Ramirez, Angelica

Public Comment

From:

Villalobos, David

Sent:

Friday, September 10, 2021 10:42 AM

To:

sbcob

Subject:

FW: Santa Rita Holdings, Inc.

Attachments:

Santa Rita Holdings, Inc BOS letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

Letter for hearing of 9/21

From: Kathleen Wold <kathleen.wold@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 2:35 PM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>

Subject: Santa Rita Holdings, Inc.

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

David,

Please find attached my letter for the BOS meeting on September 21, 2021 for the following item:

Set a hearing to consider recommendations regarding the JCCrandall, LLC Appeal of the Planning Commission's Approval of the Santa Rita Agriculture, Inc., Cannabis Cultivation Project, Case Nos. 19CUP-00000-00018 and 21APL-000000-00031, Third District, as follows: (Set a hearing for September 21, 2021. Time estimate: 2 hours)



Kathleen.wold@gmail.com

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Kathleen Wold, agent for Santa Rita Holdings, Inc.

Project Santa Rita Holdings, Inc. 19CUP-00000-00018 and 21APL-00000-00031

The applicant, Santa Rita Holdings, LLC has diligently worked with staff to put before you a well-designed and thoughtful project. This project has been in process since 2019 and over the last two years the project has been refined so that the project before you on appeal is a 2.5-acre cannabis grow meeting all LUDC requirements with sensitivity to the biological resources onsite. On June 9, 2021, the Planning Commission approved the project making the required findings that the project is consistent with all applicable policies of the County's comprehensive plan, with the county's Land Use and Development Code and CEQA. However, on June 16, 2021, an appeal was filed on the Planning Commission approval. The appeal issues center around whether the applicant can utilize a recorded access easement without written permission from property owner of the land on which the easement crosses. The applicant has provided the county with the recorded access easement demonstrating the right to use this easement for egress/ingress. There is no county requirement to provide written permission from an adjacent landowner or an easement holder.

The appellant's letter also states that there were overlooked significant environment issues by not requiring the applicant to submit documentation from the State Water Resources Control board demonstrating compliance with the comprehensive Cannabis Cultivation Policy and a Phase 1 cultural study. The applicant has submitted these documents to county; therefore, this appeal issue is moot.

The applicant concurs with staff's recommendation to deny the appeal and respectful requests that the Board uphold Planning Commission's approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

Kathleen Wold, AICP