

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

*Executive  
Summary*

**ES.1 OVERVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT EIR**

This is a revised draft EIR (RDEIR), which supersedes the Draft EIR (DEIR) that was released for public comment on June 30, 2006 through September 27, 2006. Both the original DEIR and this RDEIR analyze the environmental effects of land development proposed in two configurations: the “MOU Project” and “Alternative 1.”

Following the receipt of public comment on the DEIR, the County prepared this RDEIR in order to clarify certain information regarding the project and to refine the analysis of the project. The County concluded that the best method for responding to comments would be to revise and re-circulate the entire RDEIR document for public review as opposed to simply responding to individual comments or recirculating portions of the DEIR. This approach is allowed and described in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (14 CCR 15088.5(f)(1)). This RDEIR will be circulated for public comment and the comments to this RDEIR received during the public comment period will be addressed in the final EIR (FEIR) for the project.

CEQA requires written responses to comments received during the public comment period to be included in the FEIR. Because this RDEIR supersedes the DEIR, the comments received during the public comment period for this RDEIR will be the comments that will be addressed in writing in the FEIR. The comments the County received on the previous DEIR will remain part of the record of the proceedings for the project; however, written responses to those comments will not be included in the FEIR, as allowed in the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15088.5(f)(1)).

**IMPORTANT NOTE: As a result of the decision to prepare this RDEIR, persons wishing to submit comments that will be addressed in the FEIR must submit those comments during the public review period for this RDEIR.**

**ES.2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT CHANGES**

The decision to proceed with a wholly revised DEIR is driven by four major factors:

1. The project design has been revised to address comments received (including those of the County Central Board of Architectural Review, or CBAR) and incorporate a number of mitigation measures identified during the DEIR preparation process that will serve to reduce environmental effects. Although this RDEIR does not retain a detailed description of the original project design, where specific changes have influenced the discussions of environmental effects they are described in the impacts and mitigation sections of appropriate topics. In general terms, the project design changes are as follows:
  - Along the coastal terrace lots, minor adjustments were made to building footprints and to development envelopes to reduce potential effects to native grassland vegetation.

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

*Executive  
Summary*

- Also within the coastal terrace lots, south of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks, the access road and driveway configurations were modified to provide more contiguous areas of Private Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) and Open Space Conservation Easement (OSCE).
  - In the Alternative 1 configuration, Lot DP-19 (17.3 acres) south of the UPRR tracks was withdrawn from the application and is no longer part of Alternative 1.
  - Within the equestrian village portion of the project, between Highway 101 and the UPRR tracks on the Santa Barbara Ranch property, the building locations on Lot 71 were changed to reduce building visibility at the entrance to the project. This issue was not identified as a significant impact in the previous DEIR, but the change was made in response to the CBAR. Other minor changes in building configurations occurred on other lots in this area.
  - The agricultural support facility, originally proposed on Lot 57 between Dos Pueblos Canyon Road and Highway 101, has been moved and incorporated into the equestrian center on Lot 97. This change was made to avoid biological and visual impacts.
  - The public access road leading to the public parking, picnic area, and trail head on Lot 97 was moved to provide a full 100 foot buffer for wetlands in the northeast corner of Lot 97. Other road locations and driveways in the equestrian village area were also shifted to provide buffers for seasonal water bodies.
  - North of Highway 101, in the Alternative 1 configuration, minor adjustments were made in the elevations and locations of specific buildings to reduce the visual effects of the project from specific viewpoints. Some of these changes were made in response to impacts identified in the DEIR and others were responsive to comments from CBAR. These changes affected buildings on Lots 48 49, 51, 52A, 188, 193, 195, 210, and 215.
  - Also North of Highway 101 and in the Alternative 1 configuration, minor changes were made in lot sizes to keep development envelopes entirely within their respective lots and to allow for simpler configuration of agricultural and open space easements.
  - Several specific building footprints were adjusted in response to specific environmental concerns. These include deletion of a small barn on Lot 41, and minor shifts in the residence and drive locations on Lots DP-12 and DP-13 (in Alternative 1), to avoid development near monarch butterfly resting area. A small out-building on Lot DP-10 (in Alternative 1) was also deleted to avoid the need for clearing into coastal scrub vegetation for fire protection purposes on this lot.
2. An Open Space Management Plan (refer to Appendix G), referenced extensively in the first DEIR for implementation of mitigation measures intended to avoid or reduce biological effects, has been incorporated into the project description and is used to update the discussion of biological resources. Other mitigation measures which were originally anticipated in the Open Space Management Plan have been defined as mitigation measures to be implemented as conditions of approval for various components of the project.

