

GHWAY  
CAPACITY  
ONT.)

public access and to ensure that necessary public services-in this case, roads, are adequate to serve the increased level of development (Sections 30001.3(c) and 30250). As conditioned to limit the highway capacity, reservation to only the visitor serving uses and then only for 10 years, the Agreement will be consistent with Coastal Act and LUP requirements (see Addendum).

In response to the other three highway capacity policies, the EIR prepared for the Development Agreement and incorporated in it by reference (Sec. 1.04(a) pg. 12), includes a section on traffic and circulation (pgs. 76-87, Revisions to Traffic Analysis, Attachment B of the Final EIR, pages A-76 to A-81). The traffic discussion indicates that the developer of the hotel will participate in a plan to improve public transit as required by LUP Policy 4.1.2.5 (pg. 85, EIR). The EIR does not analyze the impact of the residential development on the allocation requirements of Policy 4.1.3.c.1. pg. 62, which limits residential use of the Highway to 15% of its capacity although this would be more appropriate to consider at the time development proposals are submitted.

#### 4. AGRICULTURE

The El Sur Ranch currently supports a significant cattle operation. This agricultural operation relies on local water sources to irrigate pasture and water stock. The Development Agreement provides for a substantial increase in non-agricultural development on the ranch. While this new development has been sited to avoid adverse impacts on the agricultural operation, it will rely on the same water source. The issue therefore, is whether or not there is sufficient water onsite to maintain the existing agricultural operation and serve all of the proposed development.

VELOPMENT  
Y HAVE  
VERSE  
FACTS ON  
RICATION

The Coastal Act (Section 30241 & 30242) requires that agriculture be protected. The Big Sur Coast LUP reflects these requirements, particularly in Section 3.6 which contains specific policies on agricultural preservation. The Development Agreement does not address the specific issue outlined above, nor the broader issue of continuing agricultural protection in any detailed manner. Only conclusionary remarks to the effect that agriculture will be supported and protected because of the definition of public recreational sites is given in the Agreement (pg. 4 & 5, 1.01(a) (1)). The EIR prepared for the project does not clearly estimate the demand for potable water generated by the proposed development nor does it analyze the impact of drawing off this water on the agricultural use (EIR pgs. 94-96). Without this information, the impact on agriculture cannot be assessed.

The LUP, however, contains a policy (3.6.2.5, pg. 33) which requires the submission of a comprehensive Agricultural Management Plan at the time development of large ranches is proposed. One of the issues to be dealt with in an agricultural management plan for the El Sur Ranch would be the analysis of the water situation vis-a-vis development and agriculture. As conditioned to require that the impacts on agriculture be addressed at the time of the first development proposal, the Agreement is consistent with Coastal Act and LUP requirements. (Page 4, revised agreement).

Ca. Coastal Com Permit #3-85-12 El Sur Ranch Dev. Agreement  
Summary of Findings - March 12, 1985