

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:

Prepared on: July 1, 2004
Department Name: Planning & Development
Department No.: 053
Agenda Date: July 13, 2004
Placement: Departmental
Estimate Time: 4 hour
Continued Item: NO
If Yes, date from:
Document File Name: G:\Group\Comp\Planning Areas\Santa Ynez\Community Plan\2000 Plan\Hearings-Meetings\BOS Initiation\Staff Report\Board Letter

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Val Alexeeff, Director
Planning & Development

STAFF CONTACT: Stephen Peterson, Comprehensive Planning Division
884-6836

SUBJECT: Initiation of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan

Recommendation(s):

That the Board of Supervisors adopt the attached Resolution formally initiating the Comprehensive Plan amendments, including related rezones, proposed in the *Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Initiation Draft Project Description*.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendation is primarily aligned with Goal No. 1, An Efficient Government Able to Respond Effectively to the Needs of the Community; Goal No. 2, A Safe and Healthy Community in Which to Live, Work, and Visit; Goal No. 4, A Community that is Economically Vital and Sustainable; and Goal No. 5, A High Quality of Life for All Residents.

Executive Summary and Discussion:

I. INTRODUCTION

This staff report provides the Board of Supervisors and the public with an overview of the primary issues raised by the initiation of the *Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Initiation Draft Project Description* for environmental review. The initiation process allows the Board and the public an opportunity to understand the proposed land use/zoning changes and new Goals/Policies/Actions/Development Standards which would be the

subject of environmental review, and to provide early input on the range of changes and issues which should be considered as part of the plan process.

Effect of Initiation on Pending and Future Projects: County regulations require that land use permits issued be consistent with both the existing land use and zoning regulations that are in place and any initiated land use and zoning regulations proposed as part of a community plan. In contrast, discretionary permits such as development plans or conditional use permits must only be consistent with the rules in place at the time of decision. Tentative parcel maps (subdivisions) are governed by the rules in effect when the project application is deemed complete by P&D.

Review Process and Tentative Schedule: After the Board adopts a Resolution to initiate the changes proposed in the *Initiation Draft Project Description*, staff will begin preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to analyze the environmental effects of the proposed project *and a reasonable range of alternatives*. A meeting to discuss the proper scope of the EIR will be held in the Fall, and the subsequently prepared draft EIR will be the subject of at least one public hearing to explain the findings of the EIR and gather public testimony on its accuracy and completeness. Once the environmental review is completed and the possible impacts associated with the proposed project and various alternatives are known, a *Revised Draft Plan* will be prepared and presented to the County Planning Commission for its public hearing(s) beginning in spring 2005. At such hearing(s) the Commission will consider the EIR, public testimony, staff advice, and the *Revised Draft Plan*, and in making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for the adoption of a final Plan. The Commission's recommendations, the Plan and the EIR will be considered by the Board by Summer 2005.

II. LEGAL AUTHORITY, PURPOSE AND INTENT

1. PURPOSE AND INTENT

The Valley's appropriate land use and zoning designations were last reviewed as part of the County-Wide update to the Comprehensive Plan undertaken in 1980-81. Since that time considerable growth has occurred and new issues and development trends have emerged. Population growth and land development have raised concerns regarding the changing character of the Santa Ynez Valley. Questions regarding the long term viability of agriculture have arisen due to residential construction and the subdivision of large agricultural parcels into ranchettes. Infrastructure and public services have been impacted by the influx of new residents and the growing tourist industry. These trends, coupled with the lack of community policies and development standards in the 1980-81 Comprehensive Plan, have necessitated the development of a focused planning document for the region.

The Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan updates the Comprehensive Plan by providing focused policy direction addressing issues and development trends specific to the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Area (SYVCPA). This update is necessary to manage current conditions, facilitate proper planning, and accurately reflect the prevailing visions and objectives of the area's residents. The Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan provides the general public, landowners and decision makers with a policy framework for planning future development in the region.

2. GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS

California State law (Government Code sections 65300 et seq.) requires jurisdictions to prepare a comprehensive, long-term general plan with land use diagrams and text to guide development. The General Plan must have at least seven state mandated elements: Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise and Safety. Santa Barbara County's General Plan, (formally known as the Comprehensive Plan) includes several optional elements permitted by state law, including the Agricultural, Energy, Scenic Highways, and Environmental Resource Management Elements. General Plans must be amended regularly to remain "current". General Plans are further defined and implemented through zoning maps and ordinances, which must be consistent with the General Plan.

Local jurisdictions may prepare more focused Community or Area Plans for smaller geographic regions. Previously adopted Community and Area Plans in Santa Barbara County include Los Alamos, Summerland, Montecito, Goleta, Orcutt and Toro Canyon.

3. WHAT IS A COMMUNITY PLAN?

Community Plans focus on general planning issues pertaining to an identified geographical area or community (Public Resources Code Section 21083.3). They are commonly used in Counties or large cities that contain a variety of distinct regions. They are adopted in the same manner as a general plan amendment and are similarly implemented by local ordinances (e.g., zoning). A Community plan must include or reference each of the Comprehensive Plan's seven mandatory elements, and must be internally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan of which it is a part (State of California, General Plan Guidelines, Office of Planning and Research 1990).

The Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan includes by reference relevant policies of the County's Comprehensive Plan. The Plan also contains new development policies specific to the Santa Ynez Region along with measures to implement those policies. The policy direction and development standards of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan will govern site-specific development proposals. The applicable zoning ordinance in the plan area is Article III (Inland), of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code. Site-specific environmental review and planning permit approvals are still required for specific developments.

4. SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY PLAN PROCESS

In 2000, the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors directed Planning and Development (P&D), to proceed with the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan process as part of the approved Comprehensive Planning Division Five-Year Work Program. It is the result of a multi-year effort by the community and County involving targeted research, data collection and analysis, extensive public involvement through General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meetings, the drafting of goals, policies, and development standards by P&D, and numerous meetings with community groups and citizens. The first step in the County-sponsored process was the production of the Santa Ynez Valley Newsletter. However, prior to the release of the Santa Ynez Valley Newsletter a group of community members prepared a document called the Valley Blueprint.

The Valley Blueprint

In response to increased development and population growth, a diverse group of Santa Ynez residents released the Valley Blueprint in the fall of 2000. The Blueprint offers the participants’ collective vision for the future of the Valley, and voices their desire “to protect the unique qualities and character of [the] region while maintaining a sound base for economic sustainability of [its] quality of life”.

