



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO Department of Agriculture/Measurement Standards

2156 SIERRA WAY, SUITE A, SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA 93401-4556
ROBERT F. LILLEY (805) 781-5910
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER/SEALER FAX: (805) 781-1035

AgCommSLO@co.slo.ca.us

Ag Tourism & Direct Marketing Work Group

June 29, 2006

Meeting Minutes

Submitted by Michael Isensee, July 11, 2006

Present:

-Anne McMahon	-Elizabeth Rolph	-Kim Pasciuto	-Michael Isensee (staff)
-Charlie Whitney	-Holly Sletteland,	-Lora Pankey Eade	-Brenda Ouwerkerk
-Colleen Childers	-Joy Barlogio	-Roy Parsons	(staff)
-Debra Garrison	-Karen Mansfield (ATF monitor),	-Steven Knudsen (alt)	

Guests: Carolyn – Chanticleer Vineyard & B&B

Absent: Alison Denlinger (alt), Angela Thompson, Deanne Gonzales, Dick Rogers, Doug Filipponi, Duane Waddell, Eric Michielssen (alt), Jamie Kirk, Kate Loftus (alt), MaryAnn Vasconcellos, Mary Bianchi, Sandra Wallace (alt), Steve Sinton, Karen Nall (staff)

Handouts:

1. Agenda & Draft minutes (purple)
2. Processing/Products Cmtee #1 report (green)
3. B&B Committee Final Report 6-26-06 & minority report (tan)
4. Events #3 Final Draft report (pink)
5. Sign Cmtee #8 First Draft (buff)

Minutes Review (Michael)

Approved with addition of name of B&B visitor (Nancy Terren from Creekside B&B)

Review of Approach – Email Communication & Final Reports (Brenda)

- As a courtesy, please let the originator of email know if you are forwarding email on to others outside the workgroup. Original ground rules included: “be careful of what you take out of meetings – confidentiality issues.” Respecting email communication should be considered part of this, so prior to sharing emails outside the work group should occur only with the permission of the email author.
- Committee reports should capture both areas of agreement and disagreement (additional points of view)
- If individuals on committees or in the work group but not on a committee feel a committee report does not reflect the individual’s point of view, a separate report (addendum, minority report, alternate view) can also be offered and will be included in staff’s work as the process continues.
- There was disagreement on if reports should reflect the names of people who held specific viewpoints. Committees can choose this approach if they agree. It can assist staff in asking questions directly to people with particular viewpoints. However, it is also recognized that the committee makeup does not reflect a representative sample of either the work group or the county populace, simply the best thoughts of individuals with particular viewpoints who worked to reach accord on certain issues.
- See format for final reports provided at last meeting (bright pink sheet)

Preliminary Discussion of Active Agriculture

- Steven (Farm Bureau) stated that Farm Bureau has concerns about the definition of active agriculture within the farmstay report. They have become aware of how the definition has become a foundation upon which a number of other reports are built upon, and would like to comment on the definition and

- provide alternative language. Problems some see in the definition of active ag is that it is difficult to enforce, exclusionary, and uses finances as a method of qualifying, which is considered problematic.
- The work group generally agreed that reaching agreement on a definition of active ag would be useful.
- There was some discussion about why a definition of agriculture was important. It was explained that since the main policy being implemented (AGP6) requires an agricultural use and further requires that visitor uses and retail uses be secondary and incidental to the agricultural use of the site, it is important to describe what quantity of agricultural use would be adequate to ensure that visitor and retail uses would be secondary and incidental to the ag use.
- Farm Bureau agreed to work with others over coming week to develop an alternative.

Presentation Second Draft: Products/Processing – (Committee #1) (Kim)

- The committee largely offered the same report as at the previous meeting with some additional details on addressing impacts and regarding restaurants (see June 13 meeting minutes)
- Report offers suggestions on how to address a variety of potential unintended consequences (noise, air quality, water, traffic, emergency services, and odor)
- Restaurants should be located on well traveled roads only and should require a higher level permit. Otherwise, the existing standards (800 sf for kitchen and seating areas and other rules) are appropriate
- Report asks the question of how to address the impacts when a site requests multiple uses that are each approved without discretionary review. Would multiple uses on a single site trigger the need for review? A similar question was how would a neighborhood with multiple uses be evaluated (or does it need to be evaluated during the drafting of the ordinance?)

