



Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning Division
Transmittal Memorandum

DATE: June 23, 2011

TO: GavPAC Members

FROM: David Lackie, Supervising Planner
Brian Tetley, Planner

CC: Supervisor Doreen Farr, 3rd Supervisorial District

SUBJECT: GavPAC Meeting No. 37

The items listed below have been included as part of the meeting materials for GavPAC Meeting No. 37, to be held Wednesday June 29, 2011 @ 6:30 p.m. in the Vista de Las Cruces School auditorium:

1. **Meeting Agenda:** Meeting No. 37 agenda (Attachment 1).
2. **Draft Meeting Minutes:** Staff has provided draft minutes for the GavPAC meetings of June 7 and June 15, 2011 for review and approval (Attachment 2).
3. **Agricultural Subcommittee Permit Tiering Worksheets:** Staff has attached a set of worksheets (Attachment 3) that reflect the work of the Agricultural Subcommittee on a tiered permit process for agricultural properties with various uses scaled as appropriate.
4. **Long-Term Schedule:** The revised long term schedule is attached (Attachment 4).

In addition to this packet, please bring the GavPAC documents binder with you to the meeting.

All GavPAC materials are also available for download from the following webpage:
<http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/gaviota/gaviota.php>

Agricultural Subcommittee Report (Agenda Item No. 5)

This meeting continues the deliberative phase of the land use planning process for the Gaviota Coast. The deliberative phase builds upon previous GavPAC work to identify core planning issues, and will provide an opportunity to discuss these issues in greater detail, and explore different planning options and approaches. Keep in mind that the goal in the deliberative stage is not to fully write or vet policy or ordinance language, but to develop consensus or at least refinement of GavPAC policy preferences which can be used by staff to craft draft policy statements and implementing tools. The review and revision to draft policy or ordinance language will occur later in the process after all of the deliberative meetings and a period of time for staff to develop the language.

This meeting affords an opportunity for the GavPAC to provide input on Agricultural Subcommittee work to date. The key product of the agricultural subcommittee so far is the tiered permitting worksheets for agricultural properties. The agricultural subcommittee has identified categories of uses and applied a tiered permitting system that recognizes appropriate scale of intensity for uses. This recognizes that a more refined approach is needed to allow additional flexibility in allowing uses of a non-impactful, appropriate scale for a subject property.

Discussion of Coastal Commission Non- Agricultural LUDC Modifications (Agenda Item No. 6)

With time allowing, the committee can initiate discussions regarding approaches to the non-agricultural related Coastal Commission LUDC modifications. The Agricultural Subcommittee will be reviewing the agricultural related LUDC modifications in the course of the subcommittee meetings, and will report to the full GavPAC at a later date. The non-agricultural related LUDC modifications include: 1) Residences on Ag-Zoned land, 2) Animal Keeping, 3) Private Bluff Stairways, and 4) Eliminated Uses Previously Allowed with CUP.

Attachments:

1. Meeting 37 Agenda
2. Meetings 35 & 36 Draft Minutes
3. Agricultural Subcommittee Permit Tiering Worksheets
4. Long-Term Schedule



Notice of Public Meeting

Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee (GavPAC) Meeting No. 37

Note: This agenda lists discussion topics for the GavPAC meetings on:

Wednesday, June 29, 2011 – 6:30 p.m.

Attendees: GavPAC Members, County Staff, and Public Participants
Please review: Meeting Materials Packet for Meeting on 06/29/11
Please bring: Meeting Materials Packet for Meeting on 06/29/11
Location: Vista de Las Cruces School - Auditorium, 9467 San Julian Rd, Gaviota, CA 93117

Agenda Item	Discussion Topics
CALL TO ORDER	
1	Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call
2	Public Comment <i>The Public Comment period is set aside to allow public testimony on items not on today's agenda. The time allocated to each speaker will be set at the discretion of the Chair.</i>
3	Administrative Briefings <i>Staff updates regarding local or other legislative activities, local planning decisions, or other updates of interest to the Committee.</i>
4	Meeting Minutes Review and Approval
5	Agricultural Subcommittee Report
6	Discussion of Coastal Commission Non- Agricultural LUDC Modifications
7	Discussion of Long-Term Meeting Schedule
Adjourn	

Questions or comments about the Gaviota Coast Plan may be directed to Brian A. Tetley at 805-884-6848 or btetley@co.santa-barbara.ca.us and further information may be obtained on the following web site: <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/gaviota/gaviota.php>

Writings that are a public record under Government Code § 54957.5(a) and that relate to an agenda item of a regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee that are distributed to a majority of all of the members of the Planning Advisory Committee less than 72 hours prior to that meeting shall be available for public inspection at Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department, 123 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA, and also on the County's website at <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/>

Attendance and participation by the public is invited and encouraged. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Hearing Support Staff (805) 568-2000. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Hearing Support Staff to make reasonable accommodations.

Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 35

***Tuesday June 7, 2011
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

Meeting Called to Order: By Chair Kim Kimbell at 6:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Baer, Boise-Cossart, Feeney, Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Bowman

County Staff Present:

Dianne Black, Planning and Development Director of Development Services

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian A. Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie Haldeman, Long Range Planning Division Associate Planner

2. Administrative Briefings: None

3. Public Comment: None

4. Meeting Minutes from May 25th, 2011

Deliberation: McNabb requested that the minutes include more details from Rich Rozzelle's presentation. Staff will refer to the audiotape from the May 25th meeting and provide a more detailed account of the presentation.

Public Comment:

Dan Falat representing California State Parks: requested that the minutes be amended to reflect more details from Mr. Rozzelle's presentation.

ACTION: Boise-Cossart moved, seconded by Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 9-0, with Lloyd abstaining, to approve the minutes with modifications.

5-8. Recreation & Trails Planning Deliberations

Staff Presentation: Sections 30211 and 30212 of the California Coastal Act includes the key provisions regarding coastal access. The County's Coastal Land Use Plan policies related to coastal access include: Policies 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3.

CRAHTAC Presentation: Dan Gira, 2nd District Appointee to CRAHTAC, explained recommendations from CRAHTAC's Gaviota Subcommittee. Recommendations include 1) Endorse the formation of a joint GavPAC / CRAHTAC trails subcommittee 2) endorse CRAHTAC's 11 trails policy principles as a starting point for subcommittee work 3) consider GavPAC involvement in trails planning issues for projects in the eastern portion of the planning area.

Mr. Gira recommended the GavPAC clearly define the "purpose and intent" of trail policies as well as the goals, objectives and policies that would help achieve that purpose and intent. Mr. Gira does not see much opportunity for trails exactions on



individual development projects on the Gaviota Coast and therefore feels it would be better to focus on developing incentives that could afford property owners a broader spectrum of uses in exchanged for voluntary trail dedications. CRAHTAC member Kalon Kelley discussed the 11 CRAHTAC trails policy principles for Gaviota. CRAHTAC specifically wants to avoid building expensive structures for vertical access to the coast and instead rely upon existing landforms. Ray Ford explained the challenges related to trail development, including topographic limitations, funding constraints, interagency coordination and the role of private non-profits.

Deliberation: McNabb is concerned about impacts to current landowners resulting from changes to existing policies on trails. Lloyd stated that there will be few discretionary projects in the planning area after the Plan is adopted, and therefore the ability to obtain trails through exactions on development project will be limited. Tautrim described potential trail opportunities and existing access points within the planning area.

McGinnis expressed concern regarding equestrian use and impacts to ESHA due to the transportation of non-native and evasive plant species by horses. She would like to see commercial equestrian uses prohibited. McGinnis is also concerned about creating paved trails (i.e. paved bike trails). McKenna wants to see the California Coastal Trail as close to the ocean as possible; it could be a primitive walking trail. Tautrim does not want to see wide multi-use trails but rather supports a more primitive trail design. Baer wants to avoid multi-use trails south of Highway 101. Boise-Cossart is concerned about impacts to ESHA from trail development. Van Leer is mindful of property owner concerns and believes their intimate knowledge of their property should be taken into consideration when planning for trails. McNabb is concerned about visitor parking and its associated impacts at trail heads. Tautrim believes primitive trails could go through ESHA with minimal impact. Feeney stated that an over ambitious trail system is not necessary and that there is little use of the existing trails in the planning area. Tautrim explained vertical connections to Camino Cielo could occur from Baron Ranch, Arroyo Hondo, and El Capitan Canyon. Chair Kimbell asked whether trails should be located on public lands or exacted or donated from private landowners. Baer recommended that trail design and planning should include ancillary support facilities (trash, parking, etc.). Feeney suggested that the County PRT map be updated using the recommendations of a GavPAC Trails Subcommittee.

