



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 and  
Development  
**Department No.:** 053  
**For Agenda Of:** November 10, 2015  
**Placement:** Departmental  
**Estimated Tme:** 1 hour  
**Continued Item:** No  
**If Yes, date from:**  
**Vote Required:** Majority

---

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Department Glenn Russell, Ph.D., Director, Planning & Development  
Director(s) (805) 568-2085  
Contact Info: Alice McCurdy, Deputy Director, Development Review Division  
(805) 568-2518

**SUBJECT:** Nicholas Appeal of the Stewart Single Family Dwelling & Agricultural Barn  
Third Supervisorial District

---

**County Counsel Concurrence**

As to form: Yes

**Auditor-Controller Concurrence**

As to form: N/A

**Other Concurrence:** N/A

**Recommended Actions:**

On November 10, 2015, staff recommends that your Board take the following actions:

- a) Deny the appeal, Case No. 15APL-00000-00015;
- b) Make the required findings for approval of the project specified in Attachment 1 of this Board Letter, including CEQA Findings;
- c) Determine that the project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15303(a) of the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as specified in Attachment 4 of this Board Letter; and
- d) Grand *de novo* approval of the project, Case No. 14LUP-00000-00438, subject to the conditions of approval included as Attachment 2 of this Board Letter.

The project site is identified as Assessor Parcel No. 135-310-041, located at 3209 Old Calzada Ridge Road, Santa Ynez Community Planning area, Third Supervisorial District. Refer back to staff if the Board takes an action other than the recommended action.

### **Summary Text:**

#### **A. Project Description**

The proposed Land Use Permit would allow for the construction of a 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling with a maximum height of 16 feet, and legalization of an 864 sq. ft. as-built agricultural storage barn with a maximum height of 19 feet. Water would be provided by the Rancho Ynecita Mutual Water Company. Sanitary services would be provided by a proposed private septic system utilizing a dry well and built in conformance with Environmental Health Services requirements. No grading, tree or vegetation removal is proposed.

#### **B. Background**

The appellant, Mr. Jim Nicholas, is appealing the County Planning Commission's July 1, 2015 decision to deny his prior appeal of the proposed project (Case No. 15APL-00000-00005) and approval of the project. At the July 1, 2015 hearing, the Commission voted 5-0 to deny the appellant's appeal, and granted *de novo* approval of the proposed project. The appellant filed a timely appeal of the Planning Commission's decision on July 7, 2015. The proposed project has been found to be in conformance with all applicable County Comprehensive Plan policies, and Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code zoning requirements. These policies and requirements along with the appellant's prior appeal issues are discussed in detail in the Planning Commission staff report, dated June 11, 2015 (Attachment 7 of this Board Letter).

#### **C. Appellant Appeal Issues and Staff Responses**

The appellant, Mr. Jim Nicholas, submitted a timely appeal of the Planning Commission's denial of his previous appeal (Case No. 15APL-00000-00005) on July 7, 2015. The appeal application (Attachment 5) contains a letter summarizing the issues raised in the appeal. An additional letter dated October 5, 2015 (Attachment 5) was submitted by the appellant summarizing the issues raised in the appeal application. These issues and staff's responses are summarized below. Although the appellant did not file a timely appeal of the CBAR's decision to approve the project, he did file a timely appeal of the Land Use Permit approval on March 23, 2015. Staff's responses to the issues raised in the appeal are limited to the issues which are applicable to the Land Use Permit approval, and to clarify CBAR's role in the permitting process.

**Appellant Appeal Issue #1:** The appellant contends that the decision of the CBAR to grant approval of the project was inconsistent with the Central County BAR Guidelines. The appellant cites County Code Chapter 2, Article 5, Section 2-33.1 – Purpose of Architectural Review. The appellant states that the project does not meet the following objectives contained within the Purpose of Architectural Review, and asserts that the objectives are Board of Supervisors Findings that are applicable to the proposed project:

1. Inappropriateness or poor quality of design. The appellant contends that the design and style does not conform to any architectural style in the area, and is not consistent with existing

residential quality and architecture. According to the appellant, CBAR members stated that the proposed development was “in conformance” with the community but could offer no examples anywhere in the County. Research of Santa Barbara County historical references completed by the appellant did not show any design/style/architecture related to that proposed. Professionals contacted also could not identify any examples of residential housing similar to that proposed.

2. Impairs the benefits of occupancy of existing property in the area. The appellant contends that the proposed project would be detrimental to the views as seen from neighboring properties. The appellant states that the CBAR’s recommended changes including increasing the roof size, and requiring dark colors and surfaces were made in order to attempt to make the entire structure disappear into the hillside.
3. Impairs the stability and value of both improved and unimproved property. The appellant contends that the approval of the project will set a precedent to allow an architectural style which is not in conformance with the area. The appellant states that there are several unimproved properties located close to the proposed development, and that the proposed “shed like structure” will not enhance the value of these properties, would set a precedent for design criteria, and would hinder the prospect of a sale of a neighboring property.
4. Destroys a proper relationship between the taxable value of real property and the cost of public services. The appellant states that the CBAR did not respond to his concerns regarding taxable value of the proposed structure. According to the appellant, the median tax is \$25,730.00, and the proposed unit tax base of the Stewart property would be either 25% or 41% of the median which destroys the relationship between taxable value and roads, schools and other infrastructure in the project site area.

**Staff Response:** The appellant cites County Code Chapter 2, Article 5, Section 2-33.1 – Purpose of Architectural Review, and asserts that the objectives included in the purpose are Board of Supervisors’ findings that are applicable to the proposed project. These findings were made by the Board of Supervisors for approval of the designation of area specific BAR’s and are not the required findings for the approval of specific projects. The required BAR findings for specific projects in the inland area are included in the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) Section 35.82.070.F.

