

# TEMPLETON AREA ADVISORY GROUP (TAAG) NOTICE OF TAAG BOARD MEETING AND AGENDA Thursday July 21, 2022 6:30 PM

The regular meeting of the Templeton Area Advisory Group (TAAG)  
has **RESUMED IN-PERSON MEETINGS** (No Zoom link for this meeting) at the  
Templeton Community Service District Board Room  
located at 502 Fifth Street  
(Entrance to the right/east of the fire station)  
in Templeton, California

## **2022-2023 TAAG BOARD MEMBERS**

Scott Shirley, Delegate/Chair  
Murray Powell, Delegate/Vice-Chair/Treasurer  
Doris Diel, Delegate/Secretary  
Dede Davis, Delegate  
John Donovan, Delegate  
Jerry Jones, Delegate  
Scott Silveira, Delegate

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLIGIANCE

2. ROLL CALL

3. AGENCY REPORTS AND UPDATES

Written reports will be read at the meeting. In-Person Reports will be live.

- 3.1. Sheriff's Office
- 3.2. California Highway Patrol
- 3.3. Supervisorial District One
- 3.4. Supervisorial District Five
- 3.5. County Planning Department
- 3.6. Templeton Community Services District

4. PUBLIC COMMENT Members of the public who wish to speak on any topic not on the agenda that is within the purview of the TAAG may approach the podium on being recognized by the Chair. Please state your name (and representation, if any) for the minutes, and limit your comments to three minutes. Per TAAG's Bylaws, no action will be taken on items not on the agenda, though Board members may ask questions of the speaker. When speaking please announce your name and place of residence for our records.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- 5.1 Approval of Minutes from June 16, 2022 TAAG Board meeting
- 5.2 Approval of Treasurer's Report

6. OLD BUSINESS

**6.1** Review of Vacation Rental Minor Use Permit application (Project No. DRC2021-0002).  
This property is located at 5240 Jack Creek Rd. Templeton, CA. This application is requesting

a modification to SLO County Code Title 22 Section 22.30.510 b. ii. that requires "No residential vacation rental shall be located within 1.500 of an existing vacation rental." In this case a currently licensed vacation rental property is located 453 feet from this project site. See **Addendum** attached below for letters from the public regarding this project.

## 7. NEW BUSINESS

**7.1** Concern voiced by Templeton resident regarding new bright paint colors at 105 S. Main Street. Templeton Community Design Plan (1990) reads that the "dominant color of new buildings should relate to the inherent color of the primary building's finish materials." Under Guideline VI: Architectural Guidelines, B. Downtown Commercial Buildings, 8: Color, "brick, stone, wood, stucco, and terra cotta tile ... are earth tones. Wherever possible minimize the number of contrasting colors appearing on the building exterior."

**7.2** Discussion regarding pending SLO County Land Use Permit Application No. DRC2020-00157 to approve a Phased Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow more than 3 acres of disturbance and a Variance for grading on slopes over 30% for purposes of establishing a shared residential access road, improving an existing ag driveway approach to residential standards, and constructing four primary single-family residential homes with subsequent utilities on two contiguously owned parcels to construct four primary single family residential homes, one 6,650-square-foot and one 5,500-square-foot residence on each parcel, on slopes in excess of 30% with a total of 8.23 acres of site disturbance. The project site consists of two contiguous parcels, owned by Doug Anderson (Applicant) located along the south side of Peachy Canyon Road in Rural Templeton (Lot 4, APNs 026-331-056 & 057; Lot 5, APN 026-331-058) approximately 116 acres and 174 acres, respectively, for a total area of +/- 290 acres. The properties are undeveloped consisting of steep and very steeply sloping topography (average slope of +/-24%) and dense oak woodland. The project will result in a total of 8.23 acres of site disturbance.

Oak Woodland Impact: The proposed project will result in the removal and impact to oak woodland habitat, with anticipated removal of 126 oak trees and impacts to an additional 150 oak trees. The project site is densely vegetated with oak woodland on steep and very steeply sloping topography, some areas in excess of 40%. Due to the dense vegetation existing on the site, it would be difficult to establish and revegetate the graded areas with oak trees.

SLO County Title 22 Land Use Ordinance (LUO) Section 22.58 – Oak Woodland Ordinance: The County adopted the Oak Woodland Ordinance to establish criteria to limit the clear-cutting of oak woodland. The intent is to maintain the character of the existing landscape. Residential development subject to a ministerial permit is not subject to the regulations within the Oak Woodland Ordinance. The proposed residential development is subject to discretionary approval as required by other standards of the LUO and is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), where potential impacts associated with tree removal may be evaluated and mitigated. The proposed project will result in the removal of 126 oak trees and impacts on approximately 150 oak trees. The Applicant proposes to establish a conservation easement on the property to mitigate the impacts of the removal and other impacts to the oak woodland habitat.

