

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 427-4863

**F10c****RECORD PACKET COPY**

Filed: 2/22/05  
49<sup>th</sup> Day: 4/12/05  
Staff: JB-SC  
Staff report prepared: 3/3/05  
Hearing date: 3/18/05  
Hearing item number: F10c

**STAFF REPORT: APPEAL  
SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE DETERMINATION**

---

<b>Local government:</b>	San Luis Obispo County
<b>Local decision:</b>	Approved with conditions (see Exhibit B).
<b>Appeal number:</b>	A-3-SLO-05-014
<b>Applicant:</b>	John Crowther
<b>Appellants:</b>	Coastal Commissioners Sara Wan & Mike Reilly
<b>Project location:</b>	8610 Van Gordon Creek Road, Cambria, San Luis Obispo County. (APN 013-011-015) (See Exhibit A).
<b>Project description:</b>	3,000 square foot farm support residence with attached 1,100 square foot garage as earthquake damage replacement (See Exhibit C).
<b>Substantive file documents:</b>	County local permits PMT2004-01284, PMT2004-01285; San Luis Obispo County Certified Local Coastal Program.
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<b>The project is Appealable; Substantial Issue.</b>

---

**Summary:** The County of San Luis Obispo approved two coastal development permits: one for the construction of a 3,000 square foot farm support residence, and another for a 1,100 square foot attached, but structurally independent garage, as earthquake damage replacement. The project is located on a 193-acre agricultural parcel adjacent to Highway One in the North Coast area of San Luis Obispo County. Appellants contend that the project does not conform to the Local Coastal Program (LCP) visual and scenic, and agricultural resource protection policies because the farm support residence has not been sited and designed to minimize adverse visual impacts and does not maintain agricultural lands to the greatest degree feasible. Staff recommends that the Commission determine that the appeal raises a **substantial issue** regarding the proposed project's conformity to LCP provisions related to visual and scenic resources and agriculture. In addition, the County did not notice the project as appealable. Staff recommends that the Commission find that the project is appealable under the Coastal Act and the certified LCP.



**California Coastal Commission  
March 2005 Meeting in Newport Beach**

Staff: J. Bishop Approved by:

## Staff Report Contents

I. Local Government Action .....	3
II. Summary of Appellants' Contentions .....	3
III. Standard of Review for Appeals.....	3
IV. Recommended Findings on Appealability .....	4
V. Staff Recommendation on Appealability .....	6
VI. Staff Recommendation on Substantial Issue .....	6
VII. Recommended Findings and Declarations.....	7
A. Project Description .....	7
1. Project Location.....	7
2. Project Description and Background.....	7
3. Standard of Review for Appeals.....	7
B. Substantial Issue Determination.....	8
1. Visual and Scenic Resources.....	8
a. Relevant LCP Provisions.....	8
b. County's Action .....	9
c. Appellants' Contentions .....	9
d. Analysis .....	10
2. Agriculture.....	12
a. Relevant LCP Provisions.....	12
b. County's Action .....	14
c. Appellants' Contentions .....	14
d. Analysis .....	14
VIII. Exhibits	
Exhibit A: Regional Location and Vicinity Map	
Exhibit B: Final Local Action Notice	
Exhibit C: Appellants' Contentions	
Exhibit D: Project Plans	
Exhibit E: Site Photos	
Exhibit F: Table O (LCP Framework For Planning)	



## **I. Local Government Action**

On January 31, 2005, the San Luis Obispo County Planning Director approved two coastal development permits: one for the construction of a 3,000 square foot farm support residence, and another for an attached, but structurally independent, 1,100 square foot garage (PMT2004-01284, PMT2004-01285). A Notice of Final County Action was received on February 7, 2005 stating that the project constitutes non-appealable development. The project was approved without conditions. (See Exhibit B).

Although the Commission initially received a permit review referral in October 2004 for this project from the County, which identified that a Minor Use Permit (MUP) would be processed, the County approved project was ultimately determined by the Planning Director to be a nondiscretionary, non-appealable coastal development permit (MUP's are discretionary permits and, depending on the circumstances of the case, may be appealable under the LCP and the Coastal Act). Commission staff had numerous discussions with the County in an effort to understand why the project was determined not to require a MUP. Notwithstanding Commission staff advice that the project should be processed as a discretionary coastal development permit, the County issued the notice of non-appealable final action.

## **II. Summary of Appellants' Contentions**

The appellants, Commissioners Wan and Reilly, have appealed the final action taken by the County Planning Director on the basis that approval of the project does not conform to the policies and ordinances of the San Luis Obispo County Local Coastal Program (LCP) related to visual and scenic resources; and agriculture. The complete text of the appellants' contentions is cited in the findings and attached as Exhibit C.

## **III. Standard of Review for Appeals**

Coastal Act Section 30603 provides for the appeal of approved coastal development permits in jurisdictions with certified local coastal programs for development that is (1) between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea or within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tideline of the sea where there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance; (2) on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream, or within 300 feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff; (3) in a sensitive coastal resource area; (4) for counties, not designated as the principal permitted use under the zoning ordinance or zoning district map; and (5) any action on a major public works project or energy facility.



As discussed below, this project is appealable because a farm support residence is not the principal permitted use for the Agriculture (AG) land use category under the LCP. Hence, the project is appealable pursuant to Coastal Act section 30603(a)(4).

## **IV. Recommended Findings on Appealability**

There is a dispute between the Executive Director and the County of San Luis Obispo regarding the appealability of this project. The County's interpretation is that the project is principally permitted, because of its designation as an "S-16-P" use by Table O of the LCP. The Executive Director, however, has determined that the project is appealable under Section 30603(a)(4) of the Coastal Act, because Farm Support quarters are not the principally permitted use allowed within the Agricultural land use category by the LCP, as further discussed below.

Chapter 6 of the LCP's Framework for Planning discusses the land use categories and allowable land uses for the coastal zone of San Luis Obispo County. Table O of section C of this Chapter establishes the allowable land uses in the coastal zone of San Luis Obispo County (see Exhibit F). Within each of fourteen land use categories, there are five possible classifications or individual land uses. Thus, the "status" of a use in any particular land use category may be P ("principally-permitted"), A ("allowed"), S ("special"), S-P (not defined), or not allowed (blank in Table O). San Luis Obispo County has stated that this project is not appealable because it is a principally-permitted land use in the agriculture land use category. Farm support quarters are designed S-16-P by Table O, with the number 16 referring to various conditions that must be met to allow the use (see below). Although Table O clearly indicates that farm support quarters are an S-P use rather than a principally permitted use, the County interpretation is that an S-P use should be treated as a principally-permitted land use.

The Commission does not agree with the County's interpretation of the LCP, and finds that the project is appealable under Coastal Act 30603(a)(4) for the following reasons. First, LCP section 23.01.0439(c) reiterates the appeal criteria of Coastal Act 30603(a), including designating development that is not the principally-permitted use for a land use category as appealable. LCP section 23.01.0439(c)(4) states that appealable development includes "[a]ny approved development not listed in the Coastal Table O, Part I of the Land Use Element as a Principal Permitted (P) Use." As just discussed, farm support quarters are not listed as a principally-permitted (P) use. Rather, they are characterized as Special (S-16) for prime soils and S-16-P for non-prime soils. The number 16 is a reference to the special standards that must be met in order to allow a farm support use on agricultural lands. These include requirements to document the need for farm support and the number of employees needed for the farm use, record an agreement limiting occupancy to farm support, meet density requirements, avoid prime lands, etc. (see LCP 23.08.167) Thus, because farm support quarters are not listed in Table O as a principally-permitted use, they are appealable pursuant to LCP section 23.01.0439(c)(4).

The project is also appealable because an S-P use is not equivalent to a principally-permitted use as contemplated by the Coastal Act and standard land use planning principles. In particular, as



discussed, an S-P use must meet certain standards, or conditions, in order to be allowable at all in the land use category. Again, in this case, farm support quarters are not allowed on Agricultural land unless the County action meets certain conditions. The fact that these conditions must be met means that the farm support quarters land use is not a ministerial permit action. In effect, an S-P use is a conditional use. The Commission has previously raised this issue in its adopted Periodic Review of the SLO County LCP, and advised the County to amend its LCP to clarify the principally-permitted uses of each land use category consistent with Coastal Act section 30603(a).