According to the Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines adopted by the Board of Supervisors (Attachment 8), the purpose of the CBAR is to encourage development that exemplifies the best professional design practices so as to enhance the visual quality of the environment, benefit surrounding property values, and prevent poor quality of design. The CBAR is guided by a set of goals that define the major concerns and objectives of its review process. These goals are:

- 1) To ensure good quality architecture compatible with community standards;
- 2) To ensure that development and building design is consistent with adopted community design standards;
- 3) To promote high standards in architectural design and the construction of aesthetically pleasing structures so that new development does not detract from existing neighborhood characteristics;

- 4) To encourage the most appropriate and efficient use of land;
- 5) To promote visual interest throughout the county through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles; and
- 6) To preserve creek areas through restoration and enhancement, and discourage the removal of significant trees and foliage.

The CBAR reviewed the proposed single family dwelling to ensure that it complies with both the Ridgeline and Hillside Development requirements and the Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines. The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling would be located on a ridgeline and as a result, is required to be designed to comply with Chapter 35.62 (Ridgeline and Hillside Development) of the County Land Use and Development Code. In compliance with this chapter, the proposed project is designed at a maximum height of 16 feet, with darker earth toned colors which are compatible with the character of the terrain and natural surroundings of the site. Grading for the project has been minimized and the proposed landscaping plan includes native vegetation and oak trees which are compatible with the existing vegetation on the parcel.

The proposed project was reviewed by the CBAR at four separate meetings (October 10, 2014, December 12, 2014, January 16, 2015, and February 13, 2015). The minutes from these meetings are included as Attachment 9 to this board letter. During the CBAR's review, they generally approved of the overall concept of the project and the architecture. Concerns by the CBAR were mainly in regards to ensuring that night lighting on the residence was minimized to the maximum extent feasible, and that the structure did not create a "lantern effect". At the October 10, 2014 meeting, the CBAR commented that they appreciate the low-impact grading approach to the project, the modesty of the house size, and the limited exterior lighting. The project returned to the CBAR for further conceptual review on December 12, 2014. At this meeting, the CBAR commented that the project materials, simplicity of form, and modesty of size proposed are in conformity with neighborhood compatibility standards. The project was directed to return for preliminary/final review and approval with additional information concerning wall sections, and exterior details including roof overhangs and lighting fixtures.

On January 16, 2015, the project returned for preliminary/final review. The appellant attended this meeting and presented the CBAR and staff with letters dated January 8<sup>th</sup> and January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015 which characterize the architecture of the proposed residence as a "shed" design. During the CBAR's review of the project, board members commented that the proposed residence is modern looking in appearance, and not an unusual design. The chair of this meeting commented that the type of architecture proposed is not uncommon for the area, and that there are examples of this type of architecture within the County. The CBAR continued the project to the February 13, 2015 meeting with additional comments directing the applicant to darken the colors to integrate into the rural setting, provide additional window details, and carefully address the potential for night time glow. On February 13, 2015, the project returned to the CBAR and at this meeting it received preliminary and final approval. The CBAR commented that the applicant has adequately addressed the CBAR's comments and concerns.

The CBAR determined that the project's design conforms to neighborhood compatibility standards, is designed to minimize grading and ground disturbance to the maximum extent feasible, that the proposed lighting is consistent with the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan lighting requirements, and that the

project is a modest design that fits well within the rural setting. Goal 5 of the Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines promotes visual interest throughout the county through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles. Surrounding adjacent parcels are developed with single family residences and accessory structures in a variety of architectural styles which are compatible with the proposed residence.

The County does not regulate land use on the basis of property values. However, the applicant has stated that they have plans in process to build a larger main residence on the parcel, and to convert the subject residence to a residential second unit which would ultimately improve property values in the area.

**Appellant Appeal Issue #2: CBAR Agenda and Minutes – No Reference to 10 Day Appeal Period.**

The appellant states that during the last CBAR meeting, he made a request to include his letters and comments into their minutes for the record, and that this request was denied because it would make the minutes too unwieldy. The appellant states that he made it clear that he would be appealing the CBAR's decision, and that a Planning and Development planner stated that his letters and comments could be forwarded to the planner for inclusion in the record and that these letters would be made part of the documentation for any Planning Commission appeal. The appellant further states that he received no communication following the final CBAR meeting, or during the 10-day appeal period. The appellant states that the CBAR minutes, agenda, and every other communication to participants provided no notice of a 10-day appeal process. The appellant states that there was not proper notice of the 10-day appeal period printed on CBAR hearing notice documents or provided verbally during any of the meetings at which he brought up the subject of an appeal. The appellant asserts that the 10-day appeal period does not begin until such notice is given to the appellant, in writing, and that these notices are common on most County documents and have been enforced by the Courts.

**Staff Response:** According to the Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines (Attachment 8), a copy of any written statements read by a member of the public shall be given to the CBAR Secretary. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the CBAR must base its decision. The CBAR is required to receive public comments per the Brown Act, but board members are not required to respond to individual comments. An interested party who cannot appear at a hearing may write a letter to the CBAR indicating their support of or opposition to the project, including their reasoning and concerns. The letter will be included as a part of the public record.

The minutes of the CBAR meetings include the name of any person who makes public comments at the meeting and their position on the project. Written comments are not included in the meeting minutes. However, written comments are provided to the CBAR secretary for inclusion in the public record. The CBAR received and reviewed the letters submitted to them by the appellant, and these letters were provided to the CBAR secretary and staff and are included as a part of the public record. The CBAR has the discretion to determine how the proceedings of its meetings are reflected in its minutes.

The appellant is correct in noting that the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) minutes and agendas do not specify the applicable timelines for appeals of BAR decisions. Staff concurs that having this additional language in BAR agendas would be helpful to the public in order to clarify this process, and is looking into making the appropriate revisions. The provisions governing appeals of BAR decisions

are specified in the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code (Section 35.102.020.C.2.c, General Appeal Procedures, Appeals for decisions of the Board of Architectural Review, and Section 35.102.040-Appeals to Commissions). These provisions state that any decision of the Board of Architectural Review to grant or deny preliminary or final approval in compliance with Section 35.102.020.C.2.c is appealable to the Planning Commission and that appeals “shall be filed with the Department within 10 calendar days following the date of the decision or determination that is the subject of the appeal.” The LUDC does not set forth that notice is required to any parties to begin the 10-day appeal clock. In some other circumstances, statutes specifically provide that the time period to challenge an action does not begin until a certain notice is provided, such as related to the Mitigation Fee Act; however, notice is not required by CBAR bylaws, the LUDC, or other regulations. Additionally, until an action is appealed, there is no “appellant”, so it is unclear who would receive such notice. In this case, the appellant was present at the February 13, 2015 CBAR hearing at which the CBAR granted preliminary/final approval and had actual notice of the CBAR’s action on the project.

