE: Documented proof of reservations for these properties can be provided upon request

| Name                      | Address                 | City, State, ZIP       | Earliest Date Rented (by Paradise Retreats) | Included in "Attachment 8 Overlay Ordinance-final"? |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| Montecito Village Retreat | 1340 Virginia Road      | Montecito CA 93108     | 29-Dec-07                                   | No  |
| Villa Primavera           | 1255 Spring Road        | Montecito CA 93108     | 26-Jun-09                                   | No  |
| Driftwood Beach Retreat   | 4347 Avenue Del Mar     | Carpinteria CA 93013   | 3-Oct-08                                    | No  |
| Casa Padaro               | 3339 Padaro Lane        | Carpinteria, CA 93013  | 30-Apr-10                                   | No  |
| Sand Castle Retreat       | 4257 Del Mar Avenue     | Carpinteria CA 93013   | 16-Aug-10                                   | No  |
| Casa Blanca               | 869 Sand Point Lane     | Carpinteria CA 93013   | 8-Feb-12                                    | No  |
| Bare Feet Beach Retreat   | 2274 Whitney Ave.       | Summerland CA 93108    | 30-Mar-09                                   | No  |
| Summer Hill Retreat       | 2319 Whitney Avenue     | Summerland CA93067     | 15-Jun-12                                   | No  |
| Villa Ballena             | 5205 Austin Road        | Santa Barbara CA 93111 | 22-Dec-07                                   | No  |
| Miramar Beach Retreat     | 1540 Miramar Beach Road | Montecito CA 93108     | 9-Aug-08                                    | Yes   |
| Miramar Beach House       | 1504 Miramar Beach Road | Montecito CA 93108     | 7-Mar-12                                    | Yes   |
| Sand Dollar Retreat       | 57 Humphrey Road        | Montecito CA 93108     | 20-Dec-07                                   | Yes   |
| Seaside Cottage           | 59 Humphrey Road        | Montecito CA 93108     | 2-Jun-08                                    | Yes   |
| Sea Ranch                 | 1361 Danielson Road     | Montecito CA 93108     | 24-Jun-10                                   | Yes   |



# Santa Barbara County Farm Bureau

Affiliated with the California Farm Bureau Federation and the American Farm Bureau Federation

October 2, 2017

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
Attn: Honorable Joan Hartmann, Chair  
105 East Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: Short Term Rentals

Dear Chairman Hartmann and members of the Board,

Santa Barbara County Farm Bureau (SBCFB) Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) representative Paul Van Leer, brought to our attention the Board intends to consider allowing homestays on AG-1 or residential properties and farmstays on AG-II properties, but limiting short term rentals (STRs) to zones where other types of visitor serving accommodations are currently allowed and to areas in which vacation rentals have been historically located.

*On behalf of the Santa Barbara County Farm Bureau (SBCFB) and its 500 farmer and rancher members we appreciate your consideration of homestays and farmstays on agricultural properties, we would also like to express (1) support of allowing STRs on AG-I and AG-II properties and (2) disagreement with the position that STRs are not a compatible use on contracted lands.*

First, the SBCFB supports allowing STRs (as well as homestays and/or farmstays) on AG-I and AG-II properties because of the importance of a supplementary revenue stream to many agricultural operations in the county.

Many agricultural operations, particularly smaller ones, struggle to remain viable in Santa Barbara County, in part because of exceedingly high land costs, and this is one tangible way that the Board could help ensure their continued existence, which is arguably a benefit not just to the owners but to the county as a whole.

Second, the SBCFB believes that STRs can, in many cases, be a compatible use on contracted lands. Land enrolled in the Agricultural Preserve Program "must be principally used for commercial agriculture, and ...compatible activities should be supportive to that agriculture"(emphasis added). It is our view that if the property is in fact used principally for agriculture, and the STR use is subordinate to that principal use, then the STRs would not violate that imperative. As for the suggestion that the use "should be supportive of agriculture" it is the view of the SBCFB that having some amount of supplemental income

generated by these STRs would, in many cases, be highly supportive in the most practical sense of the property's agricultural use.

While we do understand that there may be competing interests in different parts of the County and that the character of agriculturally zoned land can vary in different districts, we believe that the resulting concerns can be best addressed in the isolated incidents in which they may occur by imposing objective standards for potentially problematic issues (for example, by utilizing the previously suggested Good Neighbor Policy), rather than by imposing broad-brush prohibitions on this potential supplemental income for owners of agricultural properties.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Russell Doty

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RDoty", written in a cursive style.

President