In addition, as discussed in detail in the Substantial Issue Finding, the administrative record for the County's action does not establish that the approved residence is, in fact, a farm support quarters. Although the County has verbally indicated that the applicant has agreed to limit the occupancy of the house, no recorded agreement has been provided supporting a finding of consistency with section 23.08.167. In addition, there is no evidence that the County required the removal of the prior farm support quarters damaged in the earthquake as a condition of building a third residence on this agricultural property. Rather, given the presence of a primary residence and the damaged residence already on the property, nothing in the record contradicts a conclusion that the County approval is for a third residence or, at the very least, that a second residence will remain on the property after the approval. In either case, the approval would conflict with the LCP's Table O because secondary residences are not allowable at all in the Agriculture category and certainly not designated as a principally-permitted use by Table O. Thus, under Table O and Coastal Act 30603(a)(4), the approved development is appealable.

Finally, even if the County were correct that an S-P use could be treated as a principally permitted use, a farm support residence is not "the" principal-permitted use for the Agriculture (AG) land use category under the LCP as required by Coastal Act 30603(a)(4). For purposes of appealability under 30603(a)(4), only one land use may be designated as a principally permitted use not subject to appeal. For non-prime land (where the project is most likely located), there are two uses identified as principally permitted (crop production/grazing and coastal accessways) and 10 uses identified as S-P.<sup>1</sup> These uses occur in four different "land use groups" (Agriculture; Cultural, Education and Recreation; Residential; and Resource Extraction). Thus, even considering the County's argument that S-P uses can be treated as principally permitted, "farm support quarters," which are designated as one of *ten* (10) S-P uses, cannot be "the" principal-permitted for this land use category because the County has not designated a single principal-permitted use. Thus, this project is not "the" principally-permitted land use and therefore is appealable under Coastal Act 30603(a)(4).

---

<sup>1</sup> Table O of the LCP designates the following 2 uses as principally-permitted: Coastal Accessways and Crop Production & Grazing. The following 10 uses are designated as S-P: Ag Accessory Structures; Nursery Specialties-Non-Soil Dependent; Specialized Animal Facility; Farm Support Quarters; Home Occupations; Mobilehomes; Residential Accessory Uses; Single-Family Dwellings; Temporary Dwelling; and Water Wells & Impoundments.



## V. Staff Recommendation on Appealability

The staff recommends that the Commission determine that the coastal development permits granted by San Luis Obispo County is appealable to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Section 30603(a)(4) of the Coastal Act.

**MOTION:** Staff recommends a “NO” vote on the following motion:

“I move that the Commission overturn the Executive Director’s determination that the coastal development permits granted by San Luis Obispo County (PMT2004-01284; PMT2004-01285) are appealable to the California Coastal Commission under section 30603(a)(4) of the Coastal Act.”

A majority of the Commissioners present is required to pass the motion. Failure of the motion, as recommended by staff, will result in Commission jurisdiction over the project, a de novo hearing on the application, and adoption of the following resolution and findings.

### **RESOLUTION TO ADOPT SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE:**

The Commission hereby finds that the coastal development permits **PMT2004-01284 and PMT2004-01285** granted by San Luis Obispo County are appealable to the California Coastal Commission under section 30603(a)(4) of the Coastal Act.

## VI. Staff Recommendation on Substantial Issue

The staff recommends that the Commission determine that a substantial issue exists with respect to some of the grounds on which the appeals were filed pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30603.

**MOTION:** Staff recommends a “NO” vote on the following motion:

“I move that the Commission determine that Appeal No. A-3-SLO-05-014 raises **no** substantial issue with respect to the grounds on which the appeal has been filed.”

A majority of the Commissioners present is required to pass the motion. Failure of the motion, as recommended by staff, will result in Commission jurisdiction over the project, a de novo hearing on the application, and adoption of the following resolution and findings.

### **RESOLUTION TO ADOPT SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE:**

The Commission hereby finds that Appeal No. A-3-SLO-05-014 presents **a substantial issue** with respect to some of the grounds on which the appeal has been filed under § 30603 of the Coastal Act regarding consistency with the Certified Local Coastal Program and/or the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act.



## VII. Recommended Findings and Declarations

The Commission finds and declares as follows:

### A. Project Description

#### 1. Project Location

The project is located adjacent to Highway One, on the northwest side of Van Gordon Creek Road, between Cambria and San Simeon (see Exhibit A). Highway One runs just west of and roughly perpendicular to Van Gordon Creek Road in the vicinity of the site. Van Gordon Creek, on the south side of the property, flows towards the beach meeting the coast at San Simeon Beach State Park. The site consists of one parcel totaling roughly 193 acres. The property is currently used for livestock grazing and also has approximately 24 acres of avocado orchards. The property is designated Agriculture (AG) by the San Luis Obispo certified Local Coastal Program. Combining designations include Streams and Riparian Vegetation, and Geologic Study Area. There are currently two residences on the site: a 6,000 square foot primary single-family residence, and an approximately 2,000 square foot farm support residence (Van Gordon House).

#### 2. Project Description and Background

The applicant proposes to construct a 3,000 square foot farm support residence with an attached, but structurally independent, 1,100 square foot garage. The project is proposed to replace an existing farm support residence damaged in the San Simeon earthquake of December 2003. Although currently red-tagged, the County approval does not require the removal of the damaged residence concurrent with the construction of the new residence. The new farm support residence is larger in size, proposed in a different location on the property, and requires new grading and installation of a new access road. Other project components include paved courtyard and patio areas and a circular turnaround driveway. To screen the development from public view, the project includes an engineered soil berm 10'3" tall with a footprint of roughly 7,000 square feet (40 x 175). The project plans show a "future barn" to be located behind the residence, but this is not included in the County's approval. The project plans are attached as Exhibit D.

The Commission recently acted on another coastal development permit appeal for this parcel (A-3-SLO-00-156). In May of 2004, the Commission approved conversion of the existing primary residence to a 5-unit bed-and-breakfast. To maximize protection of agriculture, the project was analyzed as a "supplemental non-agricultural use" and conditioned to require all remaining agricultural land to be placed in an agricultural easement. To date, the applicant has not exercised the permit.

#### 3. Standard of Review for Appeals

The grounds for appeal under Section 30603 are limited to allegations that the development does not conform to the standards set forth in the certified local coastal program or the public access



policies of the Coastal Act. Section 30625(b) of the Coastal Act requires the Commission to conduct a *de novo* coastal development permit hearing on an appealed project unless a majority of the Commission finds that “no substantial issue” is raised by such allegations. Under section 30604(b), if the Commission conducts a *de novo* hearing, the Commission must find that the proposed development is in conformity with the certified local coastal program in order to approve a coastal development permit for the project. Section 30604(c) also requires an additional specific finding that the development is in conformity with the public access and recreation policies of Chapter Three of the Coastal Act, if the project is located between the first public road and the sea, which is not the case with this project.

## **B. Substantial Issue Determination**

The appellants’ contentions can be grouped into two issues: 1) Visual and Scenic Resources; and 2) Agriculture. The discussion below for each of these issues include: the relevant LCP policies, a description of the County’s action, the appellants’ contentions, and an evaluation of whether the contentions raise a substantial issue of conformity with the applicable LCP provisions.