In any case, the appellant notified the case planner on February 24, 2015 that he would like to be notified of the date of Land Use Permit approval. On March 18, 2015, the case planner notified the appellant that the Land Use Permit had been approved, and the dates of the 10-day appeal period. Although the appellant did not file a timely appeal of the CBAR’s decision to approve the project, he did file a timely appeal of the Land Use Permit on March 23, 2015. Therefore, staff’s responses to the issues raised in the appeal are limited to the issues which are applicable to the Land Use Permit approval, and to clarify the CBAR’s role in the permitting process.

**Appellant Appeal Issue #3:** The appellant identifies the following concerns with regards to the information and analysis contained within the Planning Commission staff report, dated June 11, 2015 (Attachment 7).

1. **Planning Commission Staff Report, Appeal Issue #1.** The appellant disagrees with staff’s response to his allegation that the CBAR’s decision to approve the project was inconsistent with the CBAR Guidelines and Purpose. In particular, the appellant disagrees with staff’s assertion that the project conforms with the stated CBAR goals contained within the Guidelines. The appellant asserts that the Board of Supervisors issued specific guidelines, not general goals of land use policy and that the staff report defines their goals and not the stated findings of the Board of Supervisors. According to the appellant, the staff report falls short of responding to his objections, and in particular, does not address the Board of Supervisors findings which he discusses in detail in several letters to the CBAR. The appellant also states that out of the six goals specified in the staff report, five of these goals were not met.

**Staff Response:** The appellant cites County Code Chapter 2, Article 5, Section 2-33.1 – Purpose of Architectural Review, and asserts that the objectives included in the purpose are Board of Supervisors’ findings that are applicable to the proposed project. These findings were made by the Board of Supervisors for approval of the designation of area specific BAR’s and are not the required findings for the approval of specific projects. The required BAR findings for specific projects in the inland area are included in LUDC Section 35.82.070.F. In order to grant final approval of a project, County Code Section 2.33.15 requires the BAR to determine whether the buildings, structures, and signs are appropriate and of good design in relation to other buildings, structures, and signs on-site or in the immediately affected area. Such determinations are based on the findings contained within Section 6.2 of the Central County Board of Architectural

Review Bylaws and Guidelines, as well additional findings required pursuant to the County Zoning Ordinances. By granting final approval of the proposed project, the CBAR found that the proposed project met the required findings for approval. In addition, the CBAR determined that the project's design conforms to neighborhood compatibility standards, is designed to minimize grading and ground disturbance to the maximum extent feasible, that the proposed lighting is consistent with the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan lighting requirements, and that the project is a modest design that fits well within the rural setting. These findings are also in conformance with the goals contained in the Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines (Attachment 8).

2. **Planning Commission Staff Report, Appeal Issue #2.** The appellant states the staff report does not directly address his complaint, but rather discusses Comprehensive Plan Visual Resources Policy 3, which requires new structures to be compatible with the scale and character of the existing community. According to the appellant, the staff report's assertion that this policy encourages diverse housing types is "a major distortion" of the intent of the word "diverse" in the context of the policy. The appellant states that the staff report's conclusion that the proposed project is consistent with this policy is incorrect and clearly not the case. The appellant asserts that planned communities are encouraged to provide a "diverse" selection of styles so that a cookie cutter appearance is not evident, and that this was never intended to apply to the construction of a single unit within an existing community and then be used to justify its approval. In addition, the appellant contends that the proposed architecture is a "Shed" design and disagrees with staff's assertion that the proposed architecture includes modern and rustic design features.

**Staff Response:** The Planning Commission staff report, dated June 11, 2015, references Land Use Element Visual Resources Policy #3, which states:

*In areas designated as urban on the land use plan maps and in designated rural neighborhoods, new structures shall be in conformance with the scale and character of the existing community. Clustered development, varied circulation patterns, and diverse housing types shall be encouraged.*

This policy applies to parcels with an urban land use designation, or to designated rural neighborhoods such as an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN). The subject parcel is located in the inner-rural area of the County with a rural land used designation, and is not within a neighborhood identified as an EDRN. Therefore, the policy that most appropriately applies to the proposed project is Visual Resources Policy #2 which states:

*In areas designated as rural on the land use plan maps, the height, scale, and design of structures shall be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment, except where technical requirements dictate otherwise. Structures shall be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms; shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the landscape; and shall be sited so as not to intrude into the skyline as seen from public viewing places.*

Staff has revised the Comprehensive Plan Consistency analysis (Attachment 3) to include analysis of this relevant policy. The decision maker has the discretion to interpret the meaning of Comprehensive Plan policies. The analysis does not change staff's recommendation regarding

this appeal. The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling would be located on a ridgeline and is required to be designed to comply with Chapter 35.62 (Ridgeline and Hillside Development) of the County Land Use and Development Code. In compliance with this chapter, the proposed project is designed at a maximum height of 16 feet, with darker earth toned colors which are compatible with the character of the terrain and natural surroundings of the site. Grading for the project has been minimized to the maximum extent feasible, and the proposed landscaping plan includes native vegetation and oak trees which are compatible with the existing vegetation on the parcel. The project is designed to be subordinate in appearance to the surrounding hillsides, and is sited to not intrude into the skyline from public viewing places.

According to Goal 5 of the Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines (Attachment 8), projects should be designed to promote visual interest throughout the county through the preservation of public scenic, ocean and mountain vistas, creation of open space areas, and providing for a variety of architectural styles. The CBAR reviewed the project in conformance with the adopted guidelines, and granted final approval of the project on February 13, 2015.

3. **Planning Commission Staff Report, Appeal Issue #3.** The appellant states that he was led to believe that his letters would not become part of the CBAR proceedings and if he wanted them introduced as part of any appeal he would have to send them to a County planner representative. In addition, the appellant would like clarification as to why Board members are not required to respond to individual public comments made on projects during the public comment portion of the meeting.

