



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA LETTER

Agenda Number:

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

Department Name: Planning & Development
Department No.: 053
For Agenda Of: Set Hearing on
November 15, 2016, for
December 6, 2016
Placement: Departmental
Estimated Time: 2.5 hours on December
6, 2016
Continued Item:
If Yes, date from:
Vote Required: Majority

TO: Board of Supervisors
FROM: Department Glenn S. Russell, Ph.D., Director, Planning and Development
Director(s) (805) 568-2085
Contact Info: Daniel T. Klemann, Deputy Director, Long Range Planning
(805) 568-2072
SUBJECT: Short-Term Rental Ordinance Project

County Counsel Concurrence

As to form: Yes

Other Concurrence: N/A

As to form: N/A

Auditor-Controller Concurrence

As to form: N/A

Recommended Actions:

That the Board of Supervisors:

On November 15, 2016, set a hearing for December 6, 2016, to consider amending the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code (LUDC), the Article II Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Article II), and the Montecito Land Use and Development Code (MLUDC) of the County Code, to implement new regulations and other revisions permitting and prohibiting the land use of Short-Term Rentals.

On December 6, 2016, your Board's action should include the following:

- a) Case No. 16ORD-00000-00009 (County LUDC Amendments)
 - i) Make the required findings for approval, including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings (Attachment 1);
 - ii) Determine that adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the State Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (Attachment 2); and

- iii) Adopt an Ordinance amending Section 35-1, the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code, of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the County Code by amending Article 35.2, Zones and Allowable Land Uses, Article 35.3, Site Planning and Other Project Standards, Article 35.4, Standards for Specific Land Uses, Article 35.8, Planning Permit Procedures, Article 35.10, Land Use and Development Code Administration, and Article 35.11, Glossary, to implement new regulations regarding the land use of Short-Term Rentals and make other minor clarifications, corrections, and revisions (Case No. 16ORD-00000-00009) (Attachment 3).
- c) Case No. 16ORD-00000-00011 (MLUDC Amendments)
- i) Make the required findings for approval, including CEQA findings (Attachment 7);
 - ii) Determine that adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the State Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (Attachment 8); and
 - iii) Adopt an Ordinance amending Division 35.2, Montecito Zones and Allowable Land Uses, Division 35.3, Montecito Site Planning and Other Project Standards, and Division 35.10, Glossary of the Santa Barbara County Montecito Land Use and Development Code, of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the Santa Barbara County Code, to implement new regulations regarding the land use of Short-Term Rentals (Case No. 16ORD-00000-00011) (Attachment 9).
- b) Case No. 16ORD-00000-00012 (Article II Amendments)
- i) Make the required findings for approval, including CEQA findings (Attachment 4);
 - ii) Determine that adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) and section 15265 of the State Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (Attachment 5); and
 - iii) Adopt an Ordinance amending Article II, the Santa Barbara County Coastal Zoning Ordinance, of Chapter 35, Zoning, of the County Code by amending Division 1, In General, Division 2, Definitions, Division 4, Zoning Districts, Division 6, Parking Regulations, Division 7 General Regulations, and Division 12, Administration, to implement new regulations regarding the land use of Short-Term Rentals and make other minor clarifications, corrections, and revisions (Case No. 16ORD-00000-00012) (Attachment 6).
- d) Resolution Transmitting Case No. 16ORD-00000-00012 (Article II Amendments) to the Coastal Commission
- i) Adopt a Resolution transmitting Article II amendments (16ORD-00000-00012) for certification by the California Coastal Commission as an amendment to Santa Barbara County's certified Local Coastal Program (Attachment 10);
 - ii) Find that transmittal of the Resolution is an administrative activity of the County, which will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment and is therefore not a "project" as defined for purposes of the California

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(5); and

- iii) Direct the Planning and Development Department to transmit the adopted Resolution to the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission.

Summary Text:

The proposed STRs Ordinance project, if adopted by your Board, will implement adopted Comprehensive Plan policies through the establishment of new zoning regulations and other revisions that will permit the use of STRs in: (1) Agricultural II (AG-II) and certain Mixed-Use zone districts; and (2) certain Commercial zone districts where other transient lodging is permitted. The ordinances, as proposed, will prohibit STRs in Residential, Resource Protection, Industrial, and certain Special Purpose zone districts. The proposed STRs Ordinance will amend the LUDC, Article II, and MLUDC. The complete text of the ordinance amendments is set forth in Attachment 3 (LUDC), Attachment 6 (Article II), and Attachment 9 (MLUDC), and summarized below.