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

3. Additional information regarding agricultural resources has been incorporated into the RDEIR as the result of interactions between County staff, the Santa Barbara Agricultural Preserve Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Conservation. *Executive Summary*
4. To simplify the presentation format and reinforce the MOU Project as the official project for which formal application has been made, the RDEIR is divided into distinct volumes that separately address the MOU Project and the Alternatives (including Alternative 1 proposed by the applicant).

### **ES.3 PROJECT OVERVIEW**

#### **ES.3.1 Setting and Context**

The proposed project consists of a large lot residential development and associated land use changes on Santa Barbara Ranch (SBR) totaling 485 acres. The project would result in 54 new rural estate residences and includes an equestrian center, agricultural support facilities, a worker duplex, public amenities (including access road, parking and restroom, hiking, biking, equestrian trails near the coastal bluff, an educational kiosk and a coastal access stair structure), and creation of conservation easements permanently protecting 161 acres for agricultural uses and 147 acres for open space. The location of the project is shown in Figure ES-1.

The proposed project occupies a portion of the Naples town site. The town site encompasses an area of 800 acres and is comprised of 274 legal lots under the Official Map of Naples. The Official Map was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on October 3, 1995, and filed for the record on December 19, 1995, in Book 99, at Pages 4 through 9 of Maps. The area occupied by SBR encompasses 219 Official Map lots, equal to roughly 80 percent of the entire Naples town site.

The proposed project would be in lieu of the potential development of the existing legal lots. The project would reduce the number of existing lots to 54 residential lots compared to the 219 lots recognized under the Official Map.

#### **ES.3.2 Official Map of Naples**

On July 23, 1888, the Naples Investment Company filed a Plan of Naples depicting lots within the town site with the County Recorder (the “Original Map;” Figure ES-2). Starting in the early 1880s and continuing into the 1920s, lots within the Naples town site were sold or otherwise transferred. In the 1940s, Signal Oil Company purchased the Naples town site and much of the surrounding lands. Signal obtained permits and installed improvements for the water supply and distribution system that is currently operated by the Naples Water Company and serves portions of the original town site.

Shortly following certification of the Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP) in 1982, the County adopted antiquated subdivision regulations and instituted an Antiquated Subdivision Overlay (ASO) District in the period between 1984 and 1988. These regulations were memorialized in

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

**Executive  
Summary**

Resolutions 94-298 and 94-299 that applied the ASO to ten subdivisions whose maps were recorded before 1893. These regulations effectively reduced the development potential of Naples from over 400 lots under the Original Map filed in 1888 down to an estimated maximum of 14 lots based on minimum lot size requirements applicable to the underlying zone designations of AG-II-100 and Unlimited Agriculture (U).