### **1. Visual and Scenic Resources**

#### **a. Relevant LCP Provisions**

The following are the relevant governing provisions from the San Luis Obispo Local Coastal Program:

*Policy 1: Protection of Visual and Scenic Resources. Unique and attractive features of the landscape, including but not limited to unusual landforms, scenic vistas and sensitive habitats are to be preserved, protected, and in visually degraded areas restored where feasible. [THIS POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AS A STANDARD.]*

*Policy 2: Site Selection for New Development. Permitted development shall be sited so as to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas. Wherever possible, site selection for new development is to emphasize locations not visible from major public view corridors. In particular, new development should utilize slope created “pockets” to shield development and minimize visual intrusion. [THIS POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AS A STANDARD.]*

*Policy 4: New Development in Rural Areas. New development shall be sited to minimize its visibility from public view corridors. Structures shall be designed (height, bulk, style) to be subordinate to, and blend with, the rural character of the area. New development which cannot be sited outside of public view corridors is to be screened utilizing native vegetation; however, such vegetation, when mature, must also be selected and sited in a manner as to not obstruct major public views. New land divisions whose only building site would be on a highly visible slope or ridgetop shall be prohibited. [THIS POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AS A STANDARD AND PURSUANT TO SECTION 23.04.021 OF THE*





CZLUIO.]

**Policy 5: Landform Alterations.** Grading, earthmoving, major vegetation removal and other landform alterations within public view corridors are to be minimized. Where feasible, contours of the finished surface are to blend with adjacent natural terrain to achieve a consistent grade and natural appearance. [THIS POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AS A STANDARD AND PURSUANT TO SECTION 23.05.034 OF THE CZLUIO.]

In addition, the North Coast Area Plan of the LCP includes standards for site selection for new development. Areawide Standard 6 states:

**North Coast Areawide Standard 6: Site Selection.** Primary site selection for new development shall be locations not visible from Highway 1 as follows:

- a. Sites shall be selected where hills and slopes would shield development unless no alternative location exists or the new development provides visitor-serving facilities.
- b. New development shall be located so that no portion of a structure extends above the highest horizon line of ridgelines as seen from Highway 1.
- c. Where single ownership is on both sides of Highway 1, building sites shall be located on the east side of Highway 1 except for identified visitor-serving development.
- d. Development proposals for sites with varied terrain are to include design provisions for concentrating developments on moderate slopes, retaining steeper slopes visible from public roads undeveloped.

## **b. County's Action**

The County approved project was determined by the Planning Director to be a nondiscretionary, non-appealable coastal development permit. The project was approved without conditions. Commission staff, however, has had numerous discussions with the County in an attempt to better understand the impacts and issues that were taken into account by the County in its nondiscretionary review of the CDP. Based on verbal and email communications, the County has indicated that of three site locations considered, the approved site would have the least impact on the public viewshed. To screen the development from public view, the County approved plans include an engineered soil berm, roughly 10-feet tall with a footprint of roughly 7,000 square feet (40 x 175).

## **c. Appellants' Contentions**

With regard to scenic and visual resource protection, the appellants contend that the County approved project does not conform to the visual and scenic resource protection policies of the LCP for the following reasons:

- The North Coast Area Plan Areawide Standard #6 requires that site selection for



*new development shall be locations not visible from Highway One. The new farm support quarters would be visible from Highway One. Alternative site locations may exist where hills and slopes would shield the development from public view. It is unclear if the project includes design provisions for concentrating development on moderate slopes, while retaining steeper slopes visible from public roads (Highway One) undeveloped. There is no evidence in the local record to establish whether the project is consistent with this LCP standard.*

- *Visual and Scenic Resource Policies 1, 2, 4, and 5 serve to protect visual resources by requiring new development to be located in areas not visible from major public view corridors, be subordinate to the rural character of the area, and minimize landform alteration. The new farm support quarters would be visible from Highway One and does not appear to use slope created "pockets" to shield development as required by the LCP. An earthen berm proposed to aid in shielding the development from the view corridor of Highway One may appear as an unnatural landform alteration. The County file does not contain structural elevations, nor does it include a visual simulation of the proposed development to ensure the development is adequately screened within the public viewshed. The County file does not include any information about the use of vegetation to screen the development as required by Policy 4. Finally, the newly proposed access road to serve the farm support unit may also be visible within the public viewshed and may alter the rural character of the rolling grasslands and hillside in this area.*

#### **d. Analysis**

The project is subject to several LCP policies related to visual and scenic resources. In general, the policies serve to protect visual resources by requiring new development to be located in areas not visible from Highway One and other major public view corridors; minimize landform alterations; and when possible, use natural topography to screen development from public view.

The North Coast Area Plan Areawide Standard 6 requires that site selection for new development be in locations not visible from Highway One. More specifically, Standard 6(a) requires sites to be selected where hills and slopes would shield the development unless no alternative location exists. Standard 6(d) requires development proposals for sites with varied terrain (such as exists here) are to include design provisions for concentrating development on moderate slopes, while retaining steeper slopes visible from public roads undeveloped. The proposed project is inconsistent with this standard because, as approved by the County, the project will be visible from Highway One, does not use hills and slopes to shield the development, and allows development on a visible hillside when alternative locations exist completely out of view from Highway One.

According to the County, the new farm support residence would be visible from Highway One for a short 90-degree view, and from roughly 7,000 feet away. The County asserts that an engineered soil berm will completely screen this view and there is no chance that the residence will obstruct views from the nearby San Simeon State Park. The County has stated in recent email communications



with Commission staff that three site locations were considered for the replacement farm support residence. Of the three sites considered to date, the County believes the proposed site would have the least impact to visual and scenic resources. However, the County's review and approval of the proposed project is based primarily on informal field reviews made while visiting the site. Although some siting and design considerations were made during the local review, no written alternatives analysis or formal visual simulations were performed to confirm these assertions.

Visual and Scenic Policy 2 aims to protect public views through the use of slope created "pockets" to shield new development. The County approved project is inconsistent with this policy because the farm support residence is located atop a windswept ridge. Commission staff has studied topographic maps and aerial photos of the project site and given the large size of the parcel (193 acres) and the undulating terrain that characterizes the property, it is likely that alternative sites are available completely out of the viewshed. For example, the existing farm support residence to be replaced is located in a steep valley and completely out of public view. Replacement of the existing farm support quarter in its current location would not be visible from Highway One. However, it should be noted that this location would raise other LCP issues that would need to be considered before a project could be approved at that location.<sup>2</sup>

The County file does not include any information about the use of vegetation to screen the development as required by Policy 4. Concerns have been raised that large landscape trees and vegetation used to screen the residence from public view would look unnatural. An example of this can be found onsite, as lush vegetation used to shield the primary residence appears out of place in the rural grasslands (see photos attached in Exhibit E). In this case, it appears the only screening technique to be used is an engineered soil berm. It is possible that native vegetation/grasses could be planted in conjunction with the earthen berm to better blend with the rural agrarian landscape.

The County approved project is inconsistent with Policy 5 because it does not minimize landform alterations within the viewshed. The County approved project includes a large engineered soil berm located in front of the residence as a means to block the house from Highway One. The sole use of an earthen berm to screen the residence raises additional concerns. First, it is unclear if the engineered berm will be effective in completely screening the new residence. A line of site profile provided by the County shows the berm screening only up to the first 8.0' of the house. Should the residence be taller than 8'0" above finished floor elevation, portions of the residence above this elevation would be visible. A profile and/or elevation of the new residence in relation to the berm are not included in the local approval. Second, the berm itself is quite large. If not appropriately designed and/or vegetated, the berm itself could appear as an unnatural landform alteration. The engineered berm is roughly 10'3" tall, 40 feet wide, and 170 feet long (roughly 7,000 s.f. footprint). Additional area would also be expected should the berm be tapered or smoothed along its edges to blend with the contours of the natural terrain. It has been the Commission's experience that soil berms can sometimes look unnatural and lack effectiveness particularly in open rural landscapes

---

<sup>2</sup> Replacing the destroyed farm support residence with a new one in the same location would result in a new house within 100 feet of Van Gordon Creek and on prime soils. To demolish and re-establish a farm support residence in the same location would require a Minor Use Permit/CDP. Additional review would also be required due to the fact that the existing farm support residence may qualify as "historical". Demolition of a historic (H) structure is appealable to the Coastal Commission.



such as this. Finally, extensive grading and earthmoving for the home, earthen berm, and the newly proposed access road may also be visible and may alter the natural form of the hillside.