Public Comment:

Suzanne Perkins: Stated that she served on CRAHTAC for 15 years and on the Parks Commission for 20 years and is currently Vice-Chair of the Summerland PAC. She explained that property owners can receive a great tax benefit from dedicating land for a trail easement and that the County can bank trail easements if there is currently no trail connectivity. She does not support necessarily making all trails multi-use and warned of potential safety concerns when mixing bicycle and equestrian uses on the same trail.

Susan Petrovich: Commented that the CRAHTAC principles do not consider agricultural issues and that they are better suited for urban areas. Ranchers should be brought into the discussion on trails. Trails that allow for bicycle and equestrian use are a concern. Canyons and draws which trails may traverse could conflict with ESHA and remote trails could increase fire concerns and create conflicts with agricultural operations.

Mike Lunsford: Multi-use trail conflicts mostly happen on steep trails, not necessarily on coastal bluff trails, such as those found in the planning area. He supports primitive trails for experienced hikers in the planning area. He asked whether moving a fence line to accommodate trails would create much of an impact to a ranching operation.



Dan Gira: CRAHTAC's principles are a starting place for Subcommittee discussion.

Susan Petrovich: Trail access should provide appropriate parking and support facilities.

Roger Himovitz: Incentivization is a key component to trail development. The GavPAC should create policy that encourages donating easements that can provide a tax benefit to the landowner, prior to processing a development application.

Dan Falat representing State Parks: Trails need to be sustainable and maintainable. If trails are going to be on State Parks land, they need to be able to support a diverse group of trail users.

Suzanne Perkins: Trail users act as watchdogs for vandalism and littering and generally help to maintain the trails. There will likely not be as high a usage of trails on the Gaviota Coast like there is for the Front County trails in the Montecito and Summerland areas.

ACTION: Feeney moved, seconded by Baer, and carried by a vote of 10-0, to agree to the formation of a GavPAC Subcommittee on trails with input from CRAHTAC and other stakeholders (including the agriculture community, State Parks, County Parks, Forest Service). That GavPAC directed the Subcommittee to consider the 11 principles created by CRAHTAC and to consider the following 1) Incentives for trail dedication 2) Development of a thematic scheme for trail development 3) Encouraging specific plans for trail development on large landholdings 4) Issues related to Coastal Trail planning. The GavPAC directed Staff to work with County Counsel to revise existing policies to recognize limits on exaction "subject to prevailing law".

9. Long-Term GavPAC Meeting Schedule: None

Adjournment – 9:18 p.m.



Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 36

***Wednesday June 15, 2011
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

Meeting Called to Order: By Chair Kim Kimbell at 6:31 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Baer, Boise-Cossart (arrived after role at 6:32), Bowman, Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Feeney

County Staff Present:

Jeff Hunt, Long Range Planning Division Director

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian A. Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie Haldeman, Long Range Planning Division Associate Planner

Claude Garciacelay, Park Planner III, County Parks Department

2. Administrative Briefings:

ACTION: Lloyd moved, seconded by Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 10-0 to authorize Chair Kimbell to write a letter to the Board of Supervisors in support of retaining the position being cut in Long Range Planning that supports the GavPAC process.

3. Public Comment:

Scott Rushing representing the Staben/Zimmerman Properties: The 16-acre, ½ mile-wide beachfront Staben property is west of Refugio State Beach. Mr. Rushing is managing the property for his Father-in-law, who is the property owner. It is a logical expansion of the State Parks' holdings at Refugio that would allow for additional sandy beach access for visitors. The property owners have discussed such an idea with State Parks. The property will be put on the market for sale this summer. The owners could be interested in receiving some sort of tax diversion/benefit in exchange for granting a trail easement or transferring to a different entity.

4. Meeting Minutes Review and Approval

Due to GavPAC meetings over back to back weeks, minutes from Meeting No. 35 on June 7th, 2011 will be reviewed at the next GavPAC meeting.

5-8. Recreation & Trails Planning Deliberations

Doug Dodge, District Ranger, Santa Barbara Ranger District, representing the US Forest Service: Mr. Dodge explained that the main concerns with new trail development in the Forest is sustainable trail design. Trails development requires significant funding for environmental analysis, design and planning work, and maintenance. He is supportive of a multi-jurisdictional trail system and of having a series



of loop trails that connect Camino Cielo with the Coast in the Gaviota Region. He explained that there are national trail standards for trail development depending upon the type of trail use. The USFS has an "Enterprise Team" which can be called upon for specific planning efforts. West Camino Cielo to Refugio Road runs through private property. The USFS has taken measures to try and prevent unauthorized off-road motorcycle usage adjacent to Camino Cielo, however such measures are typically subverted by motorcyclists.