Although the Blueprint was not a formal part of the Community Plan Process, it played an important role in identifying planning and development issues within the Valley. It served as an indicator of community concerns and gave County Staff direction for future research. Many land use issues raised in the Valley Blueprint were explored by the GPAC, County Staff and the public through the Community Plan Process. Listed below are some of the main goals enumerated in the Blueprint.

TABLE 1: VALLEY BLUEPRINT GOALS

AREA	GOAL
Development	Preserve rural character, improve and maintain infrastructure, and protect agriculture
	Accommodate a range of housing for all income levels
	Maintain and contain distinct urban communities in the Valley
	Encourage and create open space and protect visual resources
	Increase local input into planning policies
Public Services	Easily accessible parks and recreational areas
	Programs and Facilities to serve cultural, artistic, theatrical and intellectual needs
	Improve educational facilities and resources
	Provision of comprehensive social and human services
Agricultural	Encourage and enhance the diversity, growth and evolution of agricultural enterprises
	Streamlined regulatory structure for agricultural enterprises
	Balance between resource protection and agriculture
	Keep agriculturally zoned land agricultural
Infrastructure	Improve current transportation and circulation systems
	Adequate and environmentally sound water supply and sewage treatment
	Improve the quality, visual impact, and distribution of utility infrastructure

Santa Ynez Valley Newsletter: Published in March of 2001, the Santa Ynez Valley Newsletter is an informative document that provides public information on general land use issues and trends in the Santa Ynez Valley. It contains data gathered by P&D and a discussion of concerns such as growth, community character, services, traffic, agricultural preservation, natural resource protection and wine industry related issues. This document laid the foundation for future research and was the starting point for discussions on Valley land use and planning issues.

General Plan Advisory Committee: Citizen involvement in the preparation of a community plan is required by State law, and is one of the cornerstones of the Community Plan process. The Santa Ynez Valley General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) is a diverse group of community members appointed by the Third District Supervisor. The role of the GPAC is to assist and advise the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and County staff in developing, adopting, monitoring and revising the Comprehensive Plan.

Through a series of extensively noticed public meetings, the GPAC, county staff, and interested community members discussed land use and planning issues in the region, identified areas requiring future research by County Staff, and prepared land use recommendations. Over a period of nearly 2 years, a total of 35 meetings were held to discuss a wide range of issues including:

- Land Use and Zoning
- Public Services
- Parks, Recreation and Trails
- Biological Resources
- Visual Resources
- Agricultural Tourism and Wineries
- Water, Waste Water, and Flood Hazards
- Circulation and Highways
- Community Design

Community involvement through the GPAC process provided the following opportunities for County staff and planning area residents:

- To gather information and insight concerning the needs, visions, resources and unique nature of the community from the people most familiar with the Valley;
- To inform residents, business owners, and interested parties about the planning process;
- To give members of the community an opportunity to participate in the planning process;
- To build consensus for the approval of the plan and strengthen the ability of community members to be involved in its implementation

Collaboration with the Agricultural Advisory Committee and Community Groups: In August 2003 the Board directed P&D staff to work with the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and community groups to further refine controversial components of the plan and to develop alternative approaches to these issues for consideration in the EIR. As a result, staff met with the AAC eight times and with community groups on dozens of occasions. This collaboration culminated in three well-attended public meetings held in the Valley this Spring where the community had an opportunity to express concerns and ask questions. Based on the input from the AAC, community groups and the public, P&D identified how the controversial issues would be addressed in the project description and EIR alternatives.

III. SUMMARY OF PLAN COMPONENTS

The Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan was initially comprised of two components: The Preliminary Initiation Draft (PID) and The Issues and Alternatives Paper (IAP). These two documents, along with input from the recent community meeting process, served as the basis for the staff report and the *Initiation Draft Project Description* (Appendix B). The Initiation Draft Project Description is a stand alone document, built around the super element format, encompassing the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan's proposed goals,

policies, actions, and development standards; land use, zoning, and Comprehensive Plan map documents; and applicable draft zoning ordinance amendments and guidelines.

This staff report focuses on highlighting those issues that have been most controversial and seemed most worthy of the Board's attention. They include: housing, rural land use, design overlay and trails.

The two previously released components of the draft plan (PID and IAP) have also been submitted to the Board as further background information on the evolution of the draft plan.

The *Preliminary Initiation Draft (PID)* covered the aspects of the plan that were less controversial and more broadly agreed upon during the plan process. These components included: circulation, parks, police/fire and historic resources, among others.

The *Issues and Alternatives Paper (IAP)* highlighted the aspects of the plan that had been most controversial and seemingly deserved more analysis. The IAP covered: housing, rural land use, design controls, trails and environmentally sensitive habitat protection.

IV. CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED

A. HOUSING

Like all areas of the County, the Santa Ynez Valley received a state-mandated housing allocation from SBCAG. One of the most challenging components of the Community Plan process has been developing a "Valley-appropriate" approach to providing these 580 housing units that does not negatively impact the scenic, rural, small-town character of the area. Early on, this discussion was shifted from the countywide Housing Element Update process to the more local Community Plan process. After extensive discussion, community groups, citizens, the GPAC and staff support a core approach to housing that is projected to provide 520 of the 580 units allocated to the Valley.

Core Approach to Providing Housing: The "Core Approach" consists of three components (Mixed-Use, Second Units, and Agricultural Employee Housing):

Mixed-Use: Development of mixed-use projects featuring both commercial and residential uses in the town centers of Los Olivos and Santa Ynez has been supported throughout the plan process by the community, the GPAC, and staff. The Plan includes a proposal for application of a new Mixed-Use Overlay zone (MU-SYV) crafted specially for the Valley. The overlay zone was designed to generate opportunities for in-fill housing, maintain the pedestrian-oriented character of the old town areas, ensure attractive and compatible architectural design of future projects, reduce regulatory barriers to mixed-use development and prohibit uses that conflict with the townships' rural ambiance. The overlay was applied to town center areas in Los Olivos and Santa Ynez that are currently zoned C-2 (General Commercial) or CH (Highway Commercial). The draft text of the

proposed Mixed-Use Overlay is included in the Initiation Draft Project Description (Appendix B.3.a). Development proposals with over 50% of their square footage dedicated to residential uses will require a Conditional Use Permit.

Second Units: Residential second units were broadly supported as an approach to provide new rental housing opportunities. Second units are limited in size and generally are rented at moderate rates. They do not create a substantial change in the visual landscape as they are integrated into existing neighborhoods.