In conclusion, the County record does not justify the site selection for the new farm support residence. The project is inconsistent with the LCP because it would be visible from Highway One when alternative locations exist outside of public view. The project entails significant amounts of grading and landform alteration within the public viewshed and does not blend with the unique features of the landscape. In the most recent County action, which is the subject of this appeal, there has been no formal visual impact analysis in the coastal development permit review, and therefore it is unclear if all of the relevant Visual and Scenic resource protection standards were considered. Based on the limited information provided, it appears that the County approved project has not been sited or designed to minimize visual and scenic resource impacts.

**Therefore, a substantial issue is raised by the appellants' contentions regarding visual and scenic resources.**

## **2. Agriculture**

### **a. Relevant LCP Provisions**

The following policies from San Luis Obispo County's *Coastal Plan Policies* apply:

***Agriculture Policy 1: Maintaining Agricultural Lands.** Prime agricultural land shall be maintained, in or available for, agricultural production unless: 1) agricultural use is already severely limited by conflicts with urban uses; or 2) adequate public services are available to serve the expanded urban uses, and the conversion would preserve prime agricultural land or would complete a logical and viable neighborhood, thus contributing to the establishment of a stable urban/rural boundary; and 3) development on converted agricultural land will not diminish the productivity of adjacent prime agricultural land.*

*Other lands (non-prime) suitable for agriculture shall be maintained in or available for agricultural production unless: 1) continued or renewed agricultural use is not feasible; or 2) conversion would preserve prime agricultural land or concentrate urban development within or contiguous to existing urban areas which have adequate public services to serve additional development; and 3) the permitted conversion will not adversely affect surrounding agricultural uses.*

*All prime agricultural lands and other (non-prime) lands suitable for agriculture are designed in the land use element as Agriculture unless agricultural use is already limited by conflicts with urban uses.*

***Permitted Uses on Prime Agricultural Lands.** Principal permitted and allowable uses on prime agricultural lands are designated on Coastal Table O – Allowable Use Chart in Framework for Planning Document. These uses may be permitted where it can be demonstrated that no alternative building site exists except on the prime agricultural soils,*



*that the least amount of prime soil possible is converted and that the use will not conflict with surrounding agricultural lands and uses.*

***Permitted Uses on Non-Prime Agricultural Lands.*** *Principal permitted and allowable uses on non-prime agricultural lands are designated on Coastal Table O – Allowable Use Chart in Framework for Planning Document. These uses may be permitted where it can be demonstrated that no alternative building site exists except on the non-prime agricultural soils, that the least amount of non-prime land possible is converted and that the use will not conflict with surrounding agricultural lands and uses. [THIS POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED AS A STANDARD.]*

***Agriculture Policy 4: Siting of Structures.*** *A single-family residence and any accessory agricultural buildings necessary to agricultural use shall, where possible, be located on other than prime agricultural soils and shall incorporate whatever mitigation measures are necessary to reduce negative impacts on adjacent agricultural uses. [THIS POLICY SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 23.04.050 OF THE CZLUO.]*

The LCP also has specific requirements for farm support quarters that apply to this project. Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (CZLUO) Section 23.08.167 states in relevant part:

***23.08.167 – Residential Uses in the Agriculture Category:*** *Dwellings in the Agriculture land use category, including primary housing and farm support quarters are allowed accessory uses on the same site as an agricultural use, subject to the standards of this section. Such dwellings may include mobilehomes, subject also to the standards in Section 23.08.163 (Individual Mobilehomes).*

***a. Limitation on dwelling location – prime soils.*** *Primary family housing and farm support quarters shall not be located on prime agricultural soils unless there is no other building site on the ownership that is all of the following:*

- (1) On other than prime soils;*
- (2) Less than 20 percent in slope;*
- (3) Not within a designated Flood Hazard Combining Designation.*

***c. Farm support quarters – Single family dwellings and mobilehomes:*** *Includes farm or ranch housing for farm help or a caretaker employed on land in the same ownership as the housing. Farm support quarters are allowable in the Agriculture and Rural Lands categories only when the housing is in direct support of existing agricultural production activities on lands owned or leased by the farm housing owner, subject to the following standards:*

- (4) Status of residents:* *Occupancy of farm support quarters in the form of single-family dwellings or mobilehomes is limited to the full-time employees and the spouse and children of full-time employees of agricultural or ranching operations*



*conducted by the owner of the farm support housing, or lessor or the housing owner's acreage. Farm support quarters are not to be rented or leased to individuals other than farm help and their families. An agreement between the property owner and the county limiting occupancy to farm workers shall be executed and recorded prior to building permit issuance.*

### **b. County's Action**

The County approved project was determined by the Planning Director to be a nondiscretionary, non-appealable coastal development permit. The project was approved without conditions. However, apparently pursuant to CZLUO Section 23.08.167, the County informally required the applicant to provide proof of a recorded farm support agreement prior to issuance of the permit. This information was not included in the local approval transmitted to the Commission.

### **c. Appellants' Contentions**

With regard to Farm Support quarters on Agricultural lands, the appellants contend in full:

- ⇒ *Residential Density and Farm Support Quarters – CZLUO Section 23.08.167. There is not evidence in the County record showing that the requirements for farm support quarters prescribed under CZLUO section 23.08.167 have been met. Without addressing the future use of the existing farm support quarters and assuring through a deed restriction that the new residential structure will be used only as farm support in perpetuity, the project will result in two primary residences on the site, in excess of the residential density allowed by the LCP on agricultural lands. Additionally, the County approval does not require removal of the damaged structure that the new residence is intended to replace, leaving the potential for three residences on the site, which is inconsistent with the Agricultural policies of the LCP.*
- ⇒ *Agriculture – Policies 1 and 4. The proposed project has not been sited and designed to maintain agricultural lands to the greatest degree feasible. The lengthy access road and the large amount of grading will convert more agricultural land to residential use than necessary. Other locations for the farm support quarters may be more compatible with continued agricultural use of the site. In addition, non-compliance with residential density limits on Ag. lands, as discussed above, jeopardizes the integrity of the agriculture land use designation thereby threatening continued agricultural use on the site and throughout the planning area. Lastly, it is unclear if the County approved project is located on non-prime agricultural soils as required by the LCP.*

### **d. Analysis**

The LCP policies cited above generally require that that maximum amount of agricultural land be maintained. In addition, CZLUO Section 23.08.167 establishes criteria that must be met for a farm support quarters to be established on agricultural lands.



**Farm Support Quarters**

Farm support quarters are allowable in the Agricultural land use category only when the housing is in direct support of existing agricultural production activities. In this case, the applicant maintains approximately 24-acres of avocados and leases portions of the 193-acre property for cattle grazing. Under the LCP ordinance establishing the density of farm support quarters (23.08.167(c)(5)), a single farm support residence would be allowed.

CZLUO Section 23.08.167(c)(4) requires that a deed restriction be recorded assuring that the new residential structure will be used only as farm support. Without this deed restriction, the project will result in two primary residences on the site, in excess of the residential allowed by the LCP on agricultural lands. Although the County has verbally indicated that an agreement with the landowner was recorded, a copy of the written agreement was not provided in the local record. The Commission cannot establish, therefore, whether the requirements of section 23.08.167(c)(4) have been met.

Additionally, the County approval does not require removal of the existing damaged farm support unit that the new residence is intended to replace. Not addressing the damaged structure leaves open the possibility for three residences on the site. This is inconsistent with the residential density and farm support requirements of the LCP for agriculture.