Public Comment:

Alan Howard: Inquired as to whether the County or the USFS has a database of all property owners in the planning area who have formally allowed access to their property under California Civil Code Section 813. He thinks Section 813 filings should be communicated to the general public, so that people know which property owners have granted the public access to their land. He stated that access across such land would not be considered trespassing.

Les Freeman: Does the USFS police inappropriate parking and littering at trailheads? He also stated that upper Refugio Road is not wide enough to support 2-way traffic if, for example, a fire truck was responding to an emergency and residents were trying to evacuate their property in their vehicle.

Doug Dodge: Responded to Mr. Freeman by stating that groups of volunteers help to cleanup certain areas of the Forest, such as the shooting area at Arroyo Burro Road and Camino Cielo. However, the forest service does not have the resources to maintain these facilities on a daily basis.

Rachel Couch: She is the project manager for the State Coastal Conservancy, the State agency mandated to implement the Coastal Trail pursuant to the Coastal Act. They can bring funding and technical expertise to the trail planning process. She is interested in participating in a Trails Subcommittee. The Coastal Conservancy owns some land, however they are not in the business of land management.

Suzanne Perkins: Urges the GavPAC to consider supporting off-road trails over "on-road trails", as the public primarily thinks of off-road trails when they have a vision of what trails should be. Existing and proposed on-road trails are shown on PRT maps. She stated that a proposed trail on a private property would still take years to implement.

Mike Lunsford: It may be helpful to have Staff do an analysis on the history behind some of the places on the PRT. This information might help guide a Trails Subcommittee.

Susan Petrovich: The CRAHTAC principles should be revised to state that the coastal trail should be only be as close to the ocean as feasible, not as possible.

Les Freeman: Any trailheads east of Refugio Road would have not room for parking. Littering at trailheads and on USFS land is an issue and can impact the health of livestock. His ranch has suffered substantial impacts to livestock from littering and trash accumulation on Refugio Road.

Alan Howard: The County and Caltrans should take into consideration any loss of parking space along the Highway 101 corridor that could be a result of new trails policies or the GavPAC's planning efforts.

Suzanne Perkins: When planning for trails, support facilities (restrooms, etc) should be provided at trailheads where necessary.



Susan Petrovich: Does not support continuous access to the coast as there are marine mammal “haul out” locations and other sensitive areas on the coast which should be protected from human disturbance.

Suzanne Perkins: Does not think all trails should be “multi-use”. The GavPAC should stay away from creating trails that could support off-road vehicles. A specific trail could be designated for mountain bike usage.

Susan Petrovich: Asked if there was any way for trails to be closed on “Red Flag” / high fire hazard days.

Suzanne Perkins: The County should establish criteria that allow the public to be involved in trail planning and maintenance.

Susan Petrovich: Is concerned about inverse condemnation of land for designation as recreation.

Deliberation: McGinnis asked if the USFS has applied for joint grant funding with the County. Dodge responded that there are no plans for new USFS trails in the planning area, except for the connector from the Baron Ranch trail. McNabb asked if the USFS feels there is adequate access to the forest for fire fighting. McNabb suggested property owners be involved in updating the PRT maps. Baer wants the GavPAC to discuss the PRT map in relation to the western part of the planning area as well. Lloyd responded to Mrs. Perkins that a road Right-of-Way could be expanded to accommodate on-road trails. Tautrim requested aerial photo examples of constructed sections of the coastal trail in other areas as a reference for trails deliberations. Boise-Cossart wants to see the intent of the Coastal Act for trail access followed and she reminded the Committee that County CLUP Policy 7-15 States that “the vegetation in the small canyons at the mouths of Canada San Onofre and Canada del Molino streams shall not be disturbed by recreational development use.” Lloyd suggested creating a trail overlay/network for the Cojo-Jalama Ranches. Lloyd reminded the GavPAC that the PRT map does not preclude property owners from dedicating a trail easement somewhere else on their property. Mr. Garciacelay stated that all County trails prohibit motor vehicle usage and that it is County and USFS policy that all trails are multi-use, but that a trail dedication can have accompanying use restrictions. He also said the County is looking into expanding their ability to close trail access on high fire hazard days. McGinnis inquired as to whether there is any educational material available on trail usage during high fire hazard days. McNabb inquired about the ability to enforce restricted trail uses. Staff stated that the trail siting guidelines developed for the Goleta and Toro Canyon plans can be used as a resource for the GavPAC.