It is widely acknowledged that in many neighborhoods in the Valley 20% to 30% of properties have been developed with second units. A large percentage of these second units were built illegally, without County permits. Many speculate that the high cost of water and sewer hook up fees and increased tax assessments on the property as a result of the second unit caused landowners to construct the units without permits. The County plans to work with service districts to find a way to reduce these financial barriers and ensure the districts costs are covered.

In December 2003, the County adopted amendments to the regulations governing second units. Most importantly, the new regulations allow attached and detached second units with a ministerial rather than discretionary permit on residentially zoned properties. As part of the Housing Element process, the County will consider amendments to the zoning ordinance to allow residential second units in all agricultural zone districts with a ministerial permit on parcels that are not enrolled in the County's Agricultural Preserve Program.

Agricultural Employee Housing: Increasing the amount of housing available on farms and ranches for agricultural employees was broadly supported throughout the Community plan process. Historically, the production of agricultural employee housing in the Valley has been minimal, with only 40 units produced Valley-wide between 1993 and 2000. Under the Housing Element the County will consider ordinance amendments to increase the production of agricultural employee units by:

- reducing permit requirements from discretionary to ministerial
- conducting a countywide study of agricultural employee housing needs
- seeking CDBG funding for agricultural employee housing
- supporting applicants seeking state and federal agricultural employee housing funds with technical assistance, local gap funding or written support letters
- working cooperatively with cities within the County to provide housing within urban areas that meets the needs of agricultural employees

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC endorsed the Core Approach and recommended considering rezoning of four sites in the Santa Ynez Township to moderate levels of density (see housing alternatives below).

AAC Recommendation: The AAC did not provide comments on Housing.

Staff Recommendation

Preliminary analysis of the “Core Approach” indicates that mixed-use projects, agricultural employee housing and second units could generate the 580 total units needed under the State mandate. However, the analysis also reveals that an adequate number of units would not be generated in the very low income category. Projections show the Core Approach is short approximately 60 units. In order to successfully plan for these units and facilitate state certification of the County’s Housing Element, P&D, community groups and housing developers have committed to work together cooperatively to identify one or more appropriate sites for a non-profit affordable housing project or low income senior citizen housing project. The site(s) would be selected during the environmental review phase of the plan process. They would be conditionally rezoned as part of the plan provided that the project proposed for the site meets stringent size, scale, bulk, massing and design standards to ensure the project is Valley-appropriate and supplies adequate numbers of affordable units. In addition, affordable units would first be made available to locals.

A Valley-focused affordable housing roundtable group has already begun meeting to identify appropriate sites. The committee consists of representatives from non-profit housing providers, community groups, the County Housing Authority, P&D, the Cities of Solvang and Buellton, the current 3rd District Supervisor’s staff, the new incoming 3rd District Supervisor’s transition team and interested members of the public.

Final projections of the numbers of units expected to be generated through the Core Approach and any selected sites will be provided in the plan’s Environmental Impact Report.

See Appendix B.2.f for a map of some potential housing sites already identified for consideration. See the Issues and Alternatives Paper for a discussion of the relative constraints of each of these sites.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

Consider the environmental impacts associated with rezoning the following specific sites to the levels of density recommended by the GPAC:

- Corner Farm/Duckett Site (APNs 141-380-014 and 008) – 5.5 acre community facility/park and 44 housing units
- Burtness Site (APNs 143-330-026, 029 and 031) – between 10 and 46 units
- Baldacchino Site (APNs 143-220-005 and 007) – between 8 and 28 units
- Hastings Site (APN 143-261-002) – between 9 and 30 units

Consider the environmental impacts associated with rezoning the following site (not recommended by the GPAC):

- Hale Site (APNs 141-201-021, 023 and 024)– between 20 and 50 units

B. RURAL LAND USE

1. PLANNING AREA BOUNDARY

The proposed 231,500 acre planning area for the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan extends north from Camino Cielo at the crest of the Santa Ynez Mountains to Alisos Canyon Road in the northwest and to the southern boundaries of the Los Padres National Forest in the northeast. It extends westward from the National Forest boundary east of Lake Cachuma, almost to Drum Canyon Road, west of the City of Buellton. The Los Padres National Forest surrounds all but the western edge of the planning area, and portions of the forest can be found within its boundaries. (See Appendix B.2.a)

As proposed, the boundaries of the community plan area match the boundaries of the Santa Ynez Valley Rural Region – one of eight rural regions in the County identified in 1998 as part of the Agricultural Element Phase II amendments for use in future rural/agricultural planning efforts. The GPAC affirmed the use of the rural region boundary as the community plan area boundary on an 11-1 vote at their June 7, 2001 meeting. The Board of Supervisors reaffirmed the planning area boundary on August 19th, 2003 after being asked by the Agricultural Advisory Committee to consider a smaller planning area based on the boundaries of the Valley’s Inner-Rural area.

Supporting arguments for maintaining the planning area boundary, as it is currently proposed, include:

- Five of six Community Plans previously adopted by the County have included rural/agricultural areas within the planning area boundary.¹ (See Table 2)
- The Board has directed that consistency rezones of rural areas from Ordinance 661 to Article III take place as part of individual Community Plan efforts.
- The proposed planning area boundary generally encompasses the watershed of the Santa Ynez Valley. It is a commonly held planning principle to consider watershed boundaries when establishing the extents of a planning area. Land use planning at the watershed level takes into account the intimate relationship between interconnected natural systems and community land use and their direct influences upon each other. Five of the six Community Plans previously adopted by the County use watersheds as a criterion in establishing their planning area boundaries.¹
- The Valley Blueprint stresses “regional inter-relatedness” and encourages that planning in the area be conducted on a Valley-wide basis - “We need to think, plan and act as a Valley” (pg. 39, Valley Blueprint). A significant proportion of the 40 committee members that created the Blueprint live in the rural portions of the Valley.
- Residents of the townships, Existing Developed Rural Neighborhoods (EDRN’s) and rural areas identify with the common community of the Santa Ynez Valley. Half of the unincorporated Valley’s 11,300 residents reside outside of the three townships. Many of the citizens most involved with the civic life of the Valley live in the rural areas.

¹ The 5 Community Plans are: Toro Canyon , Summerland, Montecito, Goleta and Orcutt. The Los Alamos Community Plan is the exception.

TABLE 2: RURAL AREAS WITHIN COMMUNITY PLANNING AREAS			
	Total Area Coverage: Acres	Total Rural Area: Acres	% of Plan Area designated rural:
Orcutt	15,655	7,999	51%
Goleta	32,286	24,367	75%
Toro Canyon	5,955	5,634	95%
Montecito	14,258	8,725	61%
Los Alamos	583	0	0%
Summerland	907	588	65%
Santa Ynez	231, 050	226,429	98%

GPAC Recommendation: Consistent with Staff Recommendation (see below).

