



200 EAST CARRILLO STREET, SUITE 400 SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93101-2190

MAILING ADDRESS P. O. BOX 99 SANTA BARBARA, CA 93102-0099

TELEPHONE (805) 962-0011 FACSIMILE (805) 965-3978 1.5



OF COUNSEL

ARTHUR R. GAUDI DANIEL C. DAVID SUSAN M. BASHAM STEVEN K. McGUIRE

RETIRED PARTNERS GERALD S. THEDE DAVID K. HUGHES

OUR FILE NUMBER

21901.1

July 5, 2010

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors 105 East Anapamu Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101

J. TERRY SCHWARTZ DAVID W. VAN HORNE PETER D. SLAUGHTER DOUGLAS D. ROSSI

ERIC P. HVOLBØLL CRAIG A. PARTON CLYDE E. WULLBRANDT

TODD A. AMSPOKER MARK S. MANION MELISSA J. FASSETT

IAN M. FISHER SHEREEF MOHARRAM

KRISTEN M.R. BLABEY LESLEY E. CUNNINGHAM

SAM ZODEH

KENNETH J. PONTIFEX CHRISTOPHER E. HASKELL TIMOTHY E. METZINGER

Re: California Coastal Commission Staff Recommended Modifications to

County Land Use and Development Code

Dear Board Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Coastal Commission staff's recommended modifications to the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC). We have participated in the Zoning Ordinance Reformatting Project (ZORP) since its inception and believe that the scope of the suggested modifications go far beyond the simple reformatting effort as originally envisioned, and have far reaching ramifications and unintended consequences that have not been adequately disclosed or reviewed by the public stakeholders. Moreover, many of the staff's suggested modifications are substantive in nature and therefore should be subject to full review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and some of the proposed changes appear to remove existing flexibility through the County review process which currently provides for more beneficial projects.

For example, Modification 14 would require that development resulting from a lot line adjustment avoid any and all impacts to environmentally sensitive habitats (ESH) and buffer areas thereby removing the flexibility for mitigating such impacts on constrained lots and eliminating property owner incentives such as enhancing artificially created and/or degraded wetlands. If certified, the revised lot line adjustment findings would require that all impacts to ESH areas be avoided, regardless of the net beneficial result that could be accomplished through mitigation/enhancement. Similarly, Modification 9 would designate habitat restoration as a non-principally use throughout the Coastal Zone and would thereby discourage such projects due to the increased expense and difficulty in obtaining permits.

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors July 5, 2010 Page 2

We urge your Board not to accept the suggested modifications without a more thorough review and consideration as they are substantive changes to the existing permit procedures and jurisdiction, eliminate flexibility for many beneficial projects, and undermine years of well thought community input on the County's planning process.

Very truly yours,

C.E. Chip Wullbrandt

for PRICE, POSTEL & PARMA LLP

CEW:lkh