ACTION: Van Leer moved, seconded by Baer, and carried by a vote of 10-0, to create a Gaviota Trails Subcommittee including the following GavPAC members: McGinnis, Bowman, Feeney, and Boise-Cossart. The GavPAC requested that all GavPAC Committee members be noticed of the Subcommittee meetings and that the Subcommittee should engage stakeholders (State Parks, County Parks, agriculturalist/ranchers, landowners, Forest Service, etc) in the planning process. The GavPAC directed the Subcommittee to discuss the following recommendations:

- 1) Update PRT maps for the eastern and western portions of the Gaviota planning area and consider updating the PRT maps with appropriate trail linkages between inland and coastal trails, including linkages between Baron Ranch, Arroyo Hondo, and El Capitan Canyon.
- 2) Consider incentives for trail dedication, including reducing the existing permit requirement for a trail from a CUP to a CDP/LUP



- 3) Develop thematic scheme for trail development and consider the appropriate intensity of use for a trail and the trail audience
- 4) Consider Policy to encourage specific plans for trail development on large landholdings
- 5) Consider issues related to Coastal Trail planning, including the proximity of the trail to the ocean and the CCC guidelines for the Coastal Trail and Coastal access.
- 6) Consider implications for desired infrastructure (e.g. parking) associate with trails development
- 7) Consider potential impacts of trails development from the landowner perspective
- 8) Consider minimizing the use of asphalt for trails
- 9) Consider CRAHTAC adopted principles for trail development.

9. Long-Term GavPAC Meeting Schedule: The July 6th GavPAC will include an update on planning for the GTC site. The final GavPAC meeting before the break, on July 20th, will include discussion of non-agriculture related CCC modifications.

Adjournment – 9:00 p.m.



Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land			
<u>Outdoor Recreation</u>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Proposed Permit Requirements	
<u>Activity</u> ^{1,2}		Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
Campgrounds	CUP per Sec. 35.42.240 - <i>Rural Recreation</i> of the LUDC	1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 3) Tent camping only (i.e., no motorhomes, recreational vehicles (RVs), etc) ³ 4) No new infrastructure 5) No electricity (power) 6) No waste discharge on-site 7) Located outside of the proposed Gaviota Critical Viewshed Corridor 8) 15 or fewer campsites, with a maximum of 2 vehicles per site 9) No new impervious surfaces 10) Maximum stay of 14 days per person per year 11) Incremental increases to noise and lighting 12) No visitor serving services (i.e., laundry, showers, general store). A farm stands selling local produce is an acceptable visitor serving use.	No Tier 1
Fishing ⁴	May be considered <i>Rural Recreation</i> and require a CUP	1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 3) Legally permitted or existing offstream reservoirs 4) Cumulative total of 10 roundtrips per day	1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) If new structure is proposed, it must be less than 600 square feet 3) Does not interfere with agricultural production, resources, or operations on or adjacent to the lot on which it is located and does not adversely impact environmental resources 4) Cumulative total of 20 roundtrips per day
Horseback Riding	May be considered <i>Rural Recreation</i> and require a CUP	1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 3) Cumulative total of 10 roundtrips per day for <i>all outdoor recreation activities</i>	1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) If new structure is proposed, it must be less than 600 square feet 3) Does not interfere with agricultural production, resources, or operations on or adjacent to the lot on which it is located and does not adversely impact environmental resources 4) Cumulative total of 20 roundtrips per day
Footnotes			
1) In regards to outdoor recreation activities, motorized vehicle (i.e., trucks, ATVs, OHVs, etc) usage shall be conducted on existing ranch roads. Motorized vehicle usage shall only result in incremental increases to noise and lighting			
2) Activities will also need to follow the appropriate Santa Barbara County Fire Codes and receive Fire Department approval, as necessary.			
3) Staff will create a definition for vehicle allowances at campgrounds that would restrict RV/motorhome access to campgrounds.			
4) Activities will also need to follow all appropriate State & Federal Regulations (i.e., CA DFG, US FWS, RWQCB, etc)			