AAC Recommendation: The AAC recommended limiting the planning area to cover only the urban and inner-rural areas. This approach would alleviate many of their other concerns with the plan related to agricultural land use and zoning since a reduced planning area would not regulate the rural area. Under that scenario, the plan area would cover approximately 20,000 acres, as opposed to 231,050 acres as now proposed. The committee contends that rural land use issues should be addressed in a countywide context, not as part of the preparation of individual community plans. The AAC recognizes that regulation of land to prevent negative impacts on agriculture is needed. However, they request that the efforts occur within a forum oriented to agriculture rather than inner-rural or urban perspectives. The AAC went ahead and provided recommendations on all rural land use components of the plan in case it is determined that the planning area boundary should stand as proposed.

Staff Recommendation

Maintain the full 231,050 acre planning area as originally proposed and reaffirmed by the Board of Supervisors in August 2003.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

Staff requests guidance on defining the boundaries for a reduced Planning Area alternative. A starting point for discussion would be to consider a Planning Area which includes only the inner-rural and urban areas (existing or proposed).

2. PARCELIZATION – MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE

Through the County Comprehensive Plan, strong goals and policies have been established to protect agriculture as an important resource countywide. Agriculture is an important component of the Valley’s economy. In addition, agricultural lands provide open space, wildlife habitat, recharge to the groundwater basins and an aesthetic appeal which contributes to the rural quality of life that is highly valued by the community. Both the Valley Blueprint and GPAC deliberations identified the important goals of maintaining

the rural character of the Valley and preserving agriculture. The community has consistently indicated that the Valley should stay the same: rural and with a strong agricultural economy.

One identified trend that undermines these goals is the continuing subdivision of large agricultural properties into smaller and smaller parcels. Not only does this trend of parcelization introduce additional development into the rural areas, with its associated impacts, but it can also result in diminished agricultural viability on parcels that are subdivided down to a size that is too small to support a productive agricultural operation. The parcelization trend contributes to changing the character of the region from one of large parcels with working agriculture to one of residential estates without working agriculture. Subdivision of agricultural land into ever-smaller parcels often leads to decreased viability on both the subject and neighboring properties and creates land use incompatibility that can threaten agricultural operations.

Figure 2 in the Issues and Alternatives Paper illustrates the extent of parcelization that has occurred in the Santa Ynez Valley from 1970 to the present. Over 400 new parcels have been created in the rural portions of the Valley during this time. Figure 3 in the Issues and Alternatives Paper depicts the potential increase in parcelization that could theoretically occur under existing land use designations in the Rural Area of the Valley. Understanding the existing land use designations and potential parcelization provides information for the community and decision-makers as to whether certain land use patterns should be updated to better reflect the land use patterns desired by the community.

At present, 12 applications for agricultural subdivisions are pending in the planning area (5 in the rural area, 7 in the inner-rural area).

Inner Rural Parcelization: The subdivision of larger working agricultural parcels into smaller residential ranchettes has been an ongoing trend in the Inner-Rural area. Much of the area is zoned Ag-I-5 (5 acre minimum parcel size). As properties have subdivided down to this level, few of them continue in active agriculture. Under current zoning, an additional 51 five acre parcels could be created in the Inner-Rural area. The true agricultural viability of a five acre parcel is very limited.

Agricultural Viability: Flexibility to adapt to different forms of agriculture contributes to the long-term preservation of agriculture in the Santa Ynez Valley. Sufficient parcel acreage is required to retain flexibility to shift production from one agricultural commodity to another depending on market forces. Excessive parcelization can limit this flexibility. For example, vineyards are unique since many varieties of wine grapes grow well on non-prime soils traditionally used for cattle grazing and are economically viable on relatively small parcels. The success of vineyards on non-prime soils might lead to the subdivision of non-prime lands to a smaller parcel size that cannot support any other crop beside grapes. Should vineyards become economically unattractive in the future or decline for other reasons, such as disease, these newly-created smaller parcels may not be large enough to support other productive agricultural operations. They would be too small for grazing and could have soils and conditions that may be inappropriate for growing other crops.

Rangeland and Minimum Parcel Size: Productive rangeland is dependent on a combination of factors including but not limited to slope, length of grazing season, water availability, soil productivity, vegetation (forage type and quality), and the total availability of contiguous rangeland. Minimum parcel sizes necessary

to sustain feasible cattle grazing operations and dry land farming were assessed by the Santa Barbara County Cattlemen's Association in a 1988 report. The Cattlemen's Association determined that the minimum grazing carrying capacity of 25-30 cattle units is necessary to sustain a viable grazing operation. During the adoption of the County's Agriculture Element, this standard was analyzed for certain areas in the county. Based upon this threshold, the minimum parcel size sufficient to support 25-30 head of cattle could result in a range of 375 to 450 acres (15 acres per head, which is characteristic of the Santa Ynez Valley) to 2,500-3,000 acres (assuming 100 acres per head, which is more typical of the Cuyama area, where there is less rainfall) (*1988 Agriculture Element (Final EIR 88-EIR-17)*).

This standard was adopted into the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual in 1993 as one factor used by the County to assess significant environmental impacts from proposed agricultural land divisions, consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Parcelization and fragmentation have been determined to significantly degrade the overall productivity and value of agricultural lands as evident under the County's environmental threshold rating system, which assigns the highest grazing value to the largest parcels. Evaluation of rural land divisions based on the cattle grazing performance standard allows for defining the minimum acreage necessary to maintain the maximum number of agricultural opportunities since almost all other agricultural activities can be conducted on less acreage than cattle grazing.

Board actions denying the subdivision of large ranchland subdivision projects based on agricultural viability concerns (such as the Solvang 594 tract map (TPM 14,265) and Mission Oaks tract map (TM14,315)) have provided one basis for reevaluating minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area as part of the Community Plan. In the case of the Solvang 594 and Mission Oaks subdivisions, the Board of Supervisors made decisive findings that parcel sizes greater than the 100-acre minimum under current zoning are required to ensure viable rangeland for grazing. Project alternatives to the proposed 100 to 250 acre parcel sizes for these projects included subdivision reconfigurations that would have maintained parcel sizes of 320, 640 and even larger acreage in order to reduce significant impacts to agriculture and maintain viable grazing land. The Board actions highlight the fact that agricultural properties of 320 or 640 acres, depending upon site-specific constraints, may still not be of sufficient size to ensure long-term productivity of grazing land. The Board's decision on Mission Oaks was challenged in court and upheld.