**Staff Response:** The minutes of the CBAR meetings include the name of any person who makes public comments at the meeting and their position on the project. Written comments are not included in the meeting minutes. However, written comments are provided to the CBAR secretary for inclusion in the public record. The CBAR received and reviewed the letters submitted to them by the appellant, and these letters were provided to the CBAR secretary and staff and are included as part of the public record. During the public comment portion of the meeting, all speakers should indicate their position either for or against the project, and should provide all pertinent facts within their knowledge, including the reasons for their position. Testimony should relate to the design issues of the project and the findings upon which the CBAR must base its decision. Comments that are submitted to the CBAR are reviewed and in some cases taken into consideration when making final decisions. The CBAR is required to receive public comments according to the Brown Act, but board members are not required to respond to individual comments. The CBAR has the discretion to determine how the proceedings of its meetings are reflected in its minutes.

4. **Planning Commission Staff Report, Page 17 – DevStd VIS-SYV-1.3.** The appellant contends that the staff report's statement that no other suitable building sites are available on the subject parcel is incorrect. In addition, the appellant questions whether staff or the CBAR conducted a site visit and notes that this information was not included in the staff report. The appellant cites specific sections from the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code pertaining to development guidelines and CBAR exemptions. The appellant states that the CBAR did not produce any findings to support an exemption from the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines (LUDC Section 35.62.040).



**Staff Response:** DevStd VIS-SYV-1.3 states: *Development shall not occur on ridgelines if suitable alternative locations are available on the property. When there is no other suitable location, structures shall not intrude into the skyline or be conspicuously visible from public viewing places. Additional measures such as an appropriate landscape plan and limits to building height may be required in these cases.*

The proposed project site is located on a ridgeline and there are no other suitable alternative locations available on the property. The CBAR did not conduct a site visit as a part of their review. The project planner and supervising planner conducted a site visit on March 13, 2015. Staff's analysis indicates that other areas of the parcel are constrained topographically with steep slopes, would require additional grading and ground disturbance, or are located adjacent to a blue line creek or in areas that contain numerous oak trees. The area proposed for development of the residence is pre-disturbed, and readily accessible from Old Calzada Ridge Road. This area is predominately flat (3-5% slopes) and adjacent to the existing 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn. The applicant did not request an exemption from compliance with the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines (LUDC Section 35.62.040), and instead designed the proposed residence to be in compliance with the guidelines which limits the height of the single family dwelling to 16 feet, requires grading to be minimized to the maximum extent feasible, and landscaping that is compatible with adjacent vegetation which includes native oak trees. As a result, findings to support an exemption from the Ridgeline and Hillside Development Guidelines by the CBAR were not required.

**Appellant Appeal Issue #4:** The appellant's letter states that no garage or utility building has been proposed for parking. The appellant contends that other residential units within the development have garages, and that the proposed development does not conform to present residential unit standards. In addition, according to the appellant, cars, trucks, vans, grading equipment, and storage containers are presently stored on the project site without the issuance of a storage yard permit.

**Staff Response:** According to the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code (Section 35.36.050, Required Number of Spaces: Residential Uses), single family dwellings are required to provide 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit. These parking spaces are not required to be covered or located within a garage. The proposed project would provide two uncovered parking spaces adjacent to the proposed single family dwelling. Therefore, adequate parking has been provided in conformance with the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. The additional vehicles and storage containers located on the property are for the sole use of the property owner. According to Section 35.20.040.2.i (Exemptions from Planning Permit Requirements), a structure with an aggregate value of less than \$2,000.00 is exempt from permits. According to the applicant, the storage containers located on the subject property are valued at less than \$2,000.00, and as a result are exempt from permits. Section 35.36.090 (Parking Standards for Agricultural Zones and Uses) of the Land Use and Development Code does not contain requirements regarding the storage of privately owned vehicles and equipment.

**Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:**

Budgeted: Yes

The costs for processing appeals are provided through a fixed appeal fee and funds in P&D's adopted budget. Total costs for processing the appeal are approximately \$7,750.40 (40 hours). The costs are partially offset by the appeal fee of \$648.26. This work is funded in the Planning and Development Permitting Budget Program, as shown on page D-289 of the adopted 2015-2017 FY budget.

**Special Instructions:**

The Clerk of the Board shall publish a legal notice at least 10 days prior to the hearing on November 10, 2015. The notice shall appear in the Santa Ynez Valley News Press (labels attached). The Clerk of the Board shall fulfill noticing requirements. A minute order of the hearing and copy of the notice and proof of publication shall be forwarded to the Planning and Development Department, Hearing Support, Attention: David Villalobos.

**Attachments:**

1. Board of Supervisors Findings
2. Proposed De Novo Land Use Permit with Conditions, dated November 10, 2015
3. Comprehensive Plan Consistency
4. CEQA Exemption
5. Appeal Application to the Board of Supervisors
6. Planning Commission Action Letter, dated July 6, 2015
7. Planning Commission Staff Report, dated June 11, 2015
8. Central County Board of Architectural Review Bylaws and Guidelines
9. CBAR Minutes (10/10/14, 12/12/14, 1/16/15, 2/13/15)
10. Project Plans

**Authored by:**

Dana Eady, Planner, 934-6266  
Development Review Division, Planning and Development Department

## ATTACHMENT 1: FINDINGS

### 1.0 CEQA FINDINGS

#### 1.1 CEQA EXEMPTION

The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed project is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a). Please see Attachment 3, Notice of Exemption.

### 2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE FINDINGS

#### 2.1 LAND USE PERMIT FINDINGS

**In compliance with Section 35.30.100.A of the County Land Use and Development Code, prior to the approval or conditional approval of an application for a Land Use Permit the review authority shall first find, based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant, that adequate public or private services and resources (e.g., water, sewer, roads) are available to serve the proposed development.**

The Rancho Ynecita Mutual Water Company has issued a can and will serve letter dated October 24, 2014 verifying that water service will be provided for the proposed project. Sanitary services will be provided by a proposed septic system utilizing a dry well. Environmental Health Services has reviewed and approved the proposed septic system design. Access will be provided by an existing private driveway from Old Calzada Ridge Road. Police services will be provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department and Fire protection will be provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (station #32). Therefore the project is consistent with this finding.