**Agriculture**


The County approved project does not maintain agricultural lands to the greatest degree feasible as required by the LCP. The project involves construction of a lengthy access road (at least ¼ mile long and 14 feet wide) and significant amounts of grading (approximately 3-4 thousand cubic yards). As such, the project would convert more agricultural land to residential use than may be necessary. This is land that could be used for cattle grazing or some other agricultural use. The land under which the damaged structure is located is considered prime agricultural soil and could be converted back to avocado production. In addition, the siting and design of the project may unnecessarily fragment the usable agricultural portions of the parcel, further diminishing its value as agricultural land. Combined with the residential density non-compliance concerns discussed above, conversion of large amounts of viable agricultural land to residential use threatens continued agriculture on the site and throughout the planning area. Lastly, there is no evidence in the County approval showing that the new farm support avoids prime soils as required by the LCP.<sup>3</sup>

**Therefore, a substantial issue is raised by the appellants' contentions regarding farm support residences and agriculture.**

---

<sup>3</sup> Under the LCP, prime agricultural soils or land means any of the following: a) All land which qualifies for rating as class I or II in the Soil Conservation Service land use capability classifications; b) Land which qualifies for rating 80 through 100 in the Storie Index Rating; c) Land which supports livestock used for the production of food and fiber and which has an annual carrying capacity equivalent to at least one animal unit per acre as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; d) Land planted with fruit- or nut-bearing trees, vines, bushes or crops which have a nonbearing period of less than five years and which will normally return during the commercial bearing period on an annual basis from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production not less than \$200 per acre.







San Luis Obispo County  
Periodic Review

# San Luis Obispo County Communities and Coastal Planning Areas





EXHIBIT NO. A  
APPLICATION NO. 1-3-SD-05-014  
1042  
California Coastal Commission

Map Note: The information presented on this map is subject to revision. All locations are approximate and data have not been field checked. Attempts have been made to ensure completeness of the data; nevertheless, inaccuracies may exist.



PROJECT  
 Minor Use Permit  
 Crowther D00010P



EXHIBIT  
 Land Use C

EXHIBIT NO. A  
 APPLICATION NO.  
 A-3-SLC-05-014  
 2 of 2  
 California Coastal Commission



SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING

VICTOR HOLANDA, AICP  
DIRECTOR

NOTICE OF FINAL COUNTY ACTION

FINAL LOCAL  
ACTION NOTICE

REFERENCE # 3-SLO-05-050  
APPEAL PERIOD 2/8 - 2/22/05

DATE OF DECISION: January 31, 2005

DATE OF NOTICE: February 1, 2005

FILE NUMBER: PMT2004-01284, PMT2004-01285 Crowther

The Planning Director made the decision on the above-referenced application on January 31, 2005.

The proposed development shall comply with all applicable standards and policies of the County's Local Coastal Program. Including, but not limited to, Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.08.167.

The proposed development is in conformity with the certified local coastal program. The proposed use is in conformity with the public access and recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act, because the project is not adjacent to the coast and the project will not inhibit access to the coastal waters and recreation areas. All local rights of appeal have been exhausted as defined in Section 13573 as the project constitutes non-appealable development.

This action is not appealable pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30603 and the County Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance 23.01.043. This notice is for information purpose only. There will not be a public hearing on this action. Contact the Commission's Santa Cruz Office at (831) 427-4863 for further information on appeal procedures. If you have questions regarding your project, please contact Martha Neder at (805) 781-5600.

Sincerely,

Martha Neder, AICP, Planner  
SLO County Planning Dept.

(Planning Department use only)

Date original to applicant: John Crowther ✓ Mailed Hand-delive

Date copy mailed (certified) to Coastal Commission February 1, 2005


RECEIVED

FEB 07 2005

CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA

EXHIBIT NO. <b>B</b>
APPLICATION NO. <b>A-3-SLO-05-014</b>
<b>1041</b>
California Coastal Commission

COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER • SAN LUIS OBISPO • CALIFORNIA 93408 • (805) 781-5600



**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 427-4863

[www.coastal.ca.gov](http://www.coastal.ca.gov)

**COMMISSION NOTIFICATION OF APPEAL**

**DATE:** February 23, 2005  
**TO:** Matt Janssen, Environmental Specialist  
County of San Luis Obispo, Planning & Building Department  
County Government Center  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  
**FROM:** Steve Monowitz, Permit Supervisor  
**RE:** Commission Appeal No. A-3-SLO-05-014

Please be advised that the coastal development permit decision described below has been appealed to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 30603 and 30625. Therefore, the decision has been stayed pending Commission action on the appeal pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30623.

**Local Permit #:** PMT2004-01284; PMT2004-01285  
**Applicant(s):** Dave & Jane Crowther  
**Description:** Construction of a 4,100 square foot farm support quarters as earthquake damage replacement.  
**Location:** Van Gordon Creek Rd. & Highway 1, San Simeon (San Luis Obispo County) (APN(s) 013-011-015)  
**Local Decision:** Approved w/ Conditions  
**Appellant(s):** California Coastal Commission, Attn: Commissioner Mike Reilly;  
Commissioner Sara Wan  
**Date Appeal Filed:** 2/22/2005

The Commission appeal number assigned to this appeal is A-3-SLO-05-014. The Commission hearing date has been tentatively set for March 16-18, 2005 in Newport Beach. Within 5 working days of receipt of this Commission Notification of Appeal, copies of all relevant documents and materials used in the County of San Luis Obispo's consideration of this coastal development permit must be delivered to the Central Coast District office of the Coastal Commission (California Administrative Code Section 13112). Please include copies of plans, relevant photographs, staff reports and related documents, findings (if not already forwarded), all correspondence, and a list, with addresses, of all who provided verbal testimony.

A Commission staff report and notice of the hearing will be forwarded to you prior to the hearing. If you have any questions, please contact Jonathan Bishop at the Central Coast District office.

**CCC Exhibit C**  
**(page 1 of 2 pages)**

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 427-4863



**APPEAL FROM COASTAL PERMIT  
DECISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

Please review attached appeal information sheet prior to completing this form.

**SECTION I. Appellant(s):**

Name, mailing address and telephone number of appellant(s):

Commissioner Mike Reilly

Commissioner Sara Wan

45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000

45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000

San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

(415) 904-5200

(415) 904-5200

**SECTION II. Decision Being Appealed**

1. Name of local/port government:

San Luis Obispo County

2. Brief description of development being appealed:

Construction of a 4,100 square foot farm support quarters building.

3. Development's location (street address, assessor's parcel number, cross street, etc.):

Van Gordon Creek Road & Highway 1, San Simeon, San Luis Obispo County (APN 013-011-015).

4. Description of decision being appealed:

a. Approval; no special conditions: XX

b. Approval with special conditions: \_\_\_\_\_

c. Denial: \_\_\_\_\_

Note: For jurisdictions with a total LCP, denial decisions by a local government cannot be appealed unless the development is a major energy or public works project. Denial decisions by port governments are not appealable.

**TO BE COMPLETED BY COMMISSION:**

APPEAL NO: A-3-SLO-05-014

DATE FILED: 2-22-05

DISTRICT: Central

**RECEIVED**

FEB 22 2005

CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
CENTRAL COAST AREA

**CCC Exhibit** C  
(page 2 of 2 pages)

**APPEAL FROM COASTAL PERMIT DECISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PAGE 2)**

5. Decision being appealed was made by (check one):

- a.  Planning Director/Zoning Administrator  
b.  City Council/Board of Supervisors  
c.  Planning Commission  
d.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Date of local government's decision: 1/31/05

7. Local government's file number: PMT2004-01284; PMT2004-01285

**SECTION III Identification of Other Interested Persons**

Give the names and addresses of the following parties: (Use additional paper as necessary.)

a. Name and mailing address of permit applicant:  
Dave & Jane Crowther  
P.O. Box 698  
Cambria, CA 93428

b. Names and mailing addresses as available of those who testified (either verbally or in writing) at the city/county/port hearings (s). Include other parties which you know to be interested and should receive notice of this appeal.

- (1) Matt Janssen, Planner  
SLO County Planning & Building Dept.  
County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION IV. Reasons Supporting This Appeal**

Note: Appeals of local government coastal permit decisions are limited by a variety of factors and requirements of the Coastal Act. Please review the appeal information sheet for assistance in completing this section which continues on the next page.

APPEAL FROM COASTAL PERMIT DECISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Page 3

State briefly your reasons for this appeal. Include a summary description of Local Coastal Program, Land Use Plan, or Port Master Plan policies and requirements in which you believe the project is inconsistent and the reasons the decision warrants a new hearing. (Use additional paper as necessary.)