Residential development in rural agricultural areas can affect agricultural productivity resulting from the placement of non-agricultural uses adjacent to and within agricultural lands. Typical conflicts associated with residential development and cattle grazing include increased traffic conflicts, disturbance of livestock from trespass and off-road vehicles, attacks from domestic dogs and the fragmentation of grazing lands related to road building and fencing. While the total amount of land used for residential uses may be minor in comparison to grazing areas, these conflicts have the ability to significantly affect the overall productivity and long-term continuation of grazing operations.

Earlier drafts of the Plan attempted to address parcelization issues by increasing minimum parcel sizes in the rural area. While endorsed by the GPAC, the approach did not receive broad support from the community and was opposed by the Agricultural Advisory Committee. P&D has since revised its recommendation to reflect the approach to dealing with parcelization that was suggested by the AAC.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC recommended increasing minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area consistent with Appendix D.1.

AAC Recommendation: The AAC recommended against adjusting minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area. They expressed that any consideration to adjust minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area should be undertaken as part of a countywide program, not in the context of an individual community plan. The committee felt that the County has adequate tools (eg. Environmental thresholds, Agricultural Element policies) to evaluate effects of proposed agricultural land divisions, and suggested the County develop additional policy language to clarify the high level of review and rigorous standards that must be met in order to approve an agricultural land division.

Staff Recommendation

Staff's recommendation is to retain existing agricultural zoning minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area (e.g. AG-II-40 and AG-II-100) (see Appendix B.2.x and B.2.y). In addition, Action LUA-SYV-4.3 directs staff to work with the AAC to develop new policies related to agricultural land division that provide land owners with clear direction on the exacting standards, thresholds, policies, and findings required to approve agricultural land divisions. P&D should incorporate policy language to make clear that land use and zoning designations do not provide vesting, and that land use densities (e.g. A-II-100) are maximums that may be reduced (requiring larger parcel sizes) based on specific conditions.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

- Adjust minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area to the 320 and 640 acre designations as proposed in earlier drafts of the plan. (See Appendix D.1)
- Adjust minimum parcel sizes in the Rural Area to 320 acres. (See Appendix D.2)

3. MOUNTAINOUS ZONE

Special circumstances exist in the mountainous and remote areas of the County that warrant different land use approaches. These locations present extreme fire hazards, minimum access to services and roads, fragile biological resources, key watershed areas and a high potential for erosion problems. The Mountainous Zone is intended to protect mountainous and surrounding areas from water quality degradation, erosion, and flooding due to both development and intensive agricultural practices. Land uses appropriate for mountainous areas include grazing, scientific and educational use, as well as limited residential and agricultural uses.

The proposed Santa Ynez Valley Mountainous Zone (MT-SYV) (see Appendix B.3.b) is similar to the AG-II zone district in that it allows development of a primary residence and guest house, as well as farming and grazing. It was modeled after Mountainous Zones already adopted and in existence in the Goleta and Toro Canyon community plan areas. The substantive differences between AG-II and MT zones are:

1. MT requires a conditional use permit for the installation of 5 acres or more of new cultivation in areas with slopes of over 40%;

2. MT requires a conditional use permit for the development of artist studios and oil extraction facilities, both of which are uses allowed by right within the AG-II zone;
3. MT prohibits some more intensive and commercial/agricultural operations such as kennels, animal hospitals, greenhouses, and facilities for the packaging of horticultural or agricultural products that would be allowed in the AG-II zone; and,
4. MT requires that the following special findings be made in order to approve conditional use permits:
 - a. the project will not cause significant erosion or adverse impacts to downstream water courses and bodies
 - b. the project will not cause any significant adverse effects on environmentally sensitive habitat areas.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC endorsed the staff recommendation as seen below.

AAC Recommendation: The AAC proposes that all areas designated with Mountainous Zoning in the Plan retain their current AG-II zoning. The committee feels that Mountainous Zoning was originally created for the coastal mountains of the Goleta Valley Community Plan where densely populated urban areas exist immediately downhill from agricultural areas on steep slopes. The AAC contends that conditions north of the ridgeline of the Santa Ynez mountain range are considerably different from those on the South coast and therefore should not be designated with a similar Mountainous Zoning. In addition, the AAC contends that the added restrictions of the Mountainous Zone will excessively limit agricultural use, prohibit potentially appropriate development, and devalue the properties where the zone district is applied.

Staff Recommendation

Consistent with direction in the Land Use Element, staff proposes to apply the Mountainous Area (MA) land use designation and a proposed new Mountainous Santa Ynez Valley (MT-SYV) Zone to parcels located within the Los Padres National Forest (LPNF) boundaries (See Appendix B.2.x and B.2.y). The change is intended to:

- Ensure protection of mountainous lands that are unsuited for intensive development, while permitting reasonable use of these lands which typically have slopes in excess of 40% with outstanding watershed and habitat resource values.
- Allow only low-intensity development in these areas due to the presence of extreme fire hazards and minimal services.

Re-designation from Agriculture to Mountainous would not affect existing agricultural use. A Minor Conditional Use Permit would be required for new or expanded areas of cultivated agriculture, vineyards or orchards located on slopes greater than 40%, where the cumulative disturbed area on slopes exceeding 40% exceeds 5 acres.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

Do not apply the Mountainous Zone as part of the SYVCP.

4. ORDINANCE 661 CONSISTENCY REZONE

The Plan includes a proposal to carry out consistency rezones, from the antiquated Ordinance 661 to the current Article III Zoning Ordinance, as directed by the Board of Supervisors during the 1998 Agricultural Element-Phase II. The purpose is to apply modern zone districts to simplify the zoning and permitting process. Consistency rezones have been a component of all previous community plans with a rural component. Currently in the Santa Ynez Valley there are five Ordinance 661 Zoning Districts: General Agriculture (AG), Intensive General Agricultural (AGI), Limited Agricultural (AL), Watershed Agricultural (WA), and Unlimited Agricultural (U). The rezoning of agricultural land from Ordinance 661 to Article III designations would primarily apply to larger parcels in the outlying areas of the Santa Ynez Valley and the Los Padres National Forest, although smaller parcels nearer the center and in the periphery of the planning area would also be rezoned.