The County was subsequently sued by one of the Naples landowners, and in 1994, the California Supreme Court struck down the subdivision regulations pertaining to lot size (*Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara* [1994] 7 Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 725). In response, the County rescinded these regulations and later adopted the Official Map of Naples (the “Official Map”; Figure ES-3). The Official Map only recognizes those lots for which the County previously issued a certificate of compliance demonstrating that a division of land complied with state and local laws, or had a deed history establishing the lot as a separate legal parcel. Because the Official Map only recognizes 274 legal lots (as opposed to over 400 lots alleged by Naples landowners), the Map’s adoption led to further litigation:

- Santa Barbara County Superior Court Case No. 179265, challenging the County’s ASO Ordinance, alleging inverse condemnation and seeking monetary damages for alleged violations of civil rights and seeking declaratory relief
- Santa Barbara County Superior Court Case No. 203256, challenging the action of the County and the California Coastal Commission in adopting and certifying Ordinance No. 4084 which, among other things, regulates private wastewater facilities
- Threatened and tolled litigation, challenging the County’s 1994 rescission of its antiquated subdivision regulations, adoption of the Official Map and determination of parcel validity within the Naples townsite

In late 2002, the County and landowners representing roughly 80 percent of the Official Map lots entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) setting forth a protocol and structure for the submittal of project applications as a part of a potential global resolution of pending and threatened litigation. The MOU does not create entitlements, rights or approvals, and does not impair the County’s ability to enforce its applicable ordinances, resolutions, policies or statutes. However, it does provide a protocol for the County to consider applications for development and conservation at Naples.

Most importantly, the MOU preserves the opportunity to control land use planning for Naples as opposed to a situation where individual lot owners could seek development permits for single family homes under the current “Grid” configuration of the Official Map. Under the MOU, the County retains the ability to reject the project. At the same time, the applicants retain the ability to terminate the MOU as well as the ability not to use the entitlements the County approves. If any of these scenarios occur, the applicants would still have 219 lots that potentially could be developed. This could lead to applications for development in an ad hoc, fragmented basis, thus potentially subjecting the County to a high number of unilateral takings claims (if development

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

were denied on grounds other than valid health and safety concerns) and could likely compromise the very goals promoted in the CLUP.

*Executive  
Summary*

### **ES.3.3 Required Approvals and Implementation**

Actions by the County necessary to approve the project are described in Section 2.0 (MOU Project Description). The following processes and approvals would be necessary to authorize and/or approve the development proposed in the MOU Project:

- Certification of the FEIR
- Amendments to the Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP) and the Comprehensive Plan to create the Naples Planned Development (NPD) land use designation
- Amendments to the Coastal Zoning Ordinance and Inland Zoning Ordinance to create a new NPD zone district
- Application of the new land use designation and zone district to the SBR property
- Removal of the “Special Problems Area” designation over the property
- Adoption of a Development Agreement that provides for continuation of proposed development standards for the term of the agreement
- Creation of an PACE and OSCE
- Approval of the following series of discretionary permits or actions to create the project:
  - Development Plan (DP) for the entire project, and Development Plan for Lot 97 (residence, equestrian facility, and agricultural support facility)
  - Lot merger or extinction of development rights to reconfigure the existing lots to accommodate the development design
  - Individual Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) for each residence in the Coastal Zone and Land Use Permits for each residence in the inland area
  - Individual CDPs for access roads, other improvements and for grading or related creek restoration activities in the Coastal Zone
  - Major Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a proposed package sewage treatment plant
  - Major CUP for coastal access improvements
  - Major CUP for an onsite water treatment facility, depending upon the proposed source of potable and irrigation water for the project
  - Minor CUP for each of the 16 septic disposal wastewater systems for development in the inland area if connection to a single package sewage treatment plant is not otherwise required
  - Minor CUP for a proposed farm employee duplex

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

**Executive  
Summary**

- Building Permits and Road Encroachment Permits

Additional approvals required by state and federal agencies would also be requested at this time, including:

- CDFG Section 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement, if required (e.g., for the proposed span bridge at Tomate Canada Creek)
- California Department of Health Services certification (via Santa Barbara County Health Services) of proposed water supply and treatment plants
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) encroachment permits
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 notification and/or permit

**ES.3.4 Land Use Considerations**

Existing land use and zoning designations for the Naples town site consist primarily of commercial agriculture, with minimum lot size requirements ranging from 10 acres (“U” zone applied to inland lots) to 100 acres (AG-II-100 zone for coastal lots). This translates to a hypothetical residential development potential of 14 lots that is far less than the 274 legal lots recognized in the 1995 Official Map of Naples. In short, existing agricultural land use designations and implementing zoning ordinances at Naples do not align with the residential lot densities already in existence.