#### 2.1.1 In compliance with Subsection 35.82.110.E.1 of the County Land Use and Development Code, prior to the approval or conditional approval of an application for a Land Use Permit the review authority shall first make all of the following findings:

##### 1. The proposed development conforms:

##### a. To the applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, including any applicable community or area plan.

As discussed in Attachment 3 of the Board Letter dated November 10, 2015, incorporated herein by reference, the project is consistent with the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, including the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan. Therefore, the project is consistent with this finding.

##### b. With the applicable provisions of this Development Code or falls within the limited exception allowed in compliance with Chapter 35.101 (Nonconforming Uses, Structures, and Lots).

As discussed in section 6.4, Zoning - Land Use Development Code Compliance, of the Planning Commission staff report dated June 11, 2015, incorporated herein by reference, the

project is in conformance with the applicable requirements of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. Therefore, the project is consistent with this finding.

**2. The proposed development is located on a legally created lot.**

The subject parcel was legally created as a part of Tract Map 11,880 which recorded on August 28, 1975 (book 91, pages 88-94). Therefore, the subject parcel is legally created and the project is consistent with this finding.

**3. The subject property is in compliance with all laws, regulations, and rules pertaining to uses, subdivisions, setbacks and any other applicable provisions of this Development Code, and any applicable zoning violation enforcement fees and processing fees have been paid. This Subsection shall not be interpreted to impose new requirements on legal nonconforming uses and structures in compliance with Chapter 35.101 (Nonconforming Uses, Structures, and Lots).**

Upon issuance of the subject land use permit legalizing the as-built 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn, the subject property will be in compliance with all laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to zoning uses, subdivision, setback and any other applicable divisions of the Land Use and Development Code. No zoning violation enforcement/processing fees have been assessed. As discussed in Section 6.4, Zoning: Land Use and Development Code Compliance of the staff report dated June 11, 2015, incorporated herein by reference, the project is consistent with all of the requirements of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. Therefore, the project is consistent with this finding.

**ATTACHMENT 3: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY**

<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>
<b>Land Use Element – Land Use Development Policies</b>	
<p><i><b>Land Use Development Policy 3:</b> No urban development shall be permitted beyond the boundaries of land designated for urban uses except in neighborhoods in rural areas.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The subject parcel is located in the Santa Ynez Community Plan inner rural area in the Rancho Ynecita neighborhood. The AG-I-20 zone district allows for the construction of single family dwellings and agricultural accessory structures with the approval of a Land Use Permit. Therefore, the project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><i><b>Land Use Development Policy 4:</b> Prior to the issuance of a use permit, the County shall make the finding that adequate public or private services and resources (i.e., water, sewer, roads, etc.) are available to serve the proposed project.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The Rancho Ynecita Mutual Water Company has issued a can and will serve letter dated October 24, 2014 verifying that water service will be provided for the proposed project. Sanitary services would be provided by a proposed septic system utilizing a dry well. Environmental Health Services has reviewed and approved the proposed septic system design. Access would be provided by an existing private driveway from Old Calzada Ridge Road. Police services would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department and Fire protection would be provided by the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (station #32). Therefore, the proposed project is in consistent with this policy.</p>
<b>Land Use Element – Hillside and Watershed Protection Policies</b>	
<p><i><b>Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy #1:</b> Plans for development shall minimize cut and fill operations. Plans requiring excessive cutting and filling may be denied if it is determined that the development could be carried out with less alteration of the natural terrain.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project involves minimal ground disturbance (less than 50 cubic yards of grading) for construction of the single family dwelling. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><i><b>Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy #2:</b> All developments shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling would be located in a flat area of the subject parcel, and is designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology and hydrology of the subject parcel. Minimal ground disturbance (less than 50 cubic yards of grading) is required for construction of the residence. The proposed landscaping plan includes the installation of native vegetation</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
<p><i>suited to development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.</i></p>	<p>and oak trees. The existing agricultural storage barn is also located in a flat area of the parcel and outside of the drip line of onsite native oak trees. No natural features, landforms, native vegetation (including trees) would be impacted as a result of the proposed project. There are no known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards within the project site area. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Hillside and Watershed Protection Policy #6:</b>  <i>Provisions shall be made to conduct surface water to storm drains or suitable watercourses to prevent erosion. Drainage devices shall be designed to accommodate increased runoff resulting from modified soil and surface conditions as a result of development. Water runoff shall be retained onsite whenever possible to facilitate groundwater recharge.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project would create less than 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces and as a result is not subject to a Storm Water Management Plan. However, to facilitate groundwater recharge, storm water runoff from the proposed residence would be directed to the proposed landscaping planters and groundcover located to the north of the proposed residence. Any excess surface runoff would be directed to historic drainage areas on the subject parcel. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Land Use Element – Visual Resources Policies</b></p>	
<p><b>Visual Resources Policy #2:</b> <i>In areas designated as rural on the land use plan maps, the height, scale, and design of structures shall be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment, except where technical requirements dictate otherwise. Structures shall be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms; shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the landscape; and shall be sited so as not to intrude into the skyline as seen from public viewing places.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The subject parcel is located within the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan inner-rural area. Surrounding parcels are developed with single family residences and accessory structures in a variety of sizes and architectural styles. These styles include Spanish style, ranch, modern, and rustic designs. The proposed single family dwelling is smaller in size than the majority of single family dwellings located within Rancho Ynecita. However, there are existing residential accessory units on adjacent parcels which are of similar size and scale (i.e. 1,000 sq. ft. residential second unit, and 650 sq. ft. guest house).</p> <p>The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling would be located on a ridgeline and as a result, is required to be designed to comply with Chapter 35.62 (Ridgeline and Hillside</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
	<p>Development) of the County Land Use and Development Code. In compliance with this chapter, the proposed project is designed at a maximum height of 16 feet, with darker earth toned colors which are compatible with the character of the terrain and natural surroundings of the site. Grading for the project has been minimized and the proposed landscaping plan includes native vegetation and oak trees which are compatible with the existing vegetation on the parcel. The project is designed to be subordinate in appearance to the surrounding hillsides, and is sited not to intrude into the skyline from public viewing places. The nearest public viewing place of the subject parcel is from Old Calzada Ridge Road. The proposed residence would be located at an elevation lower than the road and would therefore not impede views of the surrounding hillsides or intrude into the skyline from that location. The existing agricultural storage barn is a rustic wooden design with a maximum height of 19 feet, and is compatible with the proposed residence. Therefore the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><i>Visual Resource Policies, Policy 5. Utilities, including television, shall be placed underground in new developments in accordance with the rules and regulations of the California Public Utilities Commission, except where cost of undergrounding would be so high as to deny service.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> In accordance with the project description (condition No. 1), all utilities would be installed underground. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><b>Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan (SYVCP)</b></p>	
<p><b>SYVCP – Land Use Rural, Inner-rural and EDRNS</b></p>	
<p><i>Policy LUA-SYV-3: New development shall be compatible with adjacent agricultural lands.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed single family dwelling would be located on a flat area of the subject parcel, adjacent to Old Calzada Ridge Road. The Rancho Ynecita neighborhood is comprised of 20-acre agriculturally zoned parcels which are developed with low intensity residential, agricultural (vineyards, orchards) and equestrian uses. There are no existing</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
	<p>agricultural operations located adjacent to the project site. However, the proposed project’s design is compatible with the surrounding agriculturally zoned land and existing development. The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling would be a maximum height of 16 feet and is designed with darker earth toned colors in order to blend in with the surrounding natural environment. The proposed dwelling includes architectural elements characteristic of modern and rustic designs such as a standing seam roof, metal siding, and a wooden deck. The existing agricultural storage barn is a rustic wooden design with a maximum height of 19 feet, and is compatible with the proposed residence. The project site is located on a pre-disturbed area of the parcel which is not used for agricultural operations. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><i>DevStd LUA-SYV-3.1: New non-agricultural development adjacent to agriculturally zoned property shall include appropriate buffers, such as trees, shrubs, walls, and fences, to protect adjacent agricultural operations from potential conflicts and claims of nuisance. The size and character of the buffers shall be determined through parcel-specific review on a case-by-case basis.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The subject parcel is located within the AG-I-20 zone district in the inner-rural area of Santa Ynez. The Rancho Ynecita neighborhood is comprised of 20-acre parcels which are developed with low intensity residential, agricultural (vineyards, orchards) and equestrian uses. The topography of the parcels in this area of Santa Ynez is varied and includes a mixture of steep slopes and valleys. The majority of single family dwellings in Rancho Ynecita have been constructed on ridgelines with agricultural and other accessory uses located in lower lying areas below. The existing agricultural storage barn and proposed single family dwelling are located on a predominately flat ridgeline adjacent to Old Calzada Ridge Road. There are no existing agricultural operations located adjacent to the project site. However, there are adequate buffers in place including oak trees and shrubs to protect future agricultural operations from potential conflicts and claims of nuisance. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>



REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
<b>SYVCP - Circulation</b>	
<p><i>Policy CIRC-SYV-1: The County shall allow reasonable development of parcels within the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan Area while maintaining safe roadways and intersections that operate at acceptable levels of service.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project includes the construction of a new 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling, and legalization of an as-built 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn on the 18.60 acre parcel. Access to the site would be provided by an existing private driveway from Old Calzada Ridge Road. The proposed development is reasonable and would not create safety hazards to existing roadways or cause intersections to operate at an unacceptable level of service. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<b>SYVCP - Wastewater</b>	
<p><i>DevStd WW-SYV-1.1: Septic system installations shall only occur on parcels that are free of site characteristics listed under “VIII.D.3.i. Individual, Alternative and Community Systems Prohibitions” in the Water Quality Control Plan for Central Coast Basin, Region 3 by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Adherence to Regional Water Quality Control Board and other applicable state standards, applicable zoning regulations and the County Wastewater Ordinance shall constitute a finding of consistency with Land Use Development Policy 4.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Sanitary services for the proposed single family dwelling would be provided by a new septic system utilizing a dry well. The septic system has been reviewed and approved by Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services. The subject parcel does not include site characteristics listed under section VIII.D.3.i of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin, Region 3. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>
<p><i>DevStd WW-SYV-1.2: To the maximum extent feasible, development requiring private sewage disposal shall utilize gravity flow of wastewater to the septic tank and disposal field to minimize mechanical failure, which may cause surfacing of effluent. For lots of record where gravity flow of effluent is unavailable, pumping may be allowed. For new subdivision where gravity flow to the public sewer is unavailable, the lift station shall be owned and/or maintained by a public agency such as a community services district. Private operation and maintenance of a shared or community lift station shall be prohibited.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project includes a new septic system utilizing a drywell. The project has been designed to the maximum extent feasible to utilize gravity flow. Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services has reviewed and approved the proposed septic system design. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
<p><i>DevStd WW-SYV-2.6: Development shall be designed to reduce runoff from the site by minimizing impervious surfaces, using pervious or porous surfaces, and minimizing contiguous impervious areas.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project includes less than 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces and grading and ground disturbance has been minimized to the maximum extent feasible. The project is designed to reduce runoff from the site with a pervious driveway, and a proposed landscaping plan that includes new ground cover, trees, and shrubs. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>
<p><i>DevStd WW-SYV-2.7: Development shall incorporate best management practices (BMPs) to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff. The BMPs include, but are not limited to dry wells for roof drainage or other roof downspout infiltration systems, modular paving, unit pavers on sand or other porous pavement for driveways, patios or parking areas, multiple-purpose detention systems, cisterns, structural devices (e.g., grease, silt, sediment, and trash traps), sand filters, or vegetated treatment systems (e.g. bioswales/filters). Drywells, bioswales and other infiltration systems for storm water shall maintain appropriate setbacks from onsite sewage disposal system components.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project would create less than 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces and as a result is not subject to a Storm Water Management Plan. However, to facilitate groundwater recharge, storm water runoff from the proposed residence would be directed to the proposed landscaping planters and groundcover located adjacent to the proposed residence. Any excess surface runoff would be directed to historic drainage areas on the subject parcel. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><b>SYVCP – Fire Protection</b></p>	
<p><i>DevStd FIRE-SYV-2.2: Development shall be sited to minimize exposure to fire hazards and reduce the need for grading and clearance of native vegetation to the maximum extent feasible. Building sites should be located in areas of a parcel’s lowest fire hazard, and should minimize the need for long and/or steep access roads and/or driveways.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project site is located on a flat ridge of the subject parcel. The area of the site proposed for development of the single family dwelling is mostly devoid of vegetation and trees which minimizes the need for grading and clearance of native vegetation. Access to this area of the parcel is provided by an existing private driveway of approximately 300 feet in length from Old Calzada Ridge Road. This area is the parcel’s lowest fire hazard area, and is accessible to fire emergency vehicles. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
<b>SYVCP – Biological Resources</b>	
<p><i>Policy BIO-SYV-1: Environmentally sensitive biological resources and habitat areas shall be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.</i></p> <p><i>Policy BIO-SYV-3: Significant biological communities shall not be fragmented by development into small, non-viable areas.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The area proposed for development of the single family dwelling is adjacent to existing development consisting of an 864 sq. ft. barn. No tree or vegetation removal is proposed as a part of the project. The existing native oak trees and vegetation within the project site area would be preserved and protected. There are no significant biological communities on the subject parcel which would be fragmented by the proposed project. The proposed landscaping plan includes additional oak trees and native vegetation which is compatible with the existing vegetation adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with these policies.</p>
<p><i>Policy BIO-SYV-8: Native protected trees and non-native specimen trees shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Non-Native specimen trees are defined for the purposes of this policy as mature trees that are healthy and structurally sound and have grown into the natural stature particular to the species. Native or non-native trees that have unusual scenic or aesthetic quality, have important historic value, or are unique due to species type or location shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible.</i></p> <p><i>DevStd BIO-SYV-8.1: A “native protected tree” is at least six inches in diameter as measured at breast height (DBH = 4.5 feet above level ground). A “non-native specimen tree” is at least 25 inches DBH. Areas to be protected from grading, paving, and other disturbances shall generally avoid the critical root zone ( a circular area around a tree trunk with a radius equivalent to one foot for each inch of diameter at breast height) or drip line as applicable. Standards for oak tree protection in inner-rural and rural areas are governed by the County’s Deciduous Oak Tree Protection and Regeneration Ordinance</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> No tree or vegetation removal is proposed as a part of the project. The existing native oak trees on the subject parcel would be preserved and protected. The proposed landscaping plan includes additional oak trees and native vegetation to enhance the existing landscaping at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy and development standard.</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
<i>(Article IX of Chapter 35 of the Santa Barbara County Code.</i>	
<b>Policy BIO-SYV-9:</b> <i>Trees serving as known raptor nesting sites or key raptor roosting sites shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible.</i>	<b>Consistent:</b> None of the existing trees are known raptor nesting or roosting sites. However, the proposed project does not propose to remove any trees, and the existing oak trees at the project site would be preserved and protected. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.