See Attached.

Note: The above description need not be a complete or exhaustive statement of your reasons of appeal; however, there must be sufficient discussion for staff to determine that the appeal is allowed by law. The appellant, subsequent to filing the appeal, may submit additional information to the staff and/or Commission to support the appeal request.

SECTION V. Certification

The information and facts stated above are correct to the best of my/our knowledge.

Signed: *Michele Raley*  
Appellant or Agent

Date: February 22, 2005

Agent Authorization: I designate the above identified person(s) to act as my agent in all matters pertaining to this appeal.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Document2)

CCC Exhibit C  
(page 4 of 7 pages)



APPEAL FROM COASTAL PERMIT DECISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Page 3

State briefly your reasons for this appeal. Include a summary description of Local Coastal Program, Land Use Plan, or Port Master Plan policies and requirements in which you believe the project is inconsistent and the reasons the decision warrants a new hearing. (Use additional paper as necessary.)

See Attached.

Note: The above description need not be a complete or exhaustive statement of your reasons of appeal; however, there must be sufficient discussion for staff to determine that the appeal is allowed by law. The appellant, subsequent to filing the appeal, may submit additional information to the staff and/or Commission to support the appeal request.

SECTION V. Certification

The information and facts stated above are correct to the best of my/our knowledge.

Signed: *Lois Allen*  
Appellant or Agent

Date: February 22, 2005

Agent Authorization: I designate the above identified person(s) to act as my agent in all matters pertaining to this appeal.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Document2)

**CCC Exhibit C**  
**(page 5 of 7 pages)**

**Reasons for Appeal: San Luis Obispo County Coastal Development Permit PMT2004-01284, PMT2004-01285 (Crowther)**




The County approved project is development of a 3,000 square foot manufactured home and 1,100 square foot garage for farm support quarters as earthquake damage replacement. Coastal Act Section 30603(a)(4) states that any development approved by a coastal county that is not designated as "the" principally permitted use under the zoning ordinance is appealable. A farm support quarters is not "the" principally permitted (P) use for the Agriculture land use category under the LCP and therefore is appealable to the Coastal Commission.

The project is inconsistent with the policies and ordinances of the San Luis Obispo County Local Coastal Program, as detailed below.

1. **Site Selection** – North Coast Area Plan Areawide Standard #6 requires that site selection for new development shall be locations not visible from Highway One. The new farm support quarters would be visible from Highway One. Alternative site locations may exist where hills and slopes would shield the development from public view. It is unclear if the project includes design provisions for concentrating development on moderate slopes, while retaining steeper slopes visible from public roads (Highway One) undeveloped. There is no evidence in the local record to establish whether the project is consistent with this LCP standard.
2. **Residential Density and Farm Support Quarters** – CZLUO Section 23.08.167. There is no evidence in the County record showing that the requirements for farm support quarters prescribed under 23.08.167 have been met. Without addressing the future use of the existing farm support quarters and assuring through a deed restriction that the new residential structure will be used only as farm support in perpetuity, the project will result in two primary residences on the site, in excess of the residential density allowed by the LCP on agricultural lands. Additionally, the County approval does not require removal of the damaged structure that the new residence is intended to replace, leaving the potential for three residences on the site, which is inconsistent with the Agricultural policies of the LCP.
3. **Agriculture** – Policies 1 and 4. The proposed project has not been sited and designed to maintain agricultural lands to the greatest degree feasible. The lengthy access road and the large amount of grading will convert more agricultural land to residential use than necessary. Other locations for the farm support quarters may be more compatible with continued agricultural use of the site. In addition, non-compliance with residential density limits on Ag. lands, as discussed above, jeopardizes the integrity of the agriculture land use designation thereby threatening continued agricultural use on the site and throughout the planning area. Lastly, it is unclear if the County approved project is located on non-prime agricultural soils as required by the LCP.
4. **Visual and Scenic Resources** – Policies 1,2, 4, and 5. These policies serve to protect visual resources by requiring new development to be located in areas not visible from major public view corridors, be subordinate to the rural character of the area, and minimize landform alterations. The new farm support quarters would be visible from Highway One and does not appear to use slope created "pockets" to shield development as required by the LCP. An earthen berm proposed to aid in shielding the development from the view corridor of Highway One may appear as an unnatural landform alteration. The County file does not contain structural elevations, nor does it include a visual simulation of the proposed development to ensure the development is adequately screened within the public viewshed. The County file does not include any information about the use of vegetation to screen the

development as required by Policy 4. Finally, the newly proposed access road to serve the farm support unit may also be visible within the public viewshed and may alter the rural character of the rolling grasslands and hillside in this area.





**LEGEND**

- (---) EXISTING CONTOUR
- (---) EXISTING CONTOUR
- (---) LIMIT OF GRADING
- (---) FINISHED SURFACE ELEVATION
- (---) FINISH ELEVATION
- (---) EDGE OF GRAVEL ROAD
- (---) DRIVEWAY

SCALE: 1" = 20'



OWNER: JOHN CROWTHER  
 P.O. BOX 403  
 CAMBRIA, CA 93428

ENGINEER: STEVEN J. SYLVESTER, R.C.E. 20743  
 NORTH COAST ENGINEERING, INC.  
 725 CRESTON ROAD SUITE B  
 PASO ROBLES, CA 93448

A.P.N. 013-011-018

IN THE CAMBRIA OF PASO ROBLES, COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA BEING A PORTION OF RANCHO SAN SIMEON

<b>NCE NORTH COAST ENGINEERING, INC.</b> <small>CIVIL ENGINEERING • LAND SURVEYING • PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</small> 725 Creston Rd. - Suite B Paso Robles, CA 93448 (805) 239-3127 (805) 927-8651	STEVEN J. SYLVESTER R.C.E. 20743 Exp. 3/31/07	<b>REVISIONS</b>																													
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">NO.</th> <th style="width: 5%;">BY</th> <th style="width: 10%;">DATE</th> <th style="width: 80%;">DESCRIPTION</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	NO.	BY	DATE	DESCRIPTION																	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><b>CROWTHER RESIDENCE</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><b>GRADING PLAN</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><small>ENGINEER/DATE</small> J.S./AG</td> <td style="width: 50%;"><small>APPROVED FOR COUNTY RECORDS</small></td> </tr> <tr> <td><small>JOB NUMBER</small> 04133</td> <td><small>REVISIONS</small></td> </tr> <tr> <td><small>CALIFORNIA COUNTY</small></td> <td><small>DATE</small></td> </tr> </table>	<b>CROWTHER RESIDENCE</b>		<b>GRADING PLAN</b>		<small>ENGINEER/DATE</small> J.S./AG	<small>APPROVED FOR COUNTY RECORDS</small>	<small>JOB NUMBER</small> 04133	<small>REVISIONS</small>
NO.	BY	DATE	DESCRIPTION																												
<b>CROWTHER RESIDENCE</b>																															
<b>GRADING PLAN</b>																															
<small>ENGINEER/DATE</small> J.S./AG	<small>APPROVED FOR COUNTY RECORDS</small>																														
<small>JOB NUMBER</small> 04133	<small>REVISIONS</small>																														
<small>CALIFORNIA COUNTY</small>	<small>DATE</small>																														

PRELIMINARY

**PROFILE**

**NCE** NORTH COAST ENGINEERING INC.  
Plan, Specifications • Maps • Analysis • Reports • Construction  
 725 Crofton Rd., Suite B  
 Paso Robles, CA 92346  
 (805) 239-3127  
 (805) 827-8851

**PRELIMINARY**  
 E.L. SHELDON  
 Dec 1/20/04

REVISIONS:

NO.	BY	DATE	DESCRIPTION


**CROWTHER RESIDENCE**

LINE OF SIGHT

PROJECT NO. 04113

DATE 12/1/04

SHEET 3 OF 4




200 Exhibit D  
 (page 3 of 3 pages)




**PROPOSED  
BIB**  
(Primary Residence) →

**COASTAL RECORDS PROJECT  
PHOTO # 1837**

EXHIBIT NO. <b>E</b>
APPLICATION NO. <b>A-3-SLO-05-014</b>
<b>1 of 2</b>
 California Coastal Commission


Approx. Location  
of Farm Support  
Residence:



Primary Residence



AVOCADOS

EXHIBIT NO. E
APPLICATION NO A-3-SLO-05-014
2012
 California Coastal Commission



**COASTAL ZONE TABLE O**  
**EXCERPTED FROM COASTAL ZONE FRAMEWORK FOR PLANNING**  
**PART 1 OF THE LAND USE ELEMENT / LOCAL COASTAL PLAN**

**ALLOWABLE LAND USES IN THE COASTAL ZONE**

The following charts (Coastal Table O) list uses of land that may be established in the land use categories shown by the LUE area plans in the coastal zone. After determining what land use category and combining designation applies to a particular property, the chart can be used to find what uses are allowable. The chart will also show where to look in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance to find the standards that apply to the planning and development of such land uses, as well as what permit is needed before a use can be established.

