



# COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

---

## PLANNING COMMISSION MARKED AGENDA

Hearing of May 24, 2006  
9:00 a.m.

---

C. MICHAEL COONEY	1st District, Vice Chair	Santa Barbara County
CECILIA BROWN	2nd District	Engineering Building, Room 17
PARKER MONTGOMERY	3rd District	123 East Anapamu Street
JOE H. VALENCIA	4th District, Chair	Santa Barbara, CA 93101
JACK BOYSEN	5th District	(805) 568-2000 (Planning & Development)

**TV COVERAGE ANNOUNCEMENT:** *Planning Commission Hearings are televised live on County Santa Barbara Television (CSBTV) Channel 20 at 9:00 A.M. in the South Coast, Lompoc, Santa Ynez Valley, Santa Maria and Orcutt areas. Rebroadcast of Planning Commission Hearings are on Fridays at 5:00 P.M. on CSBTV Channel 20.*

### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:

- I. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- II. **TV COVERAGE ANNOUNCEMENT:** by Terry Contreras.
- III. **ROLL CALL:** All Commissioners were present.
- IV. **AGENDA STATUS REPORT:** Presented by Cintia Mendoza.
- V. **PROJECTION REPORT:** Presented by Cintia Mendoza.
- VI. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None
- VII. **PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:** Commissioner Brown reminded staff that all briefings must be placed on agendas.
- VIII. **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DIVISIONAL BRIEFINGS:** Steve Chase reported that Planners, Peter Lawson, Robert Dostalek, Morgan Jones and Alice Daly have resigned from Planning & Development. Michelle Wilson-Gibbs has returned to Planning and Development and Selena Buoni was recently hired. Steve Chase also briefed the Commission on the Thorndike property.  
Jaime Goldstein briefed the Commission on the IV Master Plan.
- IX. **MINUTES:** The Minutes of May 3, 2006 and May 10, 2006 were considered as follows:  
**ACTION:** **Approved the Minutes of May 3, 2006, as revised.**  
**Brown/Cooney** **Vote: 5-0**  
**ACTION:** **Approved the Minutes of May 10, 2006.**  
**Brown/Cooney** **Vote: 5-0**
- X. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HEARING SUMMARY:** Presented by Dianne Meester, Assistant Director, Planning and Development.

XI. **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW:**

**06ORD-00000-00002**

**CR-1. 06CUP-00000-00009**

**Lompoc Wind Energy Project**

**Lompoc**

**John Day, Planner (805) 568-2045**

Request of Mr. John V. Stahl, agent for the applicant, Pacific Renewable Energy Generation LLC, for conceptual review by the County Planning Commission of the Lompoc Wind Energy Project, Case Nos. 06ORD-00000-00002 and 06CUP-00000-00009 [applications filed on February 21, 2006]. The proposed project is located on ten AG-II zoned parcels on San Miguelito Road, adjacent to VAFB. The proposed project includes approximately 60 wind turbines with a total generating capacity of 80-120 MW (which would be sold to PG&E), associated onsite access roads, power lines, and other facilities. It also includes a power transmission line from the project site to PG&E's Cabrillo Substation in Lompoc. The application will require an amendment to the height limits of the Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 35-276) and setback variances.

**ACTION: Conceptual Review only. The following comments were made by the Planning Commission on the project:**

**Commissioner Montgomery**

- Wishes the project came in 5 years ago for concept review. But maybe now is the exactly the right time due to the current situation in Middle East and the energy crisis..
- At the macro level, as a strategic concern the U.S. must reduce dependence on foreign oil.
- U.S. can no longer supply energy needs with petroleum.
- U.S. strategic interests depend on moving to green energy and nuclear.
- Nuclear is safe, witness nuclear submarines and aircraft carriers and France's infrastructure.
- Green energy is good, but it won't get us there [meet our need or support our current lifestyle].
- Nuclear energy is the solution for power generation and key to future hydrogen production.
- The project will not address all of our strategic energy interests, but it's a start.
- From a micro standpoint, the Lompoc area should have a lot to say about the project
- I would like to hear from County Parks.
- Vandenberg AFB should have a lot to say.
- Not persuaded this project will solve the energy crisis.
- Project should be looked at like any other commercial development.
- Are these the kind of structures we really want on the County's agricultural lands and in coastal zone?