A consistency rezone aims to streamline the permitting process for agricultural development and provides several benefits to the landowner in that regard. First, the consistency rezone will eliminate the requirement that individual property owners seeking a discretionary land use permit (e.g. conditional use permit, development plan) need to apply for a rezone to Article III. The owner would no longer need to process a rezone concurrently with the permit, as the rezone would occur through community plan adoption. Because a rezone requires a Board of Supervisors hearing applicants would incur fewer costs and time delays due to elimination of this requirement. Secondly, under the draft Winery Permit Processing Ordinance, wineries requiring discretionary permits must be processed under Article III. Therefore a consistency rezone of an Ordinance 661 parcel would need to take place before that property could take advantage of the permit streamlining features of the proposed new winery regulations. Furthermore, draft ordinance amendments to facilitate the development of second units on agricultural properties would apply to Article III zone properties, not 661 zoned parcels.

In many instances the rezoning to larger minimum parcel sizes is required as part of the consistency rezone. Article III zoning allows no property in the Rural Area to carry a minimum parcel size smaller than 40 acres. Many parcels in the Rural Area designated under Ordinance 661 have minimum parcel sizes of 5 to 20 acres.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC endorsed a full consistency rezone of all Ordinance 661 parcels in the planning area including those that would require an adjustment in minimum parcel size.

AAC Recommendation: The Agricultural Advisory Committee feels that the consistency rezone should not be undertaken as part of the community plan process, but should occur separately as part of a county-wide consistency rezone program. The Committee also recommends that the consistency rezone retain existing minimum parcel sizes.

Staff Recommendation

In 1998 the Board approved a consistency rezone for most rural land in the Valley that was under Agricultural Preserve contract. Staff's recommendation would complete the consistency rezones for those rural properties not under ag preserve contract and not rezoned as part of the previous action. Parcels would be rezoned from their Ordinance 661 designations to either Ag-II-40 or Ag-II-100 under Article III

depending on their location, parcel size, the size and zoning of surrounding parcels and their soil characteristics and relative agricultural viability. See Appendix B.2.x and B.2.y.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

Limit the consistency rezone to parcels that do not require a change in minimum parcel size (e.g. 100-AG to Ag-II-100).

5. RURAL BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS AND EDRN'S

Rural Boundary Adjustments: The draft plan contains an evaluation of the existing Rural boundary line location and adjustments are recommended in several locations to more accurately reflect current land use and development patterns. Currently, the Inner-Rural Area consists of 1,359 parcels and 14,816 acres. Adjustments to the boundary, as proposed by the Plan, would retain 1,089 parcels and 11,667 acres within the Inner-Rural Area, leaving 79% unchanged. The 21% of the acreage no longer within the Inner-Rural Area would either be reclassified as rural lands or an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhoods (EDRNs), discussed in the next section. (See Table 3 and Appendix E). Below is a breakdown of the land uses in the Inner-Rural Area.

TABLE 3: LAND USES IN THE INNER-RURAL AREA

Land Use Designation	Existing		Proposed	
	Number of Parcels	Acres	Number of Parcels	Acres
Agriculture	1,356	14,804	1,063	11,612
Residential	2	9.46	25	52
Neighborhood Commercial	1	3.34	1	3.34
Split Land Use Designation	46	--	0	--
Split by Urban/Inner-Rural Boundary	5	--	0	--
Split by Inner-Rural/Rural Boundary	39	--	0	--
Total	1,449	14,816.8	1,089	11,667.34

The proposed adjustments to the rural boundary were recommended for the following reasons:

- The plan attempts to more accurately categorize areas of the Valley into inner-rural or rural designations. Under current zoning several areas are classified as inner-rural that do not fit any of the identified characteristics of the inner-rural area, such as: adjacency to a designated urban area, small parcel sizes that act as a buffer between urban and rural areas. For example, the area directly east of Brinkerhoff Road consists of large parcels, is not adjacent to urban areas and does not act as a buffer between urban and rural uses. The area is in fact surrounded on all sides by rural uses. Brinkerhoff Road is a more logical, stable boundary between the rural and inner-rural areas.

- In recent years, some parcels in the Inner-Rural area have subdivided and now feature hobby farms or ranchette uses rather than working agriculture. This trend could continue in areas designated Inner-Rural if no action is taken. The plan attempts to preserve those remaining larger agricultural parcels from further subdivision by moving them from the Inner-Rural Area (where divided parcels as small as 5 acres are allowed) into the Rural Area (where the minimum parcel size for newly created parcels is 40 acres).
- Proposed adjustments in the rural boundary line are also intended to ensure that parcels are not split by the boundary and are located completely within the rural or inner-rural areas. (See Appendix E.4)

A detailed description of each individual boundary adjustment and the reasons for that adjustment can be found in Appendix E.1.

Existing Developed Rural Neighborhoods (EDRNs): As defined by the Comprehensive Plan, Existing Developed Rural Neighborhoods (EDRNs) are neighborhood areas that have been historically developed with lots smaller than those found on the surrounding Rural lands. The purpose of this designation is to contain the pockets of smaller rural residential development and prevent them from spreading onto adjacent rural agricultural lands. There are eight (8) designated EDRNs in the Santa Ynez Valley under the existing Comprehensive Plan (refer to Appendix E.4). Under the Plan three (3) undeveloped single lot EDRNs would be eliminated (Appendix E.4, map# 4,7,10) because an undeveloped single lot does not fit the comprehensive plan definition of an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood. Placement of an EDRN designation on a single parcel implies that the parcel should be subdivided. Encouraging the subdivision of rural agricultural lands for ranchette development is not compatible with County goals for preservation of agriculture. Six new EDRNs (Appendix E.4, map# 1,2,6,9 and Appendix E. 7, map# 12,13) would be established to recognize clusters of existing developed ranchette-style parcels formerly located in the Inner-Rural area, that would now be located in the Rural area due to the Rural boundary line adjustments proposed in the plan. The new EDRNs would help limit encroachment by smaller ranchette-style properties into the rural area. Finally, the Plan also includes the adjustment of three EDRN (Appendix E.4, map# 8,11 and Appendix E.8, map# 14) boundaries to include smaller parcels directly adjacent to the existing EDRN.

Refer to Appendix E.3 for a description of each EDRN. Appendix E.2 also provides a brief description of each EDRN and the associated issues and changes to the EDRN.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC recommended adjusting boundary lines and redesignating EDRN's consistent with staff's recommendation below, except for Area F as shown on Appendix E.4 where they proposed maintaining the Rural Boundary at its existing location.