**IMPORTANT:** When determining the land use category and combining designation (if any) applicable to a particular property, also check the planning area standards and any policies from the Coastal Plan Policies Document that may apply to the property. (Planning area standards can be found in the LUE area plan that covers the part of the county containing the property in question. The LCP Policy Document may include additional requirements or standards affecting the type of development proposed.) Those standards may limit the uses allowed by the following charts, or set special permit requirements for a particular land use category, community or area of the county.

The column headings at the top of the charts are the land use categories, and the left column lists land uses, grouped under general headings. When the proposed land use is known, reading across the columns will show where the use is allowable. If a proposed use doesn't seem to fit the general land use headings, the definitions of uses in Section D of this chapter can help determine the proper group of uses to look for. A particular use of land need not be listed in the use definitions to be allowable. If a proposed use is not specifically mentioned, the planning director will, upon request, review a proposed use and identify the listed use it is equivalent to, as described in Chapter 2 of this document.

The letter "A" on the chart means that the corresponding use in the left column is "Allowed" in that land use category, if consistent with the LUE, LCP and other applicable regulations. Though some uses with an "A" in various categories (such as crop production) are identified in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance as requiring no permit, in most cases the "A" means a use can be established with a plot plan approval as part of a building permit (or more intensive permit process if required by the CZLUO based on the size of the use), subject to the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance standards that must be considered in planning and developing a use.

The letter "S" means that a use is allowable in a particular land use category only when special standards or permit procedures are followed. The number after the "S" refers to the key following the charts, which explains where to look in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance to find the special standards. A "P" means that the use is principally permitted and encouraged over non-principally permitted uses. A "PP" means the same as a "P" where found in the text. A blank space in a land use category column means the corresponding use on the left side of the chart is not allowable in that land use category.

**KEY TO COASTAL TABLE O**

<b>USE STATUS</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
A	Allowed use, unless otherwise limited by a specific planning area standard. Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Chapter 23.03 ("Required Level of Processing") determines the permit necessary to establish an "A" use, and Chapters 23.04 through 23.06 determine the site design, site development, and operational standards that affect the use. See also the "Planning Area Standards" sections of the Land Use Element Area Plans and the LCP Policy Document to find any standards that may apply to a project in a particular community or area.
S	Special use, allowable subject to special standards and/or processing requirements, unless otherwise limited by a specific planning area standard. The following list shows where in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance to find the special standards that apply to particular uses.
P	Principally permitted use, a use to be encouraged and that has priority over non-principally permitted uses, but not over agriculture or coastal dependent uses.

<b>"S" NUMBER</b>	<b>APPLICABLE COASTAL ZONE LAND USE ORDINANCE SECTION AND/OR LAND USE ELEMENT REQUIREMENT</b>	
-------------------	---	--

1	23.08.120 b	MISCELLANEOUS USES
2	23.08.120 a	MISCELLANEOUS USES
3	23.08.040	AGRICULTURAL USES
4	23.08.060	CULTURAL, EDUCATIONAL & RECREATIONAL USES
5	23.08.080	INDUSTRIAL USES are allowable subject to the special standards found in Section 23.08.080. For new or expanded uses within the Petroleum Refining and Related Industries and Marine Terminals and Piers use groups, a specific plan is required prior to acceptance of land use permit(s) subject to the standards as set forth in Section 23.08.094.
6	23.08.100	MEDICAL & SOCIAL CARE FACILITIES
7	23.08.140	OUTDOOR COMMERCIAL USES
8	23.08.160	RESIDENTIAL USES
9	23.08.170	RESOURCE EXTRACTION
10	23.08.200	RETAIL TRADE
11	23.08.220	SERVICES
12	23.08.260	TRANSIENT LODGINGS
13	23.08.280	TRANSPORTATION, UTILITIES & COMMUNICATION

A-3-SLO-05-014  
**CCC Exhibit**   F    
 (page   2   of   10   pages)

"S" NUMBER

APPLICABLE COASTAL ZONE LAND USE ORDINANCE SECTION  
AND/OR LAND USE ELEMENT REQUIREMENT

- 14 Uses are allowable in the Open Space land use category on privately-owned land subject to Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.08.120a in addition to the special standards in Chapter 23.08, only when authorized by a recorded open space agreement executed between the property owner and the county. On public lands, uses designated are allowable subject to Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.08.120b, in addition to the special standards found in Chapter 23.08.
- 15 Listed processing activities are allowable in the Rural Lands and Agriculture land use categories only when they use materials extracted on-site pursuant to Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.08.120a, or when applicable, the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Surface Mining Standards, Section 23.08.180 et. seq.
- 16 23.08.020 ACCESSORY USES
- 17 23.08.240 TEMPORARY USES
- 18 23.08.050 INTERIM AGRICULTURAL USES
- 19 23.08.400 WHOLESALE TRADE
- 20 23.08.300 ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANTS

ALLOWABLE USES

LOCAL  
COASTAL  
PLAN  
COASTAL  
TABLE 'O'

LAND USE CATEGORY

PAGE NUMBER  
OF USE

Open Space	Public Facilities	Industrial	Commercial Service	Commercial Retail	Office & Professional	Residential Multi-Family	Residential Single-Family	Residential Suburban	Residential Rural	Recreation	Rural Lands	Agriculture - Non-Prime Soils	Agriculture - Prime Soils
------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------	-------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

USE GROUP

A) AGRICULTURE	
Ag Accessory Structures	1
Ag Processing	2
Animal Raising & Keeping	3
Aquaculture	4
Crop Production & Grazing	5
Farm Equipment & Supplies	6
Nursery Specialties - Soil Dependent	8
Nursery Specialties - Non-Soil Dependent	9
Specialized Animal Facilities	10

6-39  
6-39  
6-40  
6-40  
6-44  
6-45  
6-51  
6-52  
6-58

S-3-P	S-3-P	S-3-P	S-3	S-3	S-3					S-3	S-3	S-3	S-14
S-3	S-3	S-3		S-3						S-3	A		
S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3
	S-3	S-3		S-3						S-3-P	S-3-P		
P	P	P	A	A	S-18	S-18	S-18	S-18	S-18	S-18	A	A	A
	S-3	S-3		S-3						A	A		
S-3-P	S-3-P	S-3		S-3	S-3				S-3	S-3	S-3		
	S-3	S-3		S-3	S-3				S-3	S-3	S-3		
S-3	S-3-P	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3		S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	

B) COMMUNICATIONS	
Broadcasting Studios	1
Communications Facilities	2

6-41  
6-43

								P	A	P	A	A	
	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13-P	S-13-P	S-13-P	S-13

A-3-SU-05-014  
JCC Exhibit F  
(page 4 of 10 pages)

# LAND USE CATEGORY

Open Space	Public Facilities	Industrial	Commercial Service	Commercial Retail	Office & Professional	Residential Multi-Family	Residential Single-Family	Residential Suburban	Residential Rural	Recreation	Rural Lands	Agriculture - Non-Prime Soils	Agriculture - Prime Soils
------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------	-------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