**Chairman Valencia**

- The project is a start, and every bit helps.
- Orcutt Hills is coming in with a plan for steam injection to recover more oil. Every bit helps. Also an enhanced oil recovery project in Casmalia.
- You have to do something.
- GM announced it will cap the price of gasoline at \$1.99 per gallon. If you buy one of their big vehicles, they will rebate the price difference, years.
- What we need is for them to stop making those big vehicles.

**Commissioner Boysen**

- Doesn't want to trade in his Tahoe or make the Chair trade in his Explorer.
- Doesn't see any downside to this project.
- Appears the applicant picked the perfect area in the County, protecting viewsheds as much as possible.
- Sure that the EIR will consider the visual impacts.
- Turning down such a green energy project is "like attacking motherhood."

- Only question is, what took you so long?
- Now the project is here, let's get it on the road.
- These are the types of projects we need to get on a fast track. Need to see their viability and see if there is potential for other such projects throughout the County.

#### **Commissioner Brown**

- Agrees that this is a great project.
- Was skeptical until drove through San Miguelito Canyon through the project area. It was windy. It looks like an ideal spot.
- Felt good about the project after reading the environmental assessment and bio resources section of the application.
- Appears that bird/bat impacts will be low. Looking forward to assessment in the EIR.
- In Staff's public outreach, impact to birds and bats will be a prominent question. Staff should talk with La Purisima Audubon Society.
- Unclear what effect post-construction bird/bat monitoring would have on project operations. EIR will probably address.
- Appreciate letter and comments from Community Environmental Council, and glad to see Mr. Davis and Mr. Hunt in attendance. Glad to hear they are cautiously optimistic.
- Note temporary, construction impacts to roadways/traffic/circulation. Also parking – more than 100 cars? Would like to see addressed in EIR.
- Note electric collection and transmission line impacts.
- Project will create tourist attraction at site and possible traffic impacts. Large turn-around needed.
- Note night lighting. Extent? Effect on bat population, if any.
- Fascinating project. Could ask questions all day long about experience at other sites and avian impacts. Can find a lot on the web, and EIR will address such questions.
- Get on with it. Great project.

#### **Commissioner Cooney**

- Appreciate Commissioner Brown's careful examination of all conceivable issues, which leaves him free to step back and take a broader view.
- Recognizes the project entails a trade-off: Taking one of the most beautiful, undisturbed places on Earth and making a major intrusion by installing modern technology in the middle of it.
- But we're running out of energy options and places to find solutions to our modern needs. Has begun to accept that we have to make compromises. Time is running out.
- Appreciates the major effort that has gone into securing this site as an acceptable one for installing this excellent modern technology.
- Has seen 400-foot turbines in Europe in the middle of farms that have been farmed for thousands of years. The wind projects coexist with villages and agriculture. Once you've seen it the first time you don't see it any more. You just see the beauty of the countryside.
- Looks forward to studying the project as it moves along.

#### **Chairman Valencia -- Summation**

- You seem to have gotten encouragement to continue on with your project.

**02GPA-00000-00011, 96-RZ-004**

**CR-2. TM 14,392, 96-DP-011**

**Oak View Estates Project**

**Lompoc**

**Brian Tetley, Planner (805) 934-6589**

Request of Gordon Bell, agent for the owner, Zeluck Estate, for conceptual review by the County Planning Commission of the Oak View Estates Project, Case Nos. 02GPA-00000-00011, 96-RZ-004 TM 14,392 [applications filed on February 9, 2005]. The proposed project would consist of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment 02GPA-00000-00011, from RES 12.3 units/acre to RES 1.8 units/acre, a Rezone **96-RZ-004** from RR-10 (Residential Ranchette, 10 acre minimum parcel

size) to DR 1.8 (Design Residential, 1.8 units/acre), and a Tentative Tract Map **TM 14,392** subdividing the parcel into 23 lots consisting of 21 residential lots, one lot for common open area, and one lot for a Burton Mesa Chaparral Preserve area, and a Final Development Plan **96-DP-011** for development of 21 single family residences and an onsite detention basin. The project site is 16.88 acres, AP No. 097-371-010, located north of Oak Hill Drive in the Vandenberg Village Area, Third Supervisorial District.