AAC Recommendation: The AAC supports maintaining the current location of the Rural boundary line and does not support the rezonings and adjustments to minimum parcel sizes that would result from its relocation. The AAC did not provide specific recommendations on EDRNs; however, should the rural boundary remain unchanged, four of the six newly proposed EDRNs (Appendix E.4, map# 1, 2, 6, 9) would no longer be necessary because they would remain within the Inner-Rural Area.

Staff Recommendation

Adjust boundary lines and EDNRN's as outlined in Appendix E.4.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

Maintain the boundary lines and EDNRN designations as they currently exist in the Valley. Do not institute any adjustments or redesignations as part of the SYVCP.

C. D-DESIGN OVERLAY

The Santa Ynez Valley features some of the most scenic viewsheds and visually appealing townships in the County. During the plan process, the GPAC, community organizations and numerous individuals stressed that preserving the rural character and beauty of the Valley should be a primary goal of the plan. *The Valley Blueprint* emphasized the importance of protecting "...certain key elements of the visual landscape". In response, the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) formed a Design Sub-Committee to discuss Valley-wide and community-specific design issues.

The Design Sub-Committee of the GPAC met on five occasions during the Fall of 2001 and brought its conclusions to the full GPAC and public in the Spring of 2002. The Sub-Committee identified several key locations where special protection of aesthetic resources was recommended. They are:

- **Downtown Business Districts of the Townships**
- **Township Gateways**; land adjacent to highways and major roads leading in and out of the townships. (eg., along Alamo Pintado entering Ballard and Los Olivos, or along Highway 154 & Meadowvale entering Santa Ynez Township)
- **Valley Gateways**; land adjacent to Highway 101, 154 and 246 leading in and out of the Valley (eg., at the highway 101 and 154 interchange, and along eastbound Highway 246 entering Buellton)
- **Community Separators**; land along the highways and major roads between the townships and the incorporated Cities of Solvang and Buellton that provides rural aesthetics and a sense of separation between urbanized areas. (eg. The "greenbelt" between Solvang and Buellton, and along Alamo Pintado Road between Solvang, Ballard, and Los Olivos)

The Mixed-Use Overlay zone proposed for in the township centers includes a requirement for BAR review of all projects. The draft Community Plan also includes action items directing the County to work with the community to develop individualized, township-specific design guidelines and to consider establishing individualized, township-specific design review boards. These design review provisions targeting the townships' downtown business districts have been well accepted and non-controversial.

More discussion and controversy arose regarding how to best protect aesthetics in the township gateway, valley gateway and community separator areas. In these areas, staff recommended application of the "D" Design Control Overlay. The overlay is an existing tool in the Article III Zoning Ordinance which is already in use in other locations throughout the County including portions of the Santa Ynez Valley. The "D" designation requires that new development and improvements or alterations to existing development be

reviewed by the County Board of Architectural Review (BAR). The overlay is applied in areas where unique neighborhood characteristics exist and visual resource values are high. The intent is to foster well designed and sited developments that protect scenic qualities, property values, and neighborhood character. Three pockets with the “D” Overlay already exist in the Valley under current zoning:

- Just north east of the City of Solvang
- Within and immediately west of Los Olivos township, and
- North of Hwy 154 and east of Figueroa Mountain Road near Los Olivos

In total the Valley already features the “D” Overlay on 65 parcels, totalling 584 acres. County wide there are also Design Control Overlays applied in Montecito, Goleta, and Isla Vista that have been successful in promoting good design for new projects in these communities.

In addition to the required BAR review under the “D” Design Control Overlay, there are multiple instances where BAR review on a project is required regardless of the presence of the overlay, including: projects in Hillside and Ridgeline areas, in commercial zone districts (C-1, C-2, C-3, CH, CN), communication facilities (wireless, radio or TV facilities, etc.), most commercial, industrial, residential, or agricultural signs, and all Development Plans. In addition, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors can require that any project they are reviewing be forwarded to the BAR for review and approval.

Without application of the “D” Design Control Overlay in the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan, any discretionary or ministerial project not covered by the above criteria would not be subject to design review including: single family homes, duplexes, and any agricultural structures including barns, stables, and covered riding arenas.

TABLE 4: BAR REVIEW WITHIN EXISTING COMMUNITY PLAN AREAS

	Toro Canyon	Orcutt	Los Alamos	Goleta	Summerland	Montecito
BAR review Required?	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Where?	Entire Planning Area	Old Town only	Bell Street corridor only	Hollister Ave. corridor only	Entire Planning Area	Entire Planning Area
Community - based BAR Exists?	NO	YES Old Town Advisory BAR	NO	NO	YES Summerland Association ARC	YES Official Montecito BAR

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC did not provide a recommendation on the D-Design Control Overlay.

AAC Recommendation: The AAC did not provide a recommendation on the D-Design Control Overlay.

Staff Recommendation

In response to suggestions offered by community members, staff revised the original D-Design Control Overlay recommendation in two ways:

- 1) In an attempt to refine the overlay to more accurately reflect gateway and township separator areas, the overlay zone was removed from 4 parcels along Santa Barbara Avenue at the southern

end of Los Olivos because the area doesn't appear to qualify as a legitimate township gateway area. See Appendix B.2.t for a map that shows where the D-Design Overlay is currently proposed.

- 2) In an attempt to minimize permitting time and expense for agricultural operations, a Valley-specific D-Overlay would be created. This overlay would exempt smaller agricultural support structures (less than 1,000 square feet) from BAR review and exempt any structure proposed on agriculturally zoned land that is not visible from public viewing areas from BAR review. See Appendix B.3.c for complete proposed ordinance language.

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

1. No Project. Do not add the Design Control Overlay to any additional parcels in the Valley as part of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan. Maintain the Overlay where it already exists in the Valley.
2. Use the Existing County-wide D-Overlay that does not provide an exemption to smaller agricultural support structures and does not provide an exemption for proposed structures on agriculturally-zoned land that would not be visible from public viewing areas.

D. TRAILS

Almost all of the trails shown on the PRT-4 map are existing or proposed trails adopted within the 1980 Comprehensive Plan. New trails on the map include updates to existing trails that were not listed on the 1980 PRT-4 map, minor proposed links within the Santa Ynez Township and four newly proposed trails: The Sedgwick Trail Link, the River Trail, the Sweetwater Connector Trail and the North Cachuma Lake Trail. See Appendix B.2.z and B.2.aa. Of the four, The River Trail and the Sweetwater Connector Trail have been the most discussed - with opposition from some property owners along the proposed route and strong support from hikers, cyclists and equestrians. Staff has revised its recommendation for the River Trail east of Highway 154; to change this section from an off-road trail traversing the Santa Ynez River to an on-road trail traveling along-side Highway 154 in the CalTrans right of way, creating a new trail called the Sweetwater Connector Trail. This modification was based in part on a suggestion from the County's trails advisory committee (CRAHTAC). They recommended realigning the proposed trail to avoid sensitive environmental resources just downstream from the dam, to limit access to the dam area for security purposes and to acknowledge the unlikelihood of acquiring trail easements in the near future. Staff has revised Action PRT-SYV-1.11 to designate the proposed River Trail between Highway 101 and Refugio Road as a high priority trail.