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

<u>Accommodations</u> <u>/Lodging</u>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Proposed Permit Requirements	
<u>Activity</u>		Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
<p>Small Scale Guest Ranch</p>	<p>CUP per Sec. 35.21.030 - <i>Agricultural Zones Allowable Land Use</i>, Table 2-1, of the LUDC. Use is currently termed "Lodging - Guest Ranch" and is in the land use category of "Services"</p>	<p>No exemptions from permit requirements.</p>	<p>A single guest ranch may be included as part of an agricultural operation on contracted land if located on a parcel of 40 acres or greater in size within the AG-II zone district, provided all of the requirements set forth below are met. Bed and breakfasts, farmstays, and homestays are included within this category of guest ranches as long as they meet the requirements established below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The guest ranch must be housed in an existing structure at least 5 years old and shall be counted toward the maximum size allowance of the development envelope. 2. The maximum number of guests accommodated shall be 15 per night and must be accommodated in 6 or fewer bedrooms. 3. The guest ranch shall be consistent with the compatibility guidelines set forth in section 2- of these Rules. 4. Food service shall only be available to registered guests. The cost of any food service shall be included in the total price for accommodation and not charged separately. 5. The guest ranch shall be located on, and be a part of, a farm or ranch operation that produces agricultural products, and the guest ranch shall not constitute the principal land use of the premises.

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

<u>Entertainment</u>		Proposed Permit Requirements	
<u>Activity</u>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
Special Events / Temporary Uses¹	<p style="text-align: center;">MCUP</p> <p>per Sec. 35.42.260.F.9 - <i>Temporary Uses and Trailers</i>, Table 4-10, of the LUDC.</p> <p>An event that would receive remuneration is currently termed a "Reception and similar gathering facilities (commercial)" and is in the land use category of "Temporary Events".</p> <p>Note: per Sec. 35.42.260.F.4, "Charitable and other noncommercial functions" are Exempt from permit requirements on a lot five gross acres or more in area when the number of persons present at the event at any one time does not exceed 300. A LUP/CDP is required when the number of persons present at the event at any one time exceeds 300.</p>	<p>1) Incidental to agricultural operations</p> <p>2) No adverse impacts to existing or potential future agricultural operations</p> <p>4) Maximum attendance of 300 people</p> <p>5) Cumulatively remains subordinate to agricultural operations</p> <p>6) 10 events per year not to exceed 3 days per event</p>	None
Footnotes			

1) A "festival permit" from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, as well as approval from the Department of Public Health, may be required.

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

<u>Agricultural Production</u>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Proposed Permit Requirements	
		Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
<p>Greenhouses (excludes seasonal or temporary shade houses and hoop structure, includes mushroom farming)</p>	<p>LUP/CDP per Sec. 35.42.140 - <i>Greenhouses</i> and Sec. 35.21.030, of the LUDC.</p>	<p>1) Greenhouse or similar structure for indoor growing up to 3,000 square feet 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips</p>	<p>1) Construction of new structure over 3,000 square feet</p>
<p>Product Preparation (incidental cleaning, grading, packing, polishing, sizing or similar preparation of crops)</p>	<p>CUP with Agricultural Industry Overlay (AIO). Not allowed in the Coastal Zone. per Sec. 35.42.040 - <i>Agricultural Processing</i> and Sec. 35.21.030, of the LUDC. Use is currently termed "Agricultural Processing - Extensive". Agricultural processing that be done with a LUP/CDP is limited a facility used for sorting, cleaning, packing, freezing, and storage of horticultural and agricultural products (other than animal) grown on the premises.</p>	<p>1) Products grown within the Santa Barbara County 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit</p>	<p>1) Incremental impacts to noise & lighting 2) 800 - 3,000 sqft new structures 3) Products growing within the Tri Counties 4) Processing beyond the raw state</p>
<p>Bee Keeping</p>	<p>Exempt per Sec. 35.42.060 - <i>Animal Keeping</i>, Table 4-1 of the LUDC.</p>	<p>N/A - Activity to remain exempt</p>	<p>N/A - Activity to remain exempt</p>
<p>Small Animal Keeping (i.e. chickens, rabbits, etc)</p>	<p>Exempt per Sec. 35.42.060 - <i>Animal Keeping</i>, Table 4-1 of the LUDC.</p>	<p>N/A - Activity to remain exempt</p>	<p>N/A - Activity to remain exempt</p>
<p>Aquaculture/ Aquaponics</p>	<p>CUP per Sec. 35.21.030 - <i>Agricultural Zones and Allowable Uses</i> and Sec. 35.42.070 - <i>Aquaculture</i> of the LUDC. Aquaculture is currently defined as "the raising and harvesting of aquatic plant and animal organisms"</p>	<p>1) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 2) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 3) A closed system</p>	<p>No Tier I.</p>