LUDC and Article II Amendments. The proposed LUDC amendments will allow STRs in the AG-II zone district, with a Land Use Permit (LUP), and subject to compliance with specific development standards. STRs also will be allowed with a LUP in the Mixed Use (MU), Community Mixed Use – Los Alamos (CM-LA), Old Town – Residential/General Commercial (OT-R/GC), Limited Commercial (C-1), Retail Commercial (C-2), General Commercial (C-3), Highway Commercial (CH), and Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial (C-V) zone districts. No additional development standards are proposed for STRs within commercial and mixed-use zones. STRs will be prohibited in all other zone districts, including residential zone districts.

The proposed Article II amendments will allow STRs in the AG-II zone district, with a Coastal Development Permit (CDP), and subject to compliance with specific development standards. STRs also will be allowed with a CDP in the Limited Commercial (C-1), Retail Commercial (C-2), and Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial (C-V) zone districts. STRs will be prohibited in all other zone districts, including residential zone districts.

MLUDC Amendments. The proposed MLUDC amendments will permit STRs in the Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial (CV) zone district of Montecito. STRs will be prohibited in all other zone districts, including residential zone districts.

Background:

During the review of the 2015/2016 Annual Work Program for the Long Range Planning Division, both the Montecito Planning Commission and the County Planning Commission recommended adding the review of STRs to the list of projects in the 2015/2016 fiscal year. Your Board considered the Planning Commissions' recommendations during your Board's budget workshop, and directed staff to review and clarify provisions in the County zoning ordinances concerning the use of STRs within the unincorporated areas of the County, as part of the 2015/2016 Long Range Planning Annual Work Program.

Since this project began in July 2015, staff gathered public input on the use of STRs through a variety of outlets. Staff conducted four public meetings and received over 250 emails and letters from the public

(Attachment 20). There is an emergent interest in the use of STRs; public involvement and engagement has grown throughout the course of this project.

1.0 Ordinance Development Rationale and Summary

STRs are a transient occupancy use, as are hotels, motels, hostels, and bed and breakfasts. Unlike the other traditional transient lodging uses, STRs involve the rental of residential dwelling units for periods of 30 days or less. STRs can include apartments, condominiums, and one-family dwellings.

The County is not alone in addressing the issue of STRs. Private residences have become popular transient lodging alternatives to traditional lodging uses. The increased presence of web-based “hosting” platforms like Airbnb, HomeAway, and VRBO have made the process of advertising and renting homes, or individual rooms within homes, easier and more attractive to homeowners. The increase in transient stays in residential areas has raised a variety of neighborhood compatibility issues across the state, as well as in the County.

The County has the authority to establish a long-range land use plan and to implement policies through regulations. The County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations that direct the location and extent of land uses, as well as provide standards and regulations that serve to differentiate appropriate land uses within each zone district and create regulations for orderly growth, development, and use of property through zoning. The use of STRs has not previously been defined in the LUDC, Article II, or the MLUDC; however, STRs have been growing in number throughout the County, so these amendments are within the County’s authority to ensure orderly growth, development, and use of the property through zoning.

The following provides a summary of the proposed ordinance amendments that the County and Montecito Planning Commissions recommended that your Board adopt:

1.1 Definitions

The attached ordinances define a “Short-Term Rental” as: “A structure which is permitted to be rented for overnight lodging in compliance with this Development Code, in whole or in part and with or without the presence onsite of the Owner or representative of the Owner, that is rented for 30 consecutive days or less.”

1.2 Allowance in the AG-II Zone District (LUDC and Article II)

The County Planning Commission recommended the Board adopt ordinance language to provide a path for permitting STRs on lots zoned AG-II in the inland and coastal zone areas. Larger agricultural parcels have a greater ability to reduce nuisance and neighborhood compatibility issues through increased buffers between neighbors and STRs. STRs in AG-II zone districts will require the approval of a LUP or CDP, compliance with specific development standards, and a yearly permit renewal. This process will allow staff to monitor the use and allow neighbors potential recourse through the permit renewal consideration process.