GPAC Recommendation: The GPAC did not provide a recommendation on Trails.

AAC Recommendation: The AAC recommended that recreational trails should not be designated on agriculturally zoned lands located outside of the Inner-Rural Boundary. They felt that a more general network of trail locations should be put into a narrative discussion in the plan to describe the goals of the community, but that specific trail locations should not be mapped without the consent of property owners.

Staff Recommendation

Amend the existing 1980 PRT-4 map to add (See Appendix B.2.z and B.2.aa):

1. Four new trails:
 - Santa Ynez River Trail (Key #1)
 - Sweetwater Connector Trail (Key #63)
 - North Cachuma Lake Trail (Key #10)
 - Sedgwick Reserve Trail (Key #3a)
2. Two new trail links:
 - Link between Santa Ynez Township and the River Trail (Key #16b)
 - Link between Solvang and the River Trail (Key #16a)

Alternatives for consideration in the EIR

Keep the existing PRT-4 map from 1980. Do not add any new trails or trail links to the PRT-4 map as part of the SYVCP.

V. APPENDICES

- A. Board Resolution
- B. Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Initiation Draft Project Description
 1. Compendium of Proposed Goals, Policies, Actions, and Development Standards
 2. Map Packet
 3. Draft Ordinances & Guidelines
- C. Public Meeting notes
 1. April 29th, 2004
 2. May 6th, 2004
 3. May 20th, 2004
- D. Rural Area Alternative Maps
- E. EDRN Table and Maps

VI. SUMMARY

The *Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Initiation Draft Project Description* is the product of extensive community meetings, research, field work, and professional expertise. It has been prepared using the best efforts of P&D staff, working together with members of the community and other agencies to address the full range of planning issues present within the Santa Ynez Valley. Staff recommends initiation of the *Initiation Draft Project Description* so that environmental and later discretionary review may proceed, leading to the eventual adoption of a Final Plan “in the public interest” (Government Code, §65358.(a)).

Mandates and Service Levels:

Creation of a community plan for the Santa Ynez Valley is not a mandated activity for the County. It was undertaken by the County on an elective basis. No changes in service levels would occur.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

No change in fiscal impacts beyond P&D's adopted budget; no facilities impacts. Work on the community plan was funded in FY 03-04 as part of P&D's Comprehensive Planning Division Community Plan budget located on page D-286 of the County Budget book. Continued work on the plan including environmental review and Planning Commission and Board adoption hearings was anticipated in the budget for FY 04-05.

Special Instructions:

No special instructions. P&D has satisfied legal noticing requirements by publishing display ads in the July 3rd edition of the Santa Barbara News-Press and in the July 6th and 8th editions of the Santa Ynez Valley News. In addition, P&D provided individual noticing (by mailed postcard) to:

- 1) all property owners whose property is proposed for a land use or zoning change in the Plan
- 2) all property owners whose property is adjacent to a parcel proposed for a land use or zoning change in the Plan
- 3) interested parties who have asked to be placed on the project's mailing list

This individual postcard noticing is above and beyond the level of noticing required by law.

Concurrence:

County Counsel (Initiation Resolution).

Enclosure (for Clerk of the Board's hearing distribution to the Board of Supervisors only):

- Preliminary Initiation Draft of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan, January 2004.
- Issues and Alternatives Paper, March 2004.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF INITIATING THE SANTA YNEZ)
VALLEY COMMUNITY PLAN - INITIATION DRAFT)
PROJECT DESCRIPTION AS PROPOSED AMENDMENTS)
TO APPLICABLE PORTIONS OF THE SANTA BARBARA) RESOLUTION NO. 04-
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ARTICLE III)
INLAND ZONING ORDINANCE)

WITH REFERENCE TO THE FOLLOWING:

- A. On December 20, 1980, by Resolution No. 80-566, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Land Use Element of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan; and
- B. On January 3, 1983, by Ordinance 3347, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Santa Barbara County Inland Zoning Ordinance, Article III of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code; and
- C. On December 3, 1991, by Resolution 91-696, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Circulation Element of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan; and
- D. In the 1960's the Santa Ynez Valley General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) was created by the Board of Supervisors; and
- E. Between May 2001 and June 2003 over thirty Santa Ynez GPAC public meetings were held to prepare the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description; and
- F. Per the direction of the Board of Supervisors, over the course of nine months from June 2003 to March 2004, Planning and Development met with the Agricultural Advisory Committee and several community groups to further revise and refine the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description; and
- G. In the Spring of 2004 Planning and Development and the Third District Supervisors office hosted three facilitated Town Hall Community meetings to present the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Preliminary Initiation Draft and Issues and Alternatives Paper, and hear

public comments that were then incorporated into the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description; and

- H. It is now deemed to be in the interest of orderly development of the County and important to the preservation of the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of said County that the Board of Supervisors initiate specific amendments the Comprehensive Plan and applicable Zoning Ordinances, as set forth in the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description dated June 2004; and
- I. Public officials and agencies, civic organizations, and citizens have been notified of and informed about this initiation, and have advised the Board of Supervisors on the said proposed amendments in a duly noticed public hearing.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED as follows:

1. The above recitations are true and correct.
2. The proposed map designation and text amendments to the Land Use Element, and Circulation Element are hereby initiated as such amendments are set forth in the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description dated June 2004.
3. Pursuant to the provisions of Section 35-314.4.4 of the Article III Zoning Ordinance, the proposed rezones set forth in the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description dated June 2004 are hereby initiated as amendments to the Article III Zoning Ordinance.
4. The initiation of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description meets the requirements of Government Code Section 66474.2.(b).
5. The Board of Supervisors finds that the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan - Initiation Draft Project Description dated June 2004 is adequate to begin environmental review.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this _____ day of _____, 2004, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Joe Centeno
Chair of the Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara

ATTEST:

Michael F. Brown
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: _____
Deputy Clerk-Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
STEPHEN SHANE STARK
County Counsel

By: _____
Deputy County Counsel