<b>SYVCP – Flooding and Drainage</b>	
<b>Policy FLD-SYV-1:</b> <i>Flood risks shall be minimized through appropriate design and land use controls, as well as through feasible engineering solutions that address existing problems.</i>	<b>Consistent:</b> The project site is located on a predominately flat ridgeline, and outside of a floodway or floodplain. Any flood risks associated with the project have been minimized to the maximum extent feasible through engineering and project design. There are no known flooding problems on the subject parcel. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.
<b>DevStd FLD-SYV-2.2:</b> <i>Grading and drainage plans shall be submitted with any application for development that would increase total runoff from the site or substantially alter drainage patterns on the site or in its vicinity. The purpose of such plan(s) shall be to avoid or minimize hazards including but not limited to flooding, erosion, landslides, and soil creep. Appropriate temporary and permanent measures such as energy dissipaters, silt fencing, straw bales, sand bags, and sediment basins shall be used in conjunction with other basic design methods to prevent erosion on slopes and siltation of creek channels and other ESH areas. Such plan(s) shall be reviewed and approved by both County Flood Control and Planning &amp; Development.</i>	<b>Consistent:</b> Minimal ground disturbance (less than 50 cubic yards of grading) is required for construction of the proposed single family dwelling. Since the quantity of grading is less than 50 cubic yards, a grading permit is not required. The proposed project would create less than 2,500 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces, and would not substantially alter drainage patterns on the site or in the vicinity. In addition, the proposed project would not increase the total runoff from the site. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
<b>SYVCP - Geology</b>	
<p><i>Policy GEO-SYV-1: Development shall be sited and designed to minimize the potential for geologic hazards, including but not limited to seismic, soil, or slope hazards.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The existing agricultural storage barn and proposed single family dwelling would be located on a predominately flat ridgeline adjacent to Old Calzada Ridge Road. There are no known geologic hazards located within the project site area. This area of the site contains slopes between 3 and 5% and is easily accessible from Old Calzada Ridge Road. A soils report prepared for the project dated January 19, 2015 indicates a low potential for seismic issues and liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<b>SYVCP – Cultural Resources</b>	
<p><i>Policy HA-SYV-1 Archaeological resources shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Construction of the single family residence would require minimal grading and ground disturbance (less than 50 cubic yards). There are no known archaeological resources on the subject parcel. However, the project is conditioned (Condition No. 4) to require work to stop or be re-directed and a Native American representative contacted in the event that archaeological resources are discovered on the subject parcel. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<b>SYVCP – Visual and Aesthetic Resources</b>	
<p><i>GOAL VIS-SYV-1: Protect the Rural/Agricultural Character and Natural Features of the Planning Area, Including Mountain Views, Scenic Corridors and Buffers, Prominent Valley Viewsheds, and the Quality of the Nighttime Sky.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The subject parcel is located within the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan inner-rural area. The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling would be a maximum height of 16 feet and is designed with darker earth toned colors in order to blend in with the surrounding natural environment. The existing 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn was constructed in 1977. This wood structure is a maximum height of 19 feet, and is rural/rustic architectural design that is compatible with the surrounding architecture.</p> <p>The Central Board of Architectural Review (CBAR) reviewed the proposed single family dwelling at four meetings (10/10/14, 12/12/14,</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
	<p>1/16/15, 2/13/15). On February 13, 2015, the CBAR granted preliminary/final approval of the project. At this meeting, the NBAR commented that the applicant has adequately addressed the CBAR's comments and concerns on the project.</p> <p>The proposed project includes architectural elements which are consistent with both modern and rustic designs such as a standing seam roof, metal siding, and a wooden deck. The height and colors of the structure would effectively blend it into the existing terrain and would not obstruct mountain views, scenic corridors and buffers, or prominent valley viewsheds. To protect the nighttime sky, the proposed lighting has been designed to be in compliance with the Santa Ynez Valley Outdoor Lighting Ordinance (fully shielded and directed downwards). Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this goal.</p>
<p><i>Policy VIS-SYV-1: Development of property should minimize impacts to open space views as seen from public roads and viewpoints and avoid destruction of significant visual resources.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The existing agricultural storage barn and the proposed site for the 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling are located on a ridgeline. The existing 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn was constructed in 1977. This wood structure is a maximum height of 19 feet, and is rural/rustic architectural design that is compatible with the surrounding architecture in the project site area. This structure was built prior to 1988 when the requirement for Board of Architectural Review went in to effect, and no additional design review of this structure is required.</p> <p>The project site is located on a ridgeline. Therefore, in order to minimize impacts to open space views and avoid the destruction of significant visual resources, the proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling is required to be designed to comply with Chapter 35.62 (Ridgeline and Hillside Development) of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. In compliance with the</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
	<p>chapter, the residence is designed with a maximum height of 16 feet, and includes darker earth toned colors which are compatible with the character of the terrain and natural surroundings of the site. Grading for the project has been minimized to the maximum extent feasible (less than 50 cubic yards), and the proposed landscaping plan includes native vegetation and oak trees which are compatible with the existing vegetation on the parcel.</p> <p>As a result, the proposed project has been designed to minimize impacts to open space views as seen from public roads and view points, and would not destruct significant visual resources. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this policy.</p>
<p><b><i>DevStd VIS-SYV-1.2: Development, including houses, roads and driveways, shall be sited and designed to be compatible with and subordinate to significant natural features including prominent slopes, hilltops and ridgelines, mature trees and woodlands, and natural drainage courses.</i></b></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The existing 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn was constructed without permits in 1977. This wood structure is a maximum height of 19 feet, and is rural/rustic architectural design that is compatible with the surrounding architecture. This structure was built prior to 1988 when the requirement for Board of Architectural Review went in to effect, and no additional design review of this structure is required.</p> <p>The proposed 1,200 sq. ft. single family dwelling has been designed to comply with Chapter 35.62 (Ridgeline and Hillside Development) of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code. The structure would not exceed 16 feet in height and is designed with darker earth toned colors and materials. The proposed landscaping plan includes native trees and vegetation which are compatible with the existing vegetation on the parcel. Access to the single family dwelling would be provided by an existing driveway from Old Calzada Ridge Road. Minimal grading (less than 50 cubic yards) is required for improvements to the driveway. Therefore, the proposed project has been</p>