**ACTION: Conceptual review only. The following comments were made by the Planning Commission on the project:**

**Chairman Valencia**

- This project came to us in the late '90s. Mr. Zeluck brought the project to us. Initially they had too many units, and they got cut down. We were concerned about the trees, and that got worked out.
- Finally, we ended up with a project. We basically approved the project. But there was some paperwork that needed to be finalized. We had difficulty getting that completed. There were continuances, continuances, and continuances.
- The applicant, Mr. Zeluck, would call me personally at home and ask me what the hold up was.
- I would come to the staff, and we went through two or three planners. Staff said that they were waiting on the planner for the applicant.
- The last meeting was in Vandenberg Village about four years ago. There were about 25 people there. I think it was a plan similar to this one here. We asked if there were any concerns at all, and there were concerns, but no major concerns. There was nothing earth-shattering. They were concerned that the preserve was on the back side so that we didn't intrude into the scrub area. There were concerns about the number of units, and the project now has 21 units, which isn't an extremely high-density.
- When I left that meeting, I thought that it would come in for final approval to finalize some paperwork and we'd be done with it.
- The property since passed into the estate.
- Mr. Whatley and Mr. Doud have apparently been negotiating for the property.
- They came to me in January or February of this year and asked if they could move forward with the project.
- I said that they had a completed project, but here we are today.
- They asked if they had to complete a new EIR. I said that the EIR has already been done.
- There has been no new development in that area. The only building that was going to occur was in the very front. Mr. Stoker purchased four lots from the country club, and he proposed a rezone that was denied by the Board of Supervisors.
- Everything is still the same. Nothing has changed.
- If there has to be some update, it should be very minimal in my view.
- There may be something that I don't know about the project, but I don't see anything changing in that area and I've been in the area continuously.

**Commissioner Boysen**

- I still have a little confusion about the conceptual review.
- I thought we were looking at the 21-lot proposal. The applicant is talking about different designs they are looking at. Whichever way we go, my comments may pertain.
- I like the original concept of developing only on the western portion of the property. It looks like that makes a lot of sense. I don't know about the environmental issues of this.
- I would defer to the staff as far as the level of environmental review.
- I think a new initial study is appropriate.
- A determination can be made as to whether a negative declaration or a new environmental impact review would be required.
- If we do an initial study and determine that the items applicable 10 or 12 years ago are still applicable today, we could get by with an addendum.

- We're probably going to need a new complete environmental analysis. The initial study would determine this.
- As far as the overall project, the flow is ok. We're not trying to pack too many houses here.
- When we look at lots 8 and 9, it looks they were just stuck on. I'm not convinced that we cannot do something better than the hammerhead and stub-out road. It may not be appropriate since this is a private drive.
- Overall there is development potential within this.
- There are condos across the street.
- I think this is a good transition to the half-acre lots to the east.
- I like the idea of having some kind of buffer between the development and the Burton Mesa area.
- I'd hate to see nothing happen on this property.
- I think that what is proposed certainly could make sense.
- Without a firm project before me, I'd hate to get into some of these other concepts proposed.
- I think keeping the eastern property open with development limited to the western property would look to me to have less impact. Certainly less roadways.

