#893

INLAND APPEAL FORM

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
976 OSOS STREET • ROOM 200 • SAN LUIS OBISPO • CALIFORNIA 93408 • (805) 781-5600

Promoting the Wise Use of Land • Helping to Build Great Communities

Please Note: An appeal should be filed by an aggrieved person or the applicant at each stage in the process if they are still unsatisfied by the last action.

PROJECT INFORMATION Name: Las Pilitas Resources, LLC File Number: DRC 2009-00025

Type of permit being appealed:
☐ Plot Plan ☐ Site Plan ☐ Minor Use Permit ☒ Development Plan/Conditional Use Permit
☐ Variance ☐ Land Division ☐ Lot Line Adjustment ☒ Other: Reclamation Plan

The decision was made by:
☐ Planning Director (Staff) ☐ Building Official ☐ Planning Department Hearing Officer
☐ Subdivision Review Board ☒ Planning Commission ☐ Other _____

Date the application was acted on: February 5, 2015

The decision is appealed to:
☐ Board of Construction Appeals ☐ Board of Handicapped Access
☐ Planning Commission ☒ Board of Supervisors

BASIS FOR APPEAL
State the basis of the appeal. Clearly state the reasons for the appeal. In the case of a Construction Code Appeal, note specific code name and sections disputed). (Attach additional sheets if necessary)
Please see attached statement

List any conditions that are being appealed and give reasons why you think it should be modified or removed.

Condition Number _____ Reason for appeal (attach additional sheets if necessary)

SLO CNTY PLANNING/BUILDING DEPT 2015 FEB 17 PM 3:51

APPELLANT INFORMATION
Print name: Las Pilitas Resources, LLC
Address: P.O. Box 875, Santa Margarita, CA 93453
Phone Number (daytime): (805) 610-7186

We have completed this form accurately and declare all statements made here are true.

Signature _____ Date 2-17-15

OFFICE USE ONLY
Date Received: 2/17/15 By: [illegible]
Amount Paid: $850.00 Receipt No. (if applicable): _____

Attachment to Inland Appeal Form
Las Pilitas Resources, LLC; DRC2009-00025
Basis For Appeal

The Denial Findings adopted by the Planning Commission are not supported by substantial evidence, and in fact are contradicted in many cases by the evidence in the record. Many of the findings amount to unsubstantiated conjecture, and are based on inaccuracies and misunderstandings about the project that were presented by Staff and others. In addition, the Planning Commission erred by not considering the importance of this aggregate resource to the region as a whole as required by state law, as well as other considerations that are specific to mineral resources and which alter the traditional CUP findings for projects such as this.

Further details regarding each of these points will be submitted directly to the Supervisors for their consideration in the course of this appeal.