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

<i>Agricultural Sales</i>		Proposed Permit Requirements	
<i>Activity</i>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
<p>Plant Nursery (where plants are exported from the property)</p>	<p>A commercial plant nursery is not allowed on agriculturally zoned land per the LUDC. In commercial zones, an LUP/CDP is required per Sec. 35.24.030 - <i>Commercial Zones Allowable Land Uses</i> of the LUDC. a plant nursery is defined as "a retail or commercial business where plants are grown in the ground or in containers for sale or propagation"</p>	<p>1) Material originates within the TriCounties 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit</p>	<p>1) No more than 20 vehicle roundtrips per day 2) Shade structure less than 3,000 square feet uses permeable, dark, non-reflective covering 3) No more than 10,000 square feet of total accessory structures, which includes shade structures, in the proposed critical viewshed corridor, per parcel</p>
<p>Farm Stands</p>	<p>LUP/CDP per Sec. 35.42.050 - <i>Agricultural Product Sales</i> and Sec. 35.21.030, Table 2-1 of the LUDC. Sales are exempt from permitting requirements if they meet certain standards listed in Sec. 35.42.050.C.1 and 35.42.050.D.</p>	<p>1) Material originates within the TriCounties 3) New structure(s) are less than 800 square feet 4) Incorporate new State Farm Standards Regulations per AB 2168 into the LUDC which will allow for sales of bottled water, sodas, and in a limited area, potentially nonhazardous products produced offsite. 5) Ingress and egress to agricultural sales area shall be clearly visible, and turning movements into the premises from adjacent road rights-of-way shall not create congestion or cause unnecessary slowing at access points 6) Accessory sales of artisanal crafts grown within a close proximity are allowed, but must be subordinate to farm stands sales as determined by percent sales floor area. 7) The public access to a maximum of 10,000 square feet, not including parking areas</p>	<p>No Tier 1. Activity is exempt or triggers the threshold for a development plan.</p>
<p>Firewood Processing and Sales</p>	<p>LUP/CDP or CUP per Sec. 35.25.030 - <i>Industrial Zones</i>, Table 2-20, of the LUDC. Use is currently termed "Lumber and Wood Product Manufacturing" and is in the land use category of "Industry, Manufacturing & Processing, Wholesaling"</p>	<p>1) Material originates within the TriCounties 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 4) The public access to a maximum of 10,000 square feet, not including parking areas 5) Must follow Agricultural Commissioner Guidelines for import and export of plant materials</p>	<p>No Tier 1.</p>

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land			
<u>Agricultural Processing</u>	Existing Permit Requirements	Proposed Permit Requirements	
<u>Activity</u>		Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
Composting Facility	MCUP per Sec. 35.21.030 - <i>Agricultural Zones and Allowable Uses</i> , Table 2-1of the LUDC. Not allowed in the Coastal Zone.	1) Material originates within Santa Barbara County 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 4) Structure 800-3,000 square feet 5) 2,500 cubic yards or less of composting material 6) Compost pile cannot be over 12 feet in height	No Tier 1.
Drying, Freezing, Pre-cooling and Packaging	CUP with Agricultural Industry Overlay (AIO). Not allowed in the Coastal Zone. per Sec. 35.42.040 - <i>Agricultural Processing</i> and Sec. 35.21.030, of the LUDC. Use is currently termed "Agricultural Processing - Extensive". Agricultural processing that be done with a LUP/CDP is limited a facility used for sorting, cleaning, packing, freezing, and storage of horticultural and agricultural products (other than animal) grown on the premises.	1) Material originates within the Gaviota Region 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit	
Milling of Flour, Feed and Grain	see above	1) Material originates within the Gaviota Region 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) Does not interfere with agricultural production, resources, or operations on or adjacent to the lot on which it is located 4) Structure less than 3,000 square feet	
Tree Nut Hulling and Shelling	see above	1) Material originates within the Gaviota Region 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit	
Small Scale Processing (processing beyond the raw state)	see above	1) Material originates within the TriCounties 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 4) Required to follow appropriate Health and Safety regulations	1) Structure less than 3,000 square feet
Lumber Processing, Milling	LUP/CDP or CUP per Sec. 35.25.030 - <i>Industrial Zones</i> , Table 2-20, of the LUDC. Use is currently termed "Lumber and Wood Product Manufacturing" and is in the land use category of "Industry, Manufacturing & Processing, Wholesaling"	1) Material originates within the TriCounties 2) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 3) New structure(s) less than 800 square feet 4) Must follow Agricultural Commissioner Guidelines for import and export of plant materials	
Slaughtering Facility (mobile and stationary)	Not allowed on agriculturally zoned land. Allowed in some industrial zones with a CUP per Sec. 35.25.030 of the LUDC.	No exemptions from permit requirements.	1) Requires a Gaviota Agricultural Processing Overlay 2) Material originates from the Gaviota Region 3) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 4) New structures less than 3,000 square feet