PAGE NUMBER  
OF USE

## USE GROUP

C) CULTURAL, EDUCATION & RECREATION	
Cemeteries & Columbariums	1
Churches	2
Coastal Accessways	3
Drive-In Theaters	4
Indoor Amusements & Recreation	5
Libraries & Museums	6
Marinas	7
Mbrship. Organization Facilities	8
Off-Road Vehicle Courses	9
Outdoor Sports & Recreation	10
Passive Recreation	11
Public Assembly & Entertain.	12
Rural Recreation & Camping	13
Schools - Specialized Education & Training	14
Schools - College & University	15
Schools - Pre to Secondary	16
Social Service Organizations	17
Sports Assembly	18
Temporary Events	19

				S-4	S-4								S-4	
		S-4		S-4	S-4	S-4	S-4	P	P	P				
P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
										S-4	S-4			
				S-4-P					S-4	S-4-P	S-4		S-4-P	
				S-2-P	S-2				P	P			P	
				S-1-P							S-1		S-1-P	
				S-2				S-1	A	A	A	A	A	
			S-1	S-1										
				S-4-P	S-4	S-4	S-4	S-4		S-4	S-4		S-4-P	
		A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
				A					P	P	P		P	
		S-4	S-4	S-4-P	S-4	S-4							S-4	S-14
			S-4	S-4	S-4	S-4			P	P	P	S-4-P	S-4	
									P				P	
			S-4	S-4	S-4	S-4-P	S-4-P	S-4-P	S-4-P				S-4-P	
									P	A	A	S-2	S-2-P	
				S-1							S-1	S-1	S-1	
		S-17	S-17	S-17	S-17				S-17	S-17	S-17	S-17	S-17	

A-3-S-20-05-014  
**COC Exhibit F**  
 (page 5 of 10 pages)



## LAND USE CATEGORY

Open Space	Public Facilities	Industrial	Commercial Service	Commercial Retail	Office & Professional	Residential Multi-Family	Residential Single-Family	Residential Suburban	Residential Rural	Recreation	Rural Lands	Agriculture - Non-Prime Soils	Agriculture - Prime Soils
------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------	-------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

PAGE NUMBER OF USE

## USE GROUP

<b>D) MANUFACTURING &amp; PROCESSING (CONTINUED)</b>	
Small Scale Manufacturing	21
Stone & Cut Stone Products	22
Structural Clay & Pottery - Related Production	23
Textile Products	24

6-58  
6-58  
6-59  
6-59

											P	P		
	S-15	S-15									P	P		
		S-15										P		
												P		

<b>E) RESIDENTIAL USES</b>	
Caretaker Residence	1
Farm Support Quarters	2
Home Occupations	3
Mobilehome Parks	4
Mobilehomes	5
Multi-Family Dwellings	6
Nursing & Personal Care	7
Organizational Houses	8
Residential Accessory Uses	9
Residential Care	10
Secondary Dwelling	11
Single-Family Dwellings	12
Temporary Dwelling	13

6-42  
6-45  
6-48  
6-51  
6-51  
6-51  
6-52  
6-53  
6-56  
6-56  
6-57  
6-57  
6-59

S-8	S-8	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P			S-8	S-8	S-8	S-8	S-8	S-8	S-14
S-16	S-16-P	S-16-P												
S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16	S-16	S-16	S-16	S-16	S-16	
			S-8	S-8	S-8	S-8-P	S-8-P							
S-8	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8-P	S-8	S-8				S-8	
			S-8				P	S-8	S-8					
					S-6		S-6	P	S-6-P				A	
		S-8		S-8	S-8		S-8	S-8	S-8	S-8				
S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-16-P	S-14
		S-6		S-6	S-6	S-6	S-6	S-6					S-6	
				S-8	S-8	S-8								
S-16	S-16-P	P	S-2-P	P	P	P	P	S-8	S-8					
S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	S-17-P	

A-3-SLO-05-014  
 SCC Exhibit F  
 (page 7 of 10 pages)

## LAND USE CATEGORY

Agriculture - Prime Soils	Agriculture - Non-Prime Soils	Rural Lands	Recreation	Residential Rural	Residential Suburban	Residential Single-Family	Residential Multi-Family	Office & Professional	Commercial Retail	Commercial Service	Industrial	Public Facilities	Open Space
---------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------	------------	-------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------	-------------------	------------

PAGE NUMBER OF USE

## USE GROUP

<b>F) RESOURCE EXTRACTION</b>	
Fisheries & Game Preserves	1
Forestry	2
Mining	3
Petroleum Extraction	4
Water Wells & Impoundments	5

	A	A	A	A									S-14
	A	A	A	A	A								
	S-9	S-9										S-9	S-14
	S-9	S-9		S-9	S-9					S-9	S-9	S-9	
S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P	S-9-P

<b>G) RETAIL TRADE</b>	
Auto, Mobilehome & Vehicle Dealers & Supplies	1
Building Materials & Hardware	2
Eating & Drinking Places	3
Food & Beverage Retail Sales	4
Fuel & Ice Dealers	5
Furniture, Home Furnishings & Equipment	6
General Merchandise Stores	7
Mail Order & Vending	8
Outdoor Retail Sales	9
Roadside Stands	10
Service Stations	11

									S-10	S-7	S-7		
									S-10-P	P	A		
	S-10		S-10-P	S-10	S-10			A	P	A	S-2		
			S-10-P	S-10	S-10	S-10	S-10	S-10	P	A	S-2		
										S-5	S-5-P		
									P	A			
			S-1-P						P	A			
									P	P	A		
	S-7	S-7	S-7	S-7				S-7	S-7	S-7	S-7	S-7	S-7
	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3	S-3								
			S-10						S-10-P	S-10-P	S-10		

A-3-SLO-05-014  
 CC Exhibit F  
 (page 8 of 10 pages)





## LAND USE CATEGORY

Open Space	Public Facilities	Industrial	Commercial Service	Commercial Retail	Office & Professional	Residential Multi-Family	Residential Single-Family	Residential Suburban	Residential Rural	Recreation	Rural Lands	Agriculture - Non-Prime Soils	Agriculture - Prime Soils
------------	-------------------	------------	--------------------	-------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------	-------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

PAGE NUMBER OF USE

## USE GROUP

<b>I) TRANSIENT LODGINGS</b>	
Bed & Breakfast Facilities	1
Homestays	5
Hotels, Motels	2
Recreational Vehicle Parks	3
Temporary Const. Trailer Park	4

6-41  
6-48  
6-48  
6-55  
6-59

	S-12	S-12-P	S-12-P	S-12-P	S-12-P		S-12	S-12	S-12-P	S-12		S-12	
					S-12	S-12							
			S-12-P				S-12	S-12-P	S-12			S-12	
			S-12-P						S-12	S-12		S-1	
	S-12	S-12		S-12							S-12		

<b>J) TRANSPORTATION</b>	
Airfields & Landing Strips	1
Harbors	2
Marine Terminals & Piers	3
Pipelines & Transmission Lines	4
Public Utility Facilities	5
Transit Stations & Terminals	6
Truck Stops	7
Vehicle & Freight Terminals	8
Vehicle Storage	9

6-40  
6-47  
6-50  
6-54  
6-55  
6-60  
6-60  
6-60  
6-60

S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13					S-13		S-13	S-13	S-13-P	
													S-1-P	
			S-5								S-5	S-5	S-5-P	
S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-14
S-13	S-13	S-13		S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	S-13	P	
			S-2						S-2	S-2	S-2	A	A	
											A	A		
											A	A		
			S-13						S-13	S-13	P	A	A	

<b>K) WHOLESALE TRADE</b>	
Warehousing	1
Wholesaling & Distribution	2

6-60  
6-61

	S-19	S-19						S-19			P	A	A	
	S-19	S-19									P	A		

A-3-SLD-05-014  
 CC Exhibit F  
 (page 10 of 10 pages)