#### Bloom Appeal of Kaslow TPM

Case No. 05APL-00000-00036 (04TPM-00000-00002 / TPM 14,648)



Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors March 14, 2006



### Site Information

- > 11.16 acre parcel (gross & net)
- Inner Rural area zoned A-I-5/AG-I-5 under Article III,
  5 acre minimum parcel size
- Historically vacant parcel used as part of larger 100+ acre cattle grazing operation.
- > Site is surrounded by ranchette-style development

### **Project Site Location**





### **Project Description**

- > Subdivide one 11.16-acre parcel into two parcels of 5.6 acres and 5.56 acres
- Development exclusion areas for critical root zones of onsite oaks and slopes exceeding 20%
- Sanitary service by proposed individual septic systems and water service by the Santa Ynez River Water
   Conservation District



## Project Analysis

- Mitigated ND Circulated (Oct. 21 to Nov. 14, 2005)
- No comments received from public
- Feasible mitigation measure incorporated
- Consistent w/ Comp Plan, Art. III, SMA, Chapter 21





- > Appearance by appellant David Bloom
- > PC approved project 3-2



## Appeal - Facilitation

- > Facilitation Mtg. held January 19, 2006
- Options discussed such as:
  - > Setbacks from Baseline Ave.
  - > Setbacks from Oak Hill Cemetery
  - Prohibiting solid wall along cemetery
- Unfortunately, no resolution



# Staff's responses to appeal

- > Appellant's letter 12/22/05 Several issue areas identified.
- > Staff's response to each are contained in BOS letter.



## Appellant issues

- Disrupt peaceful atmosphere of cemetery
- Gateway parcel
- Piecemeal development of previous subdivision
- Lack of VPAC involvement
- No building envelopes identified
- Staff advocated for the split
- Discretionary split and loss of open space



#### Recommendation

- Adopt the required findings for the project specified in the Planning Commission's action letter dated December 27, 2005, including CEQA findings, (Attachment A);
- Approve the Negative Declaration (05NGD-00000-00024) and adopt the mitigation monitoring program contained in the conditions of approval of the action letter;
- > 3. Deny the appeal and uphold the Planning Commission's December 14, 2005 approval of 04TPM-00000-00002; and,
- 4. Grant de novo approval of Case No. 04TPM-00000-00002 subject to the conditions included in the Planning Commission's action letter dated December 27, 2005.