1.3 Allowance in Certain Commercial and Mixed Use Zone Districts

The proposed ordinances will also permit STRs, with a LUP or CDP, in mixed use and certain commercial (MU, CM-LA, OT-R/GC, C-1, C-2, C-3, CH, and C-V Zone Districts (LUDC); C-1, C-2, and C-V Zone Districts (Article II), ; and C-V Zone District (MLUDC)) zone districts where

other traditional transient lodging uses (e.g., hotels) are permitted. Because STRs will be surrounded by other commercial uses, staff does not recommend the application of the additional development requirements that are appropriate for the AG-II zone district, to STRs in mixed use and commercial zone districts.

1.4 *Prohibition in Residential Zone Districts (LUDC, Article II, and the MLUDC)*

The County Planning Commission recommended the Board adopt ordinance language to prohibit the use in all residential zone districts (RR, R-1/E-1, EX-1, R-2, DR, PRD, SLP, SR-M, SR-H, MHP, MHS, MR-O (LUDC); RR, R-1/E-1, R-2, EX-1, DR, PRD, SR-M, SR-H, MHP (Article II); R-1/E-1, R-2, DR, PRD (MLUDC)). During public outreach, some participants expressed a number of reasons why STRs are inappropriate in residential zone districts. One major concern involved nuisances deriving from the use of STRs (e.g., noise, insufficient off-street parking, or inappropriate behavior) that is incompatible with the neighborhood. Furthermore, participants stated that the use of STRs undermines the intent of residential zone districts which can be summarized as areas that protect residential character, promote public health, safety, and welfare, ensure compatibility, provide housing opportunities, preserve the character of an area, and minimize the services needed.

Some participants also cited the current low long-term rental vacancy rate in the Santa Barbara County area to justify the recommended prohibition on STRs in residential zone districts. Studies to support this position are attached to the Planning Commission staff memo, dated November 18, 2015 (Attachment 14- Attachment B, C, and D). Growth in the STR market is exacerbating the availability of housing, including affordable and rental housing, in a market where housing is already constricted. This determinately affects the cost of housing for both affordable housing and workforce housing.

1.5 *Prohibition in the AG-I Zone District (LUDC and Article II)*

During the County Planning Commission hearing, there was discussion regarding allowing STRs in both AG-I and AG-II zone districts. After public input and consideration, the Planning Commission recommended prohibiting STRs in AG-I zone districts. The Planning Commission expressed concern that the size of AG-I lots, unlike AG-II lots, is not large enough to accommodate the use and mitigate the nuisance issues associated with the use. Some members of the Commission also spoke to the fact that AG-I lots often buffer residential zones, where STRs will be prohibited, and determined the use would not be appropriate in AG-I either. Therefore, the County Planning Commission determined that STRs on AG-I parcels would create unacceptable nuisance and land use compatibility issues, much like STRs on residentially zoned lots, and found them an inappropriate use in the AG-I zone district.

1.6 *Prohibition in Resource Protection/Management, Industrial, and Certain Special Purpose Zone Districts*

The County Planning Commission and Montecito Planning Commission also recommended the Board prohibit STRs in the resource protection/management, industrial, and certain special purpose zone districts (MT-GOL, RMZ, CN, CS, SC, PI, M-RP, M-1, M-2, M-CR, OT-R, OT-R/LC, PU, and REC, Zone Districts (LUDC); CH, PI, M-CD, PU, REC, RES, M-CR, TC, and MT-TORO Zone Districts (Article II); and RMZ, CN, PU, and REC Zone Districts (MLUDC)). Resource protection/management zone districts are created to protect natural resources from intensive development or limit development due to fire hazards or slopes exceeding 40 percent.

Industrial zone districts establish areas for manufacturing uses. The special purpose districts listed above have been created for services like utilities, transportation corridors, open spaces, or to establish and maintain specific standards for unique historic areas. The commercial zones above are appropriate for local retail, service businesses, professional uses, or coastal commercial uses. Due to the transient nature of the use of STRs and the fact that visitors staying in STRs have expectations of neighborhood environments the use would be inconsistent with the purpose and intent of the above zone districts.