Report on Lodging/B&B (Committee #6 Lodging) (Charlie)

- Committee’s fundamental issue was over definition, specifically: are B&Bs 1) operated by owner (or the site’s farmer if not the owner) who acts as host? or 2) by a host who is not necessarily the owner or the farmer?
- Committee differentiated between B&B and Inn

B&B	Inn
Breakfast only	Any Meal
No meals to others	Potential for meals to non-guests (but not a restaurant)
Resident host (but not agreement whether this person is the owner, the farmer, or simply the B&B manager/host)	Staff. Not necessarily a resident host
Employees ok	Employees ok

- Agreement that # of rooms, size of lodging and should relate to parcel size and permit requirements, but continued disagreement of where the appropriate lines are drawn.
- Agreement that a B&B which places all rooms in the residence (up to 4) should be able to be accomplished with a ministerial permit, but number of rooms should be connected to property size.
- No agreement on whether an agricultural use is required. Some believe parcels zoned for ag should qualify for use simply based upon an adequate parcel size. Others believe an ag use coupled with an adequate parcel size is vital to connect use to policy.
- Agreement that the use should not impinge on neighbor’s ability to farm
- Two approaches to room size discussed – ave. room size versus max. room size
 1. Average would provide an owner with total limits but flexibility for each individual room.
 2. Maximum size would set a maximum facility size (but only for detached lodging, allowing an unlimited size for a residence and accommodation within a residence.
- Comments from the work group and B&B owner guest included:
 1. B&Bs should be in an occupied (by either the owner or tenant farmer) residence
 2. Inns should not be allowed, as they require new structures, paid employees, and large expense. There is no clear connection on how they are incidental to an agricultural use, but are a use unto themselves
 3. Tourists are interested in country inns.

4. Rules should allow the conversion of barns or other structures
5. Guest rooms not in a residence should be permitted
6. Lodging should not be allowed in rural areas (“sticks”) unless it is a few rooms in a residence. Lodging with employees sounds like a hotel and it belongs in cities.
7. Rules should encourage the use of existing buildings, not new development
8. Allowing the use of detached (from the residence) structures should only be permitted on farms, not for lodging that is not associated with and secondary to on-site agriculture
9. Rules between B&Bs and Farmstay should be consistent and simple
10. If Inns are allowed, should only be on arterials/designated highways, on large parcels, and close to URL

Report on Signs (Committee #8 Signs) (Roy)

Committee report included the following

- Goal is retaining rural character while supporting a limited number of signs to aid in appropriate information dissemination
- 25 types of exempt signs
- General support for existing ag signs exemption, but should be clarified regarding height (from road, ground)
- Should add an allowance for sign or signs providing organizational membership (eg farm bureau, wine country alliance, central coast grown)
- Addressing lighting from signs, including internal signs, should be addressed to shield night sky
- Recommends changes to temporary sales & event signs
 1. clarify that this includes seasonal crops
 2. change time frame to 15 days prior and 3 days following
- Allow directional signs for all agtourism facilities and events, not just wineries.
 1. Create uniform design
 2. Require on a single post
 3. Allow signs to be 12” x 48”
 4. Color code sign background (eg wineries, lodging, farm sales/direct marketing, ag adventures)

Work group offered following suggestions

- tie sign size to road size/speed, so that faster moving roads would be permitted to have signs that can be viewed by fast-moving traffic
- make sign height be tied to ground height or level of highway, whichever is lower

Presentation: Temp/Special Events – (Committee #3 Events)

No new report presentation was offered, as no changes had been made

Work group member offered the following suggestion relating to nonprofit events

1. Allow nonprofit events to be exempted if the site charges no money for the use
2. Require nonprofit events to meet all requirements of other events if site charges fee for site use

Upcoming schedule:

- Staff meets weekly through July to further develop ideas
- Staff drafts ordinance
- Draft ordinance returns to Work Group for comment and feedback (late Oct/November)