Discussions of the environmental impacts of this project with the projects Planning consultants, Kirk Consulting, indicates that the project will require at least a County prepared Mitigated Negative Determination (MND) environmental study in order to comply with California Environmental Quality Act law (CEQA). Kirk Consulting has been advised that it is TAAG's general policy to generally defer its reviews and recommendations on projects until draft

MND's are issued for public review and comment. At this time, the County has not issued its environmental review for this project.

The project's Application, Project Description and other information can be found on the following SLO County Planning Citizens Self Service (CSS) website address:

[https://energov.sloplanning.org/EnerGov\\_Prod/SelfService#/plan/20ca6a47-3f0a-4819-8225-d8f63c10471d?tab=attachments](https://energov.sloplanning.org/EnerGov_Prod/SelfService#/plan/20ca6a47-3f0a-4819-8225-d8f63c10471d?tab=attachments)

## 8. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM COMMITTEES

- 8.1 Project Review Committee
- 8.2 Cannabis Project Review Committee
- 8.3 Community Outreach and Public Relations Committee
- 8.4 Traffic Circulation Committee
- 8.5 Bylaws Special Committee
- 8.6 Water/Toad Creek Committee
- 8.7 Elections Committee

## 9. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM DELEGATES (on items not on the agenda)

## 10. ADJOURNMENT

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

*The reports of the chairs of the Project Review Committee and the Cannabis Project Review Committee, concerning applications for review at this meeting (if any), and reports of any other committees, may be available for viewing (and downloading and printing) three days before the TAAG meeting at TAAG's website (<http://www.taaginfo.org>) on the "Committee Reports" page. A limited number of paper copies of the reports may be available at the meeting.*

### **APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS**

1. Chairperson will call the agenda item.
2. The project applicant or agent will present the application.
3. The Project Review Committee will present its report.
4. Chairperson will open the floor to Delegates' questions of the applicant or agent.
5. Chairperson will open the floor for public comment. Please direct public comments to the Chairperson, not to the applicant.
6. Applicant or agent addresses public comments by responding directly to the Chairperson.
7. Public comment portion of the proceedings on this item will be closed, and no further testimony will be taken.
8. The TAAG Delegates will discuss the application and, considering all public comments, will consider making a recommendation

### **GUIDELINES FOR PRESENTING ORAL COMMENTS**

It is important that all participants conduct themselves with courtesy, dignity, civility, and respect for all parties involved. If you wish to present oral comments, please observe the following guidelines:

1. Identify yourself by your full name (and representation, if any) for our minutes, and speak from the rostrum so other attendees will have the opportunity to listen to the comments. (We

do not currently use speaker slips, but we ask that speakers sign in on the list provided at the rostrum so that we can include the names of speakers in the minutes.)

2. Address your comments to the Chair. Conversation or debate between a speaker at the podium and a member of the audience is not permitted.

3. Oral comments should be brief and to the point. Your comments should be about issues, and not about any individuals involved.

4. Public oral comment is limited to three minutes per individual unless the Chair permits otherwise.

5. Please -- no audience reaction (applause or otherwise) during or after comments. 6. Written testimony (letter, e-mail, etc.) is acceptable, but should be distributed to TAAG members at least three days before the meeting.

7. Once the public comment portion of the meeting is closed, there will be no further public oral comments unless requested of and permitted by the Chair.

### **ADDENDUM – AGENDA ITEM 6.1**

Four letters from the public, received by TAAG, regarding DRC2021-0002:

Received June 5, 2022 from Larry Stone

June 5, 2022

TAAG Board Delegates and Alternates,

Regarding N-DRC2021-0002, a vacation rental within 1,500 feet of an existing vacation rental:

As one member of the team of neighbors that advised County staff in the drafting of the current Adelaida Vacation Rental Ordinance, I can offer a brief history of the process and explain my objections to granting any exceptions to the distance requirement between vacation rentals.

The desire for the Adelaida vacation rental ordinance originated from the perception among area residents that the Willow Creek-Adelaida area of north San Luis Obispo County was becoming increasingly saturated with commercial business entities: tasting rooms, vacation rentals, and the like. No set of limits or guidelines seemed to be in place to protect the rural ambiance so cherished by residents.

Beginning in 2015 and over the course of some 18 months, neighborhood groups such as the Willow Creek Preservation Group and Save Adelaida met with SLO County Planning staff, then liaison Vicky Shelby, and then County Supervisor Frank Meacham. Frank was very supportive of our efforts to provide some structure and order to an increasingly congested and chaotic neighborhood.

