The voice of our community

MONTECITO ASSOCIATION

Permitting amendments comparison

Inland Montecito | Updated October 30, 2026

MPC's inland recommendations go directly to the Board of Supervisors. CPC has no formal action on the Montecito inland code.

October 28 CPC vote: 4–0. Inland MPC recommendations still go directly to BOS; CPC requested a consistent home exemption across Montecito.

Issue	Existing ordinance	Proposed staff changes	MA requests	MPC recommendation October 19, 2026	CPC recommendation / relevance October 28, 2026
Residential size, bulk, scale and height	Guidelines and applicable code standards guide review. Not all are interchangeable with binding floor-area limits.	Staff's streamlining proposal did not incorporate MA's requested lot-based floor-area schedules.	Codify lot-based residence/accessory floor-area standards and hillside protections. Accompanying proposal: 25 feet/two stories, with MBAR compatibility findings for exceptions up to 35 feet.	No explicit adoption identified in supplied recommendation summary.	No formal CPC action on inland Montecito code. MA's lot-based standards were not added to CPC's package; the countywide 0.35 FAR design-review trigger does not apply to Montecito.
Architectural review for homes	New and remodeled homes generally require MBAR review, subject to existing exemptions.	Exempt single-story dwellings up to 2,500 sq. ft.	Limit exemption to 2,000 sq. ft. aggregate, 14 feet high, and one story, with historic-resource exceptions.	Retain architectural review for new and remodeled dwellings.	CPC REQUEST TO BOS: Apply the up-to-2,500-sq.-ft. qualifying single-story home exemption throughout Montecito for consistency. This differs from MPC. CPC did not amend the inland code; MPC's recommendation goes directly to BOS.
Residential planning permits Notice and appeals	LUPs generally require notice and are appealable.	Qualifying projects receive a Zoning Clearance. Other qualifying residential projects receive a non-appealable LUP, removing associated planning notice/appeals.	Notice for all projects requiring an LUP. Retain appeals. Hear minor-project appeals at MBAR or MPC, rather than BOS, as appropriate.	Supported streamlined/non-appealable planning-permit approach, relying on retained architectural review for community participation.	No formal CPC action on inland Montecito code. CPC's countywide recommendation supports non-appealable permits with mailed informational planning-permit notice. Park joined the 4–0 vote. This does not change MPC's inland recommendation.
Commercial height, FAR and site coverage Inland	VERIFY CURRENT CODE: Exact requirements need checking by zone, including earlier Phase 2 amendments.	Separate already-adopted Phase 2 development-standard changes from pending Phase 3 review changes.	CN/CV height: 25 feet/two stories. CN FAR: 0.25. CV FAR: 0.10. Site coverage: 30%.	No separate adoption of these numerical standards identified in supplied summary.	No formal CPC action on inland Montecito code. No separate recommendation adopting MA's numerical commercial standards was identified.
Nonresidential additions Design review	Generally require review, subject to existing exemptions.	10% allowance, minimum allowance of 500 sq. ft., maximum of 5,000 sq. ft.	Maximum 500 sq. ft.	Maximum 1,000 sq. ft., retaining percentage/minimum framework.	NO FORMAL CPC ACTION: MPC's inland recommendation goes directly to the Board of Supervisors.
Taller walls and gate posts Coastal and inland	CUP requirements apply above specified heights and in specified locations.	Move specified taller fences/walls and gate posts from CUP to LUP review.	Retain MBAR review when downshifted. Walls over 8 feet and gate posts over 10 feet: CUP plus MBAR review.	No separate modification identified in supplied recommendation summary.	No formal CPC action on inland Montecito code. CPC supported staff's countywide downshift; no separate adoption of MA's additional thresholds was identified.
Detached accessory structures Design review	Existing conditional exemption up to 500 sq. ft., as described by staff.	Expand to under 800 sq. ft., with location conditions.	Maximum 500 sq. ft. and 12 feet high.	Under 500 sq. ft., required location, and matching architectural style, materials, and colors.	NO FORMAL CPC ACTION: MPC's inland recommendation goes directly to the Board of Supervisors.

Minor residential additions	MBAR review generally applies unless exempt.	Exempt matching single-story additions up to 10% or 500 sq. ft., whichever is less.	No separate addition threshold specified. Retain notice and appeals.	Accept limited exemption, excluding designated, listed, or eligible historic resources.	No formal CPC action on inland Montecito code. CPC ultimately supported broader historic-resource protection for coastal Montecito; MPC's inland recommendation remains separate.
Pools and pool equipment Planning permits	Pools require an LUP. Standalone pools generally do not require design review.	Exempt qualifying pools and equipment from planning permits. Other applicable permits remain.	Retain planning permits, as stated in MA public comments.	Retain planning permits.	NO FORMAL CPC ACTION: MPC's inland recommendation goes directly to the Board of Supervisors.
CN/CV commercial development Permit threshold	Development Plans required for all structures.	Under 5,000 sq. ft.: Zoning Clearance. 5,000–under 10,000: LUP. 10,000 or more: Development Plan.	Preserve appropriate commercial oversight. No substitute Development Plan threshold specified.	Up to 2,500 sq. ft.: LUP. Above 2,500: Development Plan.	NO FORMAL CPC ACTION: MPC's inland recommendation goes directly to the Board of Supervisors.
Commercial Development Plans Decision-maker	MPC is the review authority identified in the County presentation.	CN: Director decides Development Plans 15,000 sq. ft. or less. MPC decides larger projects. CV remains with MPC.	Preserve meaningful Commission oversight. No numerical delegation threshold specified.	CN: limit Director review to 5,000 sq. ft. or less. CV remains with MPC.	NO FORMAL CPC ACTION: MPC's inland recommendation goes directly to the Board of Supervisors. Countywide commercial delegation discussion is not a substitute for this Montecito-specific recommendation.