As a means of resolving the disparity in land use designations and existing lot densities, the CLUP element of the County’s LCP contains Policy 2-13, which is separately and uniquely applicable to the Naples town site lots. Policy 2-13 states:

*“The existing townsite of Naples is within a designated rural area and is removed from urban services. The County shall discourage residential development of existing lots. The County shall encourage and assist the property owner(s) in transferring development rights from the Naples townsite to an appropriate site within a designated urban area which is suitable for residential development. If the County determines that transferring development rights is not feasible, the land use designation of AG-II-100 should be re-evaluated.”*

Thus, CLUP Policy 2-13 contemplates the possible need to consider a higher land use density for the Naples town site in the event that a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program is evaluated and determined to be infeasible. In compliance with CLUP Policy 2-13, a TDR Study has been completed and was released in March 2006 for two development scenarios, including: the proposed project and Alternative 1. The March 2006 TDR Study indicates that most of the proposed project and Alternative 1 locations are not feasible as receiver sites for a variety of reasons, including: remoteness from the Naples town site, lack of common interest and issues between the Naples town site and potential receiver sites, and the disparity between very high land and development values on the Gaviota Coast when compared with inland urbanized areas.

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

Consequently, the Study concludes that a full extinguishment of development rights is not feasible.

*Executive  
Summary*

These findings notwithstanding, the County continues to explore alternatives. A third scenario known as the “Grid” is presently under review and will evaluate extinguishment of development potential for SBR Alternative 1 lots under the Official Map. The TDR Study will also be updated to incorporate recent valuation data. A parallel effort is also underway to devise a program framework and an enabling ordinance. This effort could allow for development transfers even if full extinguishment is not possible.

### **ES.3.5 Project Objectives**

The primary objectives and underlying purpose of the project are to:

- Provide for a project that would result in fewer environmental impacts than would otherwise result from development of all of the existing Naples town site lots
- Achieve a long-term solution to the potential development of the existing Naples town site lots that would resolve pending litigation and future disputes over the potential development of the property between the landowners and the County
- Achieve a comprehensive development concept for Naples that would afford the County the opportunity to control land-use planning for the entire Naples town site that would not leave the County to address development at Naples on an ad hoc, fragmented basis
- Maintain long-term continued agricultural use within the project site and on adjacent properties that is compatible with a low-density residential development on the Naples town site
- Allow residential development within the Naples town site that balances agricultural, open space, recreational, and residential uses consistent with the California Coastal Act, the CLUP, Comprehensive Plan and the MOU
- Incorporate a site layout, design, and architectural style that reflect the scenic and rural character of the Naples town site and Gaviota areas, minimize environmental impacts, and preserve and/or restore wildlife habitats and other coastal resources

These project objectives seek a suitable balance between preservation of rural, coastal resource values; the ownership and use of legal lots within the project area, density allowing for agriculture and open space; and economic returns allowing for agriculture and open space. They also recognize that a CLUP that reduces the potential density that would result from the development of the existing Naples town site lots can be achieved only if the landowners are willing to develop a reduced density project in lieu of the possible density of the existing lots.

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

Executive  
Summary

## **ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY**

The County faces a number of challenges in developing concepts for the Naples town site lots in general, and the project in particular. These challenges include balancing a wide variety of conflicting opinions regarding the scale and density of new residential development on the rural Gaviota Coast, appropriate uses of the agricultural lands and open space, protection of coastal viewsheds, restrictions that should be placed on uses in the residential lots and public coastal access areas, and the type of management structure, if any, that should be responsible for the OSCEs. Moreover, the location of most of the proposed residential development in the coastal zone entails a complex permitting and approval process, including procurement of an approval from the California Coastal Commission.