1.7 Development Standards

STRs in the AG-II zone district, in both the LUDC and Article II, will be subject to the following new development standards, to address safety and compatibility issues:

- Compliance with certain fire, building, and health codes;
- Prohibit the use of non-habitable dwellings as STRs;
- Limit on the number of STRs allowed per lot;
- Limitation on the number of guests and parking restrictions;
- Nuisance response plan;
- Posted notice within unit;
- Noise limitations;
- Internet listing;
- Annual renewal of permit; and
- Permit revocation standards.

The complete list of development standards can be found in Attachment 3, page 13 (LUDC) and Attachment 6, page 7 (Article II). No additional development standards are required for the allowance of the use of STRs in the mixed use and commercial zone districts.

1.8 Ordinance Effective Date

Ordinance adoption will affect a number of existing STRs in zone districts where STRs will be prohibited. In review of STR platforms, staff found that STRs are often booked well in advance (e.g., several months) for a guest to stay in the area for special occasions (e.g., weddings, anniversaries, or reunions). Due to these factors, staff is recommending that a grace period of nine months (270 days) be given for the prohibition of STRs in residential and other prohibited zones. This will allow the owner of the property to honor previous bookings, and convert the use of the property from a STR to a permitted use, if located in a zone where STRs are proposed to be prohibited, or to obtain a permit to operate under the proposed STR regulations if in a zone where STRs are proposed to be allowed.

2.0 Summary of the County Planning Commission Hearings and Recommendation

The County Planning Commission heard this item on November 4, 2015, December 9, 2015, February 24, 2016, and August 3, 2016, and the staff briefings, memorandums, and reports are attached (Attachments 13-16).

At the August 10, 2016, hearing, the County Planning Commission revised the proposed ordinance package and made a recommendation to your Board for consideration. More specifically, the County Planning Commission recommended that your Board amend the LUDC and Article II to: (1) allow the use of STRs in AG-II zone district, with development standards, but not in the AG-I zone district; and

(2) allow STRs without additional development standards in certain commercial and mixed-use zone districts, as described in section 1.3, and the Action Letter (Attachment 11). The County Planning Commission also recommended that the Board further revise the draft ordinance standards for STRs as follows, to address certain safety and noise concerns (revisions shown in legislative format):

- 35.42.245.D.1 Compliance with fire, building, and health codes. Any dwelling used as a Short-Term Rental shall be in compliance with the California Fire Code, California Building Code, California Health and Safety Code, the National Fire Protection Association standards and/or regulations, and other relevant laws and codes in regard to carbon monoxide detectors, smoke detectors, emergency egress window, handrails, and fire extinguishers to the satisfaction of the Director.
- 35.42.245.D.8 Between the hours of 10 p.m. to 8 ~~40~~ a.m., the volume of sound generated by the Short-Term Rental shall not exceed 45 dB or existing ambient levels, whichever is greater, at any point beyond the property boundary.

3.0 Summary of the Montecito Planning Commission Hearings and Recommendation

At the November 18, 2015, hearing (Attachment 17), the Montecito Planning Commission directed staff to prepare and present a MLUDC ordinance package for the Montecito Planning Commission's consideration, which would allow STRs only in the C-V zone district (i.e., the zone district that currently allows other traditional transient lodging uses).

Pursuant to this request, at the September 21, 2016, Montecito Planning Commission meeting (Attachment 18), staff presented the MLUDC ordinance package to the Montecito Planning Commission for its consideration. Without any additional changes, the Montecito Planning Commission recommended that your Board adopt the ordinance amendments to only allow STRs in the C-V zone district (Attachment 12).

4.0 Staff Changes

Based on review of the ordinances subsequent to both the Planning Commission hearings very minor revisions were made to the definitions so that they are internally consistent within the ordinances and consistent with the overall County Code.

5.0 Enforcement

The Planning and Development Department's current approach to enforcement is generally reactive, in response to reported complaints. The enforcement program is funded and staffed to support this approach. Enforcement of the proposed ordinance could take a variety of approaches:

- Complaint-driven, as with the current program;
- Added public outreach and education;
- Some proactive enforcement, such as reviewing hosting platforms/spot checking compliance with the ordinance; and
- Actively enforcing the ordinance.