#### **Commissioner Brown**

- I agree with staff's presentation that what is proposed is a good open space transitional area.
- Perhaps with a slightly different site plan with some affordable units that would mirror the size, bulk, and scale of the market units, as attached units, would add value to the project.
- The site planning issues are this.
- I'm not a biologist. I did visit the site.
- I'm impressed with the oaks, which are unique to this area on the western portion of the property. And I've seen the arborists report, which is an interesting read in itself.
- I would be concerned about maintaining the unique character of the site as much as possible. When driving around the neighborhood, there are many of these beautiful oaks in the front yards.
- I would like the roadway configuration minimized. There are a number of ways to do this.
- Minimization of grading and maintenance of existing landforms would add to the ambience to any project that is developed. You would take advantage of the beautiful views to the south.
- I think we need a new Initial Study to get some understanding of where we are with this EIR of which the draft is from 1994 and published in 1998.
- I think there are some impacts with buildout in the interim. Traffic and circulation is one example of impacts of note.
- I don't think it is appropriate to benchmark impacts as the applicant has requested. I think that is best left to the Biologist to figure out and recommend to us.
- I appreciate staff's overview. I agree with those comments.
- I'm looking forward to a project that perhaps adds some affordable units and do slight reconfiguration of some of the lot placement for more efficient land use.

#### **Commissioner Cooney**

- I have a couple of comments.
- As far as additional environmental review, if we look only at the project site, there may not have been much that has changed in the environmental context.
- However, I think in this entire area, as you have emphasized, Mr. Chair, there is a tremendous amount of development going on, and a significant additional amount of development proposed.
- This is all going to have a cumulative impact on the streets and traffic in the area, as well as on the reserve next to the project.
- I would be reluctant to move forward with any of these concepts without a new Initial Study, and for me personally, a relatively thorough cumulative analysis of the alternatives.

- On the positive side, I want to complement these particular individuals, Mr. Whatley and Mr. Doud, for their work on a mixed affordable and market rate development in the heart of Montecito, Quinta Isabella. I watched that project being constructed and occupied. Not only is it aesthetically wonderful, but I think serves as a model for how we can incorporate affordable housing amongst market rate development throughout our County. We ought to be looking for project that would not only be accepted by neighbors, but embraced by them.
- I'm delighted that they are looking at this parcel, and I'm sure it will be developed properly.
- But we have to stop here and make sure were looking at the overall impact.

**Commissioner Montgomery**

- There is definitely a project here.
- I would urge the applicant to get an early conceptual review by the NBAR.
- On the EIR, if there is a way to move forward with a negative declaration that would be positive, provided the issues raised are addressed
- This reinforces what I've been saying *ad nauseum* for the past year or so. This community needs an updated general plan.
- I think the market situation is now such that less will net the owner more. This is a transitional area. I think you will minimize the environmental impacts with fewer lots. You will get more proportionally for them. We'll get more for our dollar if we utilize in lieu fees for the construction of affordable rentals in the County.
- I think there is a project here, and I urge the applicant to bring it forward, and staff to expedite.

**XII. STANDARD AGENDA:**

<b>1.</b>	<b>06GOV-00000-00002</b>	<b>San Roque Canyon Road Right-of-Way Abandonment</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>
			Mark Walter, Planner (805) 568-2852

Hearing on the request of Jeff Havlik, Public Works, to consider Case No. 06GOV-00000-00002 [application filed on March 10, 2006] to determine that quitclaim of the existing San Roque Canyon Road right-of-way, including the Jesusita Trail, is in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65402(a). The application involves AP Nos. 055-030-006, -069, -070, -077, located at 1575 North Ontare Road, Santa Barbara area, Second Supervisorial District. (Continued from 3/22/06 and 4/26/06)

**ACTION:** **Determined that the proposed Quitclaim of the San Roque Canyon Road Right-of-Way and the acceptance of a 15 foot wide trail easement for the Jesusita Trail are in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan and directed staff to transmit the attached agreement letter as revised by County Counsel and the consistency report required by Government Code Section 65402(a) as revised by the Planning Commission to require that an adequate study be done to ensure that the current public trail experience is preserved without increased damage to the environment to the County Public Works Department and the Board of Supervisors.**

**Brown/Boysen**

**Vote: 4-1 (Montgomery no)  
Appeal process not applicable.**

**2. 06APL-00000-00006 Hedrick Single Family Dwelling Demo/Rebuild Appeal Santa Barbara**  
Exempt, CEQA Section 15268 Robert Dostalek, Planner (805) 568-2054

Hearing on the request of Beverly McCurdy and Autumn Brook, appellants, to consider the Appeal 06APL-00000-00006 [appeal filed on February 21, 2006], of the Planning and Development Department's decision to approve Land Use Permit 06LUP-00000-00033 (Hedrick demolition/rebuild new residence), in the 20-R-1 Zone District under Article III. The application involves AP No. 061-201-004, located at 331 South Arboleda Road, Santa Barbara area, Second Supervisorial District.