By implementing the project, the applicant and the County would resolve long-standing disputes over potential development of over 80 percent of the Naples town site lots. Achieving this outcome must take into consideration both the unique property configuration that resulted from the Official Map, and the site-specific environmental and policy constraints that are identified through the EIR process. If constructed as proposed, the project would entail a density and scale of development that is considerably different from what exists today. However, the project would allow for continued agricultural operations, restoration of sensitive habitats, and improved recreational and coastal access opportunities for County residents. Perhaps most importantly, the intensification of land use at Naples is uniquely applicable to this area of the Gaviota Coast by virtue of CLUP Policy 2-13 and is not transferable to areas further removed from the Naples town site. Nor would approval of this project establish any policy or precedent for development on other areas of the Gaviota Coast.

## **ES.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

### **ES.5.1 Environmental Impact Report**

This RDEIR, required under the provisions of CEQA, assesses the physical effects of the project, alternatives to the project, and required governmental approvals.

### **ES.5.2 Impact Summary**

The project applicants have attempted to mitigate the environmental impacts by avoiding, minimizing, and reducing project effect. Nevertheless, there remain several environmental impacts that are identified as *Class I; Significant and Not Mitigable*. These are listed first in Table ES-1 (located at the end of this Executive Summary), and summarized below.

- **Biological Resources** – a significant cumulative impact related to the regional loss of grassland foraging habitat between Highway 101 and the coastal bluff along the Gaviota Coast between Coal Oil Point and El Capitan Point. The project has been modified to reduce its contribution to a less than considerable level acceptable to the County, but the cumulative impact would remain unmitigable.



**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

*Executive  
Summary*

- **Visual Resources** – significant changes in the overall visual character of the land visible along U.S. Highway 101; significant changes in specific views, particularly toward the north in the Western Region of the site for the MOU Project (KOP 5 discussed in Section 3.9).
- **Land Use** – inconsistencies with CLUP Policies and Comprehensive Land Use Policies (if identified impacts are not otherwise mitigated or if the project is not otherwise modified), related to the increasing density and visibility of the residential development plan

Remaining portions of Table ES-1 review potentially significant impacts for which mitigation measures will reduce effects to a level below significance (Class II), and effects considered less than significant (Class III).

## **ES.6 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

As required by CEQA, this RDEIR considers a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.

In Section 5.4 of the MOU the County agreed that this RDEIR would study the following alternatives: (i) a comprehensive grid development of the Naples Townsite; (ii) reduced onsite development; (iii) a one hundred sixty-two (162) Merger/Lot Line Adjustment Managed Agricultural Project; (iv) transferred development rights, as referenced in LCP Policy 2-13; (v) a no project alternative, and (vi) such other alternatives as may be mandated by CEQA and applicable plans, law, and ordinances. Section 5.4 of the MOU also states that the project alternatives shall include consideration of conventional septic systems for waste water disposal; extensions of sewer lines to the Coastal Property; onsite disposal, collection, and treatment facilities; or other reasonable alternative options for sewage treatment and disposal. The project applicants have agreed that the County would not be required to consider the “Managed Agricultural Project” (alternative iii in the MOU).

In addition to the foregoing alternatives, this RDEIR also considers the applicant’s proposed alternative (Alternative 1) and an alternative proposed by the Naples Coalition (Alternative 2). The following summarizes the alternatives that this RDEIR addresses.

### **ES.6.1 Alternative 1 – The Applicant’s Proposed Alternative**

The project applicants have proposed Alternative 1 as an alternative that the applicants would pursue in lieu of the MOU Project. The applicants have submitted detailed information regarding the design and proposed entitlements of Alternative 1 that allow for an environmental review at a project level of detail. Because there is detailed information available to evaluate the alternative and to assist the decision maker in evaluating Alternative 1 relative to the project, this RDEIR assesses Alternative 1 at a project level of detail. (See Section 9.0, in Volume 2.)