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

<u><i>Educational Experiences</i></u>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Proposed Permit Requirements	
<u><i>Activity</i></u>		Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
Educational Experiences	may require a CUP per Sec. 35.42.240 - <i>Rural Recreation</i> of the LUDC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 3) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 4) Does not include commercial facilities open to the general public who are not using the recreational facility 5) Does not require an expansion of urban services that shall increase pressure for conversion of the affected agricultural lands 6) Fewer than 10 events per year, with less than 75 people per event 	No Tier 1.

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

<u>Non-Ag Storage</u>	<i>Existing Permit Requirements</i>	Proposed Permit Requirements	
<u>Activity</u>		Exempt - (E)	Tier I - (LUP/CDP)
Equipment Storage	Not allowed on agriculturally zoned land and not specifically addressed in the LUDC.	1) Activity is incidental to agricultural operations 2) No new structure(s) that would require a permit 3) Generates no more than 10 additional vehicle roundtrips 4) 1/2-acre of storage space within the proposed critical viewshed corridor 5) Seasonal, non agricultural-related equipment 6) 16-foot height limit with the proposed Gaviota Coast critical viewshed corridor	No Tier 1.

Proposed Permit Scalability for Activities on Gaviota Coast Agricultural Land

Footnotes

- 1) In regards to outdoor recreation activities, motorized vehicle (i.e., trucks, ATVs, OHVs, etc) usage shall be conducted on existing ranch roads. Motorized vehicle usage shall only result in incremental increases to noise and lighting
- 2) Activities will also need to follow the appropriate Santa Barbara County Fire Codes and receive Fire Department approval, as necessary.
- 3) Staff will create a definiton for vehicle allowances at campgrounds that would restrict RV/motorhome access to campgrounds.
- 4) Activities will also need to follow all appropriate State & Federal Regulations (i.e., CA DFG, US FWS, RWQCB, etc)
- 5) All non-agricultural Outdoor Recreation, Lodging, Entertainment, Education Experiences, and Equipment Storage Activities shall be subordinate to agriculture
- 6) All non-agricultural activities on a parcel shall have a cumulative total of no more than 10 vehicle roundtrips per day
- 7) Operations do not negatively interfere with agricultural production or residential uses on or adjacent to the lot on which it is located
- 8) No more than 10,000 square feet of total accessory structures, including shade structures, in the proposed Gaviota Coast critical viewshed corridor, per parcel



Gaviota Coast Plan GavPAC Meeting Schedule

Meeting Dates and Discussion Topics

[Meeting dates, times, and locations are subject to change]

June 16, 2011

Meeting/ Workshop Type	Date and Time	Location	Discussion Topics
GavPAC Meeting #39	Wednesday, July 20, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Final Topics
GavPAC Meeting #38	Wednesday, July 6, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: GTC Discussion/Owner Presentation
GavPAC Meeting #37	Wednesday, June 29, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Agricultural Subcommittee Report
GavPAC Meeting #36 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, June 15, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Recreation & Trails III
GavPAC Meeting #35 ***COMPLETED***	Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Recreation & Trails II
GavPAC Meeting #34 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, May 25, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Recreation & Trails I
GavPAC Meeting #33 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, May 11, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Land Use IV
GavPAC Meeting #32 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, April 27, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Land Use III/Visual Subcommittee Report
GavPAC Meeting #31 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, April 6, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Land Use II
GavPAC Meeting #30 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, March 30, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Land Use I