The need for effective enforcement was a consistent theme expressed throughout the public process and by the two Planning Commissions. Any enhanced enforcement efforts would have budget and staffing implications. Since the ordinances, if adopted, would not be effective until fall of 2017, the Planning

and Development Department plans to bring enforcement approaches with respect to STRs for consideration by the Board during the fiscal year 2017-18 budget process.

6.0 Economic Review

Transient Occupancy Tax. The County of Santa Barbara Treasurer-Tax Collector’s office, through the Taxation portion of the County Code (Chapter 32), governs Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT). Chapter 32 related to TOT says that for the privilege of occupancy in any hotel, transients shall pay TOT. “Hotel” is defined very broadly by Chapter 32 of the Code to include STRs.

The TOT certificates clearly state on the certificate that it “does not constitute a permit. The TOT certificate is for tax collection purposes and does not constitute land entitlement under the LUDC, Article II, and MLUDC. The table below sets forth the total amount of TOT revenue that the County of Santa Barbara Treasurer-Tax Collector’s office collected, and the total number of TOT Certificates that the County of Santa Barbara Treasurer-Tax Collector’s office issued, for STRs, over the last two fiscal years.

Timeframe	Amount of TOT Collected	Number of TOT Certificates
Fiscal Year 2014 – 2015	\$1,416,339	492
Fiscal Year 2015 – 2016	\$1,669,810	535

Local Economic Impact Study. The Planning Commission received an economic report on STRs (TXP, Fall 2015) that a STR operator submitted as a public comment (Attachment 20, February 24, 2016, public comments, page 10). This report did not distinguish between incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County, but did show that STRs brought \$129.8 million to the County as a whole in direct lodging spending. Staff research found that TXP, the author of the report, produces many reports for STRs across the County. All of these reports have the same message of large economic gains due to STRs. Therefore, staff requested that the University of California, Santa Barbara Economic Forecast Project (Economic Forecast Project) evaluate the information and assumptions presented in this report.

The Economic Forecast Project found that the report inflates the economic results of STRs. In a review of the report, the Economic Forecast Project found that the report is based on an assumption that all of the people staying at STRs are additional guests to the County and would not have stayed elsewhere in the County if STRs were not available. For example, assume an individual is planning a trip to Santa Barbara County in order to attend a friend’s graduation. Initially, the individual considers staying at a hotel. However, upon further research, the person finds Airbnb cheaper than the hotel, and decides to book the Airbnb. In this scenario, the Airbnb option would result in less revenue for the County, than if the individual had chosen to stay in the hotel, yet still generated revenue. The Economic Forecast Project denoted that an increase in revenue for the County from STRs would have to come from someone who was not planning on visiting Santa Barbara, unless the individual could stay at a STR.

The Economic Forecast Project indicated that another question that the study presents pertains to those who stay in a STR, and would not have stayed in a hotel. Do these people spend in the same magnitude and proportion on other services in the County as the hotel visitors? As part of public testimony regarding STRs, some members of the public stated that people in STRs cook for themselves and do not

frequent restaurants every night like a hotel guest would. The availability of STRs thus may represent a decrease in additional revenue for the County from visitors when compared to hotel guests' spending on other services in the County.

The Economic Forecast Project also questioned the 5,000 job creation number, and pointed out that the number was not supported by adequate data and the methodology was not clearly stated to allow reviewers to determine if this number is also inflated. Therefore, the Economic Forecast Project determined that the effects of limiting STRs are not as clear as the TXP report presents them to be.

7.0 STRs within the Coastal Zone

Section 30213 of the Coastal Act, and Coastal Land Use Plan Policy (CLUP) 3.7.1 states:

“Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.”

Coastal Commission staff has indicated that STR's could provide an opportunity for low-cost lodging accommodations for visitors to the coast. Staff's research of popular Short-Term Rental hosting platforms revealed that Short-Term Rental costs in coastal, residential zone districts in the unincorporated areas of the County range from \$300 per night for a one bedroom to over \$1,000 a night for a three bedroom. Many of the listings also had three-day minimum rental periods, increasing the overall payment for the rental. The relatively high rental rates charged for STRs indicates they do not provide low-cost accommodations for visitors to coastal, unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. The ordinance does allow STR's in certain commercial and certain agricultural zones which are in the coast zone. If visitors to the coast want to stay in a STR in the coastal area these options will still be available. Therefore, the proposed prohibition of STRs in residential zones within the coastal zone would not conflict with Section 30213 of the Coastal Act and CLUP 3.7.1.