**ACTION: Accepted a petition and late submittal into the record from Michael Inbar and Bente Millard.**

**Brown/Montgomery Vote: 5-0**

**ACTION: Directed staff to schedule the project before the South BAR and return to the Planning Commission with the SBAR's recommendations.**

**Brown/Montgomery Vote: 5-0**

**Appeal process not applicable.**

**05CUP-00000-00018**  
**05DVP-00000-00007**  
**3. 05RZN-00000-00002 Better Cooling Facility Expansion Santa Maria**  
06NGD-00000-000005 Brian Tetley, Planner (805) 934-6589

Hearing on the request of Gil Rodriguez, agent for the applicant, Better Cooling, Inc. to consider the following [application filed on February 17, 2005]:

- a) **05CUP-00000-00018** for a Conditional Use Permit allowing cooling and storage of produce grown off the premises, and to change the use of a residence to a farm employee dwelling under the provisions of Ordinance 661 Zoned U;
- b) **05DVP-00000-00007** for approval of a Final Development Plan under the provisions of Ordinance 661 of the U Zone District, to develop a 13,650 square foot expansion to an existing 13,650 square foot agricultural cooling facility, a 7,000 sq. ft. shade canopy at the southeast corner of the cooler building, and a 24, 000 square foot storage building;
- c) **05RZN-00000-00002** proposing to rezone 20 acres from U to AG-II-40 under the provisions of Santa Barbara County Code Chapter 35 of Article III;

and to approve the proposed Final Negative Declaration, 06NGD-00000-00005 of the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result of this project, significant but mitigable effects on the environment are anticipated in the following categories: Aesthetics/Visual Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geologic Processes, Hazardous Materials/Risk of Upset, Land use, Noise, and Public Facilities. The ND and all documents may be reviewed at the Planning and Development Department, 624 W. Foster Road, Suite C, Santa Maria. The MND is also available for review at the Central Branch of the City of Santa Maria Library, 420 South Broadway, Santa Maria, the Orcutt Branch Library located at 1157 E. Clark, Orcutt, and the UCSB library. The application involves AP No. 129-010-035, located in the Santa Maria area, Fifth Supervisorial District. (Continued from 2/8/06, 3/8/06 and 5/10/06)

**ACTION: Recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt the findings, accept the final negative declaration, adopt an ordinance to rezone and approve the conditions of approval, as revised.**

**Boysen/Valenica**

**Vote: 4-0-1 (Montgomery abstained)**

**The Planning Commission's recommendation will automatically be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final action; therefore the appeal process is not applicable.**

**4. Housing Rezone Options Countywide Countywide**  
John McInnes, Director, Strategic and Comprehensive Planning (805) 568-3552

The Planning Commission will receive a report and consider the following:

- a) Receive a report on the status of efforts to identify sites that have the potential for meeting the state mandate to rezone 62 acres of land countywide to accommodate the County's fair share of statewide housing need as documented in the adopted Housing Element;
- b) Consider revisions to its November 30, 2005 action to include ten sites for analysis in the Housing Element Action Phase Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and,
- c) Provide direction to staff concerning the inclusion of additional sites in the Housing Element Action Phase EIR.

**ACTION: Revised the Planning Commission's action of November 30, 2005 to include ten sites for analysis in the Housing Element Action Phase Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and requested that the Board of Supervisors hold a workshop on the County's jobs/housing balance.**

**Boysen/Montgomery**

**Vote: 5-0**

**The Planning Commission's recommendation will automatically be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final action; therefore the appeal process is not applicable.**

The Planning Commission Agenda, Marked Agenda and Staff Reports are available on the  
Planning and Development Web Site at  
[www.sbcountyplanning.org](http://www.sbcountyplanning.org)

Steve Chase  
Secretary to the Planning Commission