Compromise was the key to the successful creation of the ordinance. Our original proposal was modeled after ordinances creating historic preservation overlay zones and would have affected those properties with addresses on certain roads in the Willow Creek-Adelaida area; additionally, a key provision of the original proposal was that new vacation rentals could be no closer than 1500 feet from the property line of an existing vacation rental. 1500 feet seemed an appropriate distance between vacation rentals in that, at that distance, the topography of the area tends to obscure structures and that any increase in traffic would be mitigated by the distance between rentals. County Staff suggested that the ordinance apply to all of the Adelaida Sub-Area of the North

County Planning Area and that the distance requirement be modified to no closer than 1500 feet from the structure licensed as a vacation rental. These changes to our original idea seemed acceptable to members of the neighborhood groups involved because any ordinance regulating vacation rentals was better than none at all.

I have a number of concerns regarding the applicant's request for an exception. Avera Events' proposal to locate another short-term rental less than 500 feet from a currently licensed vacation rental seems unwarranted because the current restriction does not prevent the applicant from using the property. The applicant can still rent the property to tenants on a long-term basis. Granting an exception to the VR distance rule would increase traffic congestion on the West end of Jack Creek Road and would diminish, not enhance, the neighborhood's rural ambiance.

Avera Events is also a business entity operating a wedding venue. Allowing businesses to use provisions of an ordinance meant to allow private homeowners to rent out personal property on a short-term basis seems contrary to the original intent of the ordinance.

Finally, I am concerned about future use of the property. Originally, Avera Events applied for a Temporary Event permit for 25 events hosting up to 150 persons. That request was apparently withdrawn and the application states in bold face capital letters "PROJECT IS FOR NOW ONLY FOR A VACATION RENTAL" Given that the applicant operates a wedding destination on the same property that is also applying for a vacation rental permit, will the applicant later re-apply for a Temporary Event permit?

Granting exceptions to clearly delineated rules enables opportunism and weakens neighborhoods. As good fences make good neighbors, so good rules foster good communities. The Adelaida Vacation Rental Ordinance is an example of a good rule; please do not recommend granting an exception to the 1500-foot distance requirement.

Thank you,

Larry Stone

Received June 6, 2022 from Kathy Stone

TAAG Members,

I am opposed to Avera's requested exception to the Adelaida Vacation Rental Ordinance (AVRO) distance requirement. I was a member of the neighborhood group that worked with the Board of Supervisors, TAAG, Planning Commission, and County staff to create the existing AVRO. After one and a half years of meetings and compromise, the ordinance was adopted to provide guidelines for vacation rentals in our area.

The need for regulating short term rentals in the Adelaida grew out of a widespread concern over the increasing number of vacation rentals, event centers, and tasting rooms serving food and hosting concerts. The Board of Supervisors also recognized the saturation of commercial businesses in this rural/AG area and agreed with County staff that 1,500 feet between vacation rentals was reasonable.

The ordinance has not stopped the proliferation of new businesses in the Adelaida. In fact, Avera Events is a wedding venue business. However, the AVRO has established reasonable limits that should be adhered to. Asking for a 500 foot exception to the required 1,500 feet does not seem reasonable.

Granting such an exception chips away at the foundation of the ordinance and opens the door to setting a precedent for future similar exceptions. Thank you and I hope you will deny this application.

Kathy Stone

Received June 6, 2022 from Diane Burkhart

Honorable TAAG Board members,

I am writing to oppose Avera's (N-DRC2021-0002) request for an exception to the distance requirement contained in the Adelaida Vacation Rental Ordinance (AVRO).

One of the largest issues facing our county is the lack of affordable housing, an important component of which is long term rentals. This lack of worker housing is exacerbated by the loss of inventory as homes are converted to short term vacation rentals. Unrestricted STVRs drive the loss of affordable units and negatively impact our rural neighborhoods. The supervisors recognized this when approving the AVRO, and approving exceptions serves to weaken a needed and necessary law.

Approving a short-term rental less than 500 feet from a currently licensed vacation rental dilutes the meaning and intent of the ordinance, is bad for the neighborhood and aggravates the housing shortage. I respectfully urge you to deny the request. Thank you.

Best,  
Diane Burkhart

Received June 6, 2022 from Alice Griselle

Members of TAAG,

I was a member of the neighbors that organized to establish regulations for vacation rentals in the Adelaida area. We spent a year and a half with TAAG, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors discussing, compromising and refining the regulations to fit the specific characteristics and development patterns of our area. The final product was the Adelaida Vacation Rental Ordinance.

You have a letter submitted to you by Larry Stone that goes into more detail regarding the creation and approval of the ordinance. Mr. Stone also gives the reasons why the 1,500 feet should be observed. I agree with his letter, and I hope you recommend the denial of this application.

Thanks for your consideration,  
Alice Griselle