Alternative 1 comprises the 485-acre SBR property plus a 2,752-acre portion of the Dos Pueblos Ranch (DPR) property. It includes the 219 lots on SBR and the 16 Naples town site lots on

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

**Executive  
Summary**

DPR, which together contain 86 percent of the Naples lots on the Official Map. Alternative 1 would result in the development of 72 single-family residences on large lots, plus an additional five lots, two of which would have continuing residential uses and three of which would be devoted to agricultural uses.

Alternative 1 would maintain most of the current SBR component of the project with respect to combining lots and/or extinguishing development rights to reduce the number of lots and/or development sites, development of lots, an agricultural support facility, and an equestrian farm employee duplex. However, it eliminates development of 14 lots located north of Highway 101 and shifts that development to a portion of land on DPR immediately north of the SBR property, known as the Option Parcel. The Option Parcel contains 2 existing lots on about 205 acres. The owners of SBR have entered into an option agreement with the DPR owner to purchase this land where the units would be relocated if certain terms are met. The property subject to the option would be subdivided into 16 lots, a total that equates to the 14 proposed lots in the project that would be relocated to the Option Property and two existing Naples town site lots north of Highway 101.

The applicants also have reached an agreement with the DPR owner that would reduce the remaining 14 Naples town site lots on DPR south of Highway 101, 12 of which are within the project area and 2 of which are south of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and not within the project area. The 12 Naples town site lots within this part of the project area will be combined with another 6 existing lots through lot line adjustments, lot mergers, or extinguishment of development rights. The area encompassed by the 12 Naples town site lots within the project area will remain in agricultural use, including the existing agricultural use on DP-17 and on DP-18, while the area encompassed by the existing six non-Naples town site lots will allow for a combination of single-family residences and agriculture. Of those six lots, the applicants propose to develop four new single-family residences, to replace one existing residence, and to retain the historic Casa Grande main residence. In addition, the applicants have reached an agreement with the DPR owner as part of Alternative 1 that would allow for a subdivision of an approximately 123-acre area on DPR immediately north of the Option Property into 10 new residential lots and one remainder lot that would allow for 11 total new single family residences and related improvements.

Alternative 1 would also result in the creation of an ACE over 2,635 acres and the SBR and DPR properties and 289 acres of permanent OSCEs.

Alternative 1 would follow the same general approval process and actions as outlined above for the MOU Project in Section ES 3.3. Additional actions necessary for the Alternative 1 approval are summarized as follows:

- Application of the new NPD designation and zoning to areas within the DPR property, including the Option Parcel (part of the Naples town site) and DPR land immediately north of the Option Parcel to which some Naples lots' development potential would be

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

transferred. The existing AG-II-100 zoning would be retained on the DPR property south of Highway 101.

*Executive  
Summary*

- Creation of a new Agricultural Conservation Easement that would cover much of the DPR property north of Highway 101, and all of the DPR property south of Highway 101
- Cancellation of the existing Williamson Act agricultural preserve contract on the DPR property north of Highway 101, and approval of a new Williamson Act contract over most of the same land
- Approval of a new subdivision of land encompassing the Option Property and the DPR land north of it, to accommodate the Alternative 1 development
- Mergers and lot line adjustments to re-configure the DPR lots south of Highway 101
- Approval of Coastal Development Permits and Land Use Permits for proposed residences on the DPR property

Alternative 1 is a project alternative that the County will consider and may approve in lieu of the project. As with the MOU Project, the applicants propose to proceed with development of inland portions of the project that do not require Coastal Commission approval before the Coastal Commission acts on the approvals within the coastal zone.