REQUIREMENT	DISCUSSION
	<p>designed to be compatible with and subordinate to the existing character and terrain of the natural surroundings and is consistent with this development standard.</p>
<p><i>DevStd VIS-SYV-1.3: Development shall not occur on ridgelines if suitable alternative locations are available on the property. When there is no other suitable location, structures shall not intrude into the skyline or be conspicuously visible from public viewing places. Additional measures such as an appropriate landscape plan and limits to building height may be required in these cases.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project site is located on a ridgeline. This area of the parcel is pre-disturbed and easily accessible from Old Calzada Ridge Road. The area proposed for development of the single family dwelling is predominately flat (3-5% slopes) and adjacent to the existing 864 sq. ft. agricultural storage barn. The proposed project has been designed to comply with Chapter 35.62 of the Santa Barbara County Land Use and Development Code which limits the height of the single family dwelling to 16 feet, requires grading to be minimized to the maximum extent feasible, and landscaping that is compatible with adjacent vegetation which includes native oak trees. The project’s landscaping would be compatible with the adjacent vegetation. There are no other suitable areas on the subject parcel to accommodate the proposed development. Other areas of the parcel are constrained topographically with steep slopes, or are located adjacent to a blue line creek or in areas that contain numerous oak trees. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>
<p><i>DevStd VIS-SYV-1.4: Consistent with applicable ordinances, policies, development standards and the Constrained Site Guidelines, structures shall be sited and designed to minimize the need for vegetation clearance for fuel management zone buffers. Where feasible, necessary roads and driveways shall be used as or incorporated into fuel management zones.</i></p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed project site would be located on a predominately flat ridge (slopes of 3-5%) of the subject parcel. The area of the site proposed for development of the new residence is mostly devoid of vegetation and trees which minimizes the need for grading and clearance of native vegetation. Access to this area of the parcel is provided by an existing private driveway of approximately 300 feet in length. This area is the parcel’s lowest fire hazard area, and is accessible to fire emergency vehicles. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with this development standard.</p>



<b>REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>
<p><i><b>Policy VIS-SYV-3:</b> The night sky of the Santa Ynez Valley shall be protected from excessive and unnecessary light associated with new development and redevelopment.</i></p> <p><i><b>DevStd VIS-SYV-3.1:</b> All new development and redevelopment in the planning area shall be subject to the requirements of the Santa Ynez Valley Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.</i></p>	<p>To protect the nighttime sky from excessive and unnecessary light associated with the proposed residence, the proposed lighting has been designed to be in compliance with the Santa Ynez Valley Outdoor Lighting Ordinance (low wattage, fully shielded and directed downwards). The Central Board of Architectural (CBAR) approved the proposed lighting plan on February 13, 2015.</p>