8.0 Environmental Review

The County and Montecito Planning Commissions recommend that your Board determines that the proposed project is exempt from CEQA environmental review.

The proposed ordinance amendments to the LUDC, Article II, and MLUDC are exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines. Section 15061(b)(3) states (in pertinent part) that "...the activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment." As explained further in Attachments 2, 5, and 7 (Notices of Exemption), no significant environmental impacts would occur due to the ordinance amendments.

Furthermore, the proposed ordinance amendments to Article II are exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15265 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Section 15265 sets forth a statutory exemption for the adoption of coastal plans and programs, including amendments thereto, and provides that compliance with CEQA is the responsibility of the California Coastal Commission.

9.0 Comprehensive Plan Consistency

Staff reviewed the STRs Ordinances for consistency with the applicable policies of the Comprehensive

Plan (Attachment 19). Staff concludes that the STRs Ordinances, as proposed with recommended Planning Commission changes, would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

10.0 Coastal Commission Resolution

As stated in this board letter, the amendments to Article II (i.e., the implementing ordinance of the County's Local Coastal Program (LCP)) will result in new regulations regarding STRs within the Coastal Zone. Therefore, in the event that your Board adopts the recommended amendments to Article II, staff prepared a draft resolution (Attachment 10) for submittal of the ordinance amendment to the Coastal Commission for consideration, in order to certify the amendments to the LCP. Following review and action by the Coastal Commission, your Board will have six months from the date of the Coastal Commission's action to consider and determine whether to accept any modifications to the amendments that the Coastal Commission suggests.

If your Board accepts the modifications, then your Board must adopt a resolution agreeing to implement the ordinances as modified. Staff will transmit the resolution to the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission who will review it and recommend to the Coastal Commission whether the action of the Board of Supervisors complies with regulations of the Coastal Act and the California Code of Regulations. The ordinances will become effective on the date of the Coastal Commission's final action. The attached resolution (Attachment 10) constitutes the County's third LCP submittal for 2016.

Fiscal Analysis:

The preparation of the proposed Short-Term Rental Ordinance was approved by the Board of Supervisors through the adoption of the Long Range Planning 2015/2016 Work Program. Current fiscal year staff salaries and other costs associated with the Short-Term Rental Ordinance project are budgeted in the Planning and Development Department Long Range Planning Budget Program on page D-295 of the FY 2016/2017 operating budget. Total project cost since FY 2015/2016 is \$95,000, including an estimate to cover costs associated with decision-maker hearings and to begin the Coastal Commission certification process.

There are no facilities impacts. Implementation of the ordinances will occur primarily through the development review process (i.e., zoning requirements and development standards applied to new land use permits) and there will be no cost to the County.

Special Instructions:

Planning and Development will fulfill noticing requirements. The Clerk of the Board shall provide a copy of the executed Resolution and Ordinance amendments and Board Minute Order(s) to Planning and Development, Attn.: David Villalobos.

Attachments:

1. LUDC Findings
2. LUDC CEQA Notice of Exemption
3. Ordinance amending the LUDC (Case No. 16ORD-00000-00009)
4. Article II Findings
5. Article II CEQA Notice of Exemption
6. Ordinance amending Article II (Case No. 16ORD-00000-000012)

7. MLUDC Findings
8. MLUDC CEQA Notice of Exemption
9. Ordinance amending the MLUDC (Case No. 16ORD-00000-00011)
10. Coastal Commission Transmittal Resolution
11. County Planning Commission Action Letter
12. Montecito Planning Commission Action Letter
13. County Planning Commission Staff Report, dated October 27, 2015
14. County Planning Commission Memo, dated November 18, 2015
15. County Planning Commission Memo, dated February 17, 2016
16. County Planning Commission Staff Report, dated July 27, 2016
17. Montecito Planning Commission Staff Report, dated November 10, 2015
18. Montecito Planning Commission Staff Report, dated September 14, 2016
19. Plans, Policy, and Ordinance Consistency Analysis
20. Link to Public Comments

Authored by:

Jessica Metzger, Senior Planner, 568-3532