### **ES.6.2 Alternative 2 – Offsite Dos Pueblos Ranch Alternative**

Alternative 2 reflects the recommendations of the Naples Coalition, which is a group of organizations concerned about proposed developments at the Naples town site (see Section 11.3). Alternative 2 is based on the concept that some aspects of the project could be transferred to DPR outside the Highway 101 coastal viewshed.

As suggested by the Naples Coalition, Alternative 2 would result in a total of 64 single family residences that would be located primarily within the Option Property, and within a larger 700-acre portion of DPR. The residences would be sited to avoid development within area visible from Highway 101 and areas on the coastal bluffs. Alternative 2 would allow limited legal public coastal access facilities that would maintain a level of usage similar to current conditions. Representatives of the Naples Coalition have indicated that additional units may be allowed under Alternative 2 as necessary to provide a sufficient economic return to make the alternative feasible.

### **ES.6.3 Alternative 3**

#### **ES.6.3.1 Alternative 3A – No Project Alternative with Grid Development**

Alternative 3A, the No Project Alternative with Grid Development, allows the decision maker to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts that could result if the project is not approved. Potential impacts from Alternative 3A were based on projections of what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future based on current plans and conditions

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

*Executive Summary* consistent with available infrastructure (see Section 11.4). Similar to the MOU Project, this alternative includes consideration of conventional septic systems for wastewater disposal, extensions of sewer lines, onsite disposal, collection, and treatment facilities, and other reasonable alternative options for sewage treatment and disposal.

A denial of the entitlements for any or all of the alternatives examined in this RDEIR does not mean that SBR would not be developed. The Official Map shows 219 legal lots within the SBR boundaries. A single-family dwelling unit and one guest house per lot are permitted uses in the AG-II-100 zone and the County zoning code states that a dwelling may be located on legal parcels that are less than the 100-acre minimum lot size. Alternative 3A evaluates the impacts that would result under a scenario in which the landowners would seek to develop individual lots or sell individual lots to unrelated buyers who would then seek development permits for single-family homes. The No Project Alternative with Grid Development takes into account conditions existing at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved.

**ES.6.3.2 Alternative 3B – Retention of Existing Condition**

Alternative 3B assesses the project relative to the existing physical conditions (see Section 11.4.3). This alternative addresses a scenario where no development would occur on the site, which would avoid all or most if the environmental effects of the project. Under this scenario, current agricultural uses would continue at its present level, current informal beach access and use would continue with present levels, and no other improvements or development would occur.

**ES.6.4 Alternative 4 – Reduced Development Alternative**

Alternative 4 involves changes to the project that are related specifically to the *Class I impacts* identified in Section 3.0 of this RDEIR (see Section 11.5). Alternative 4 retains the general design approach of the project, but deletes a number of lots in response to specific environmental issues. It would result in the development of 48 new residences. Alternative 4 concerns only development on SBR. Alternative 4 does not involve any development on DPR.

**ES.6.5 Alternative 5 – Clustered Development Alternative**

Alternative 5 would result in 54 single family residences of varying designs and a worker duplex, clustered in areas that are suitable for development based on site constraints (see Section 11.6). The residences would be clustered in two primary areas, one cluster located north of Highway 101 and one cluster located south of Highway 101. Alternative 5 would include mixed housing types and lot sizes. The overall character of mixed housing types would tend to be more representative of an urban setting.

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

**ES.6.6 Alternative 6 – Transfer of Development Rights**

*Executive  
Summary*

The Alternative 6 scenario involves the potential transfer of development rights from the Santa Barbara Ranch property to a designated urban area. CLUP Policy 2-13 allows the County to re-evaluate the current AG-II-100 land use designation on the project property if the County determines that it is not feasible to transfer development rights from the project site to an appropriate site within a designated urban area which is suitable for residential development. In connection with its consideration of the project, the County is evaluating the feasibility of transferring development rights in the manner specified in CLUP Policy 2-13.

**SANTA BARBARA RANCH  
REVISED DRAFT EIR**

*Executive  
Summary*

*This page intentionally left blank.*