

#3



CHARLES A JACKSON

2539 ELK GROVE ROAD SOLVANG, CALIFORNIA 93463

April 1, 2022

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

Subject: Hacienda Amador

**RE: Appeal of Denial of Home Stay Permit
2905 Via La Selva Santa Ynez, California 93460**

Dear Chair Hartmann;

I am writing today both on behalf of my Cousin, William L. Jackson and his wife Ingrid and on behalf of the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan for which I spent considerable time and energy to conceive and bring to fruition. The matter before you is the Denial of the above referenced Home Stay Permit by your Planning Commission. For the record I strongly support the action of the Planning Commission in denying the Permit, for which I testified and assisted the Jacksons in formulating their Appeal response. I ask that you do the same. I am equally concerned that your "de novo" Appeal Hearing process denies equal access to those who successfully brought forth the Appeal yielding the denial that you seek to either affirm or overrule.

The appeal before you may prove to be a watershed event for your relatively new and untested Home Stay ordinance, because the applicant in this instance is attempting to significantly expand the envelope of allowable activity under the permit while openly flouting their duties and obligations under the ordinance. Additionally, they have eschewed the ordinance itself, the land use policies and procedures of the County and the lawful order of State and County Health Departments in response to the Pandemic. All of these have posed nuisance and burden upon their immediate and surrounding neighbors. As practiced and interpreted by Hacienda Amador, your Home Stay Ordinance will set precedent for expanded commercial intrusion into the established and cherished use patterns of rural and residential neighborhoods.

Why should you uphold the unanimous denial by your Planning Commission? My answer is as follows:

1. Your Commission held a properly noticed and fair appeal hearing with equal opportunity to both sides to present. They arrived at a reasoned decision and accumulated findings in support of their decision to Deny.
2. Implicit in your ordinance and its applicability in Zone districts such as R1-5 is that larger parcels would possess more separation and buffer so as not to pose nuisance burdens. However, both the Applicant and the immediate neighbors have building envelopes abutting the set-backs with each other and other neighbors. Each parcel has extensive coverage in the form of Equine facilities (Barns, Corrals etc.) that absorb any open space or provide hospitality space that doesn't pose potential burden. The Applicant has located its hospitality space immediately proximate to the

living space of the Jacksons creating a nearly constant noise intrusion. I would ask you to consider the impact of nightly vacationers reveling less than 100 feet from your bedroom window on a school night.

3. Because Hacienda Amador operated at first without a permit, then appealed and then denied, there is almost 3 years of performance on which to reflect. During this period Hacienda Amador failed to meet the establish standards for Homestays to be compatible with and not adversely impact surrounding properties inclusive of items 4 (signage), 5 (occupancy limitations), 6 (parking), 7 (visitor limitation), 8 (Noise) and 11 (Nuisance response Plan) of the development code and there is no evidence that item 9 (internet listing) has been provided to the County.
4. During the Pandemic, Hacienda Amador continued to advertise and accept lodgers despite a State and Local Health department order prohibiting non-essential travel of greater than 100 miles as was expected of hotels and hospitality providers throughout the valley.
5. There is no provision in the Home Stay ordinance governing Events on the Property and yet Hacienda Amador has hosted multiple events on site.
6. For 28 years a feature of the Via La Selva neighborhood's use pattern has been a coded security gate for the purpose of deterring tress pass and wanderers crossing the property, and the access and egress easement serving all 3 properties. The unilateral release of gate codes to customers has altered the use pattern.
7. Hacienda Amador failed to manage their animals which resulted in numerous intrusions into neighboring properties resulting in injury, potential property damage and calls to Animal Control. Additionally, Guests to the home Stay are allowed to have dogs on site for a \$50. Fee which have gone without leash on the property and harassed neighboring animals through fences.
8. Of critical concern to the residents of the Santa Ynez Valley has been the commercial intrusion into the rural residential neighborhoods and the violation of established use patterns. It produced significant debate during the SYV Community Plan process.

I respectfully request that you give careful consideration to whether or not the Home Stay as practiced by Hacienda Amador is consistent with your vision for the Homestay Ordinance.

Charles A. Jackson