
Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 15

**Wednesday July 21, 2010
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium**

Meeting Called to Order: By Chair Kimbell at 6:35 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Kimbell, Lloyd (arrived after roll at 6:46 pm), McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: McGinnis, Tautrim

County Staff Present:

Vicki Parker, Long Range Planning Division Deputy Director

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Katie London, Long Range Planning Division Planner

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda: None

3. Administrative Briefings

Staff: At the July 13, 2010 Board of Supervisors (BOS) hearing, the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) proposed LUDC modifications item was continued to the upcoming July 27, 2010 hearing. During a meeting with Staff, CCC staff was supportive of some level of changes to the modifications; a summary of which will be available online in the Board staff report for the July 27 hearing.

Committee: The GavPAC inquired as to whether there was any discussion regarding agricultural practices on slopes greater than 30%, and if there was any mention of the subversion of the public process. Chair Kimbell stated that Third District Supervisor Farr has been very supportive of the GavPAC's efforts as it relates to the Coastal Commission's proposed modifications to the LUDC.

Public Comment:

Bill Giorgi: Asked if the details of the meeting between the CCC staff and County Staff will be posted online; and Staff responded that the Board letter for the July 27 hearing will be posted online.

4. Meeting Minutes from Meeting No. 13 on June 21, 2010 and Meeting No. 14 on June 30, 2010

Deliberations: McKenna also requested that Staff record exact wording of a motion and project it on the screen, so that all committee members can be clear on the wording of the motion before voting. McKenna asked that upon request of any committee member that Staff provide details of how each committee member voted on a particular motion. Minutes from Meeting No. 13 were amended on page 2, under the deliberation section, to include Van Leer's questions on "how would existing agricultural practices be treated? Would they grandfathered in, a violation, or non-conforming?" and the question "Whether the County has a right to farm policy". Minutes were amended on page 2, under the



deliberation section, to include McNabb's remark that "residential thresholds should be examined as they relate to existing and future structures".

ACTION: Baer moved, seconded by Boise-Cossart, and carried by a vote of 9-0, to approve the minutes with modifications.

Deliberations: No deliberation on Meeting No. 14 minutes.

ACTION: McKenna moved, seconded by Bowman, and carried by a vote of 7-0, with 2 abstaining (Baer, Feeney), to approve the minutes as presented.

5. Discuss Conceptual Planning Goals for: 1) Land Use, Zoning & Housing, and 2) Visual Resources

Deliberation: The GavPAC modified, added, and deleted items from the list of planning issues for Land Use, Zoning & Housing (LU) and Visual Resource (VIS). Staff recorded modifications to planning issues in real-time, while projecting those modifications onto a large screen visible to all meeting attendees.

A summary of the combination, addition, or removal of planning issues from the planning worksheet is listed below. Other minor changes and comments were made that are not reflected in the minutes.

- LU-1 *Maintain Existing Zoning Density*. Remove truth in zoning as a tension and make planning issue LU-8. Add 'no down-zoning' as a constraint, with the understanding that some 661 consistency rezoning will occur. Add agricultural viability as a tension.
- LU-2 *Allow for Additional Primary Residences for Extended Farm/Ranching Families* was changed to *Consider Additional Primary Residences for Extended Farm/Ranching Families and Farm Workers*. Add enforcement as a tension, add transportation access to parcels with additional dwellings as a tension.
- LU-3 *Consider Clustering of Structures Within Lots*. Add intra-TDR as a planning tool. Add unintended impact on ESHs as a tension. Add landowner resistance as tension, add transition from a rural setting to a semi-rural or urban setting as a tension. Add transportation access to parcels with additional dwellings as a tension.
- LU-4 *Prioritize Preservation of Properties Seaward of Highway 101* was changed to *Consider the Prioritization of Preservation of Properties Seaward of Highway 101*. Add definition of preservation as a tension. Add State Parks, UPRR, & Caltrans as stakeholders.
- LU-5 *Limit Development on Coastal Bluffs* was changed to *Consider Limitation of Development on Coastal Bluffs*.
- LU-6 *Strong Design Review Process & Standards to Guide Optimal Scale and Siting of Development* was changed to *Clear and Well Thought Out Design Review Process & Standards to Guide Optimal Scale and Siting of Development*. Add cost and time constraints or permit process to tensions.
- Add landowners as stakeholder to all issues.
- LU-7 *Appropriate Single-Family Dwelling Size*. Add property tax revenue as a tension. Add transportation access to parcels with additional dwellings as a tension.
- LU-8 *Truth in Zoning* was added as a planning issue.



- LU-9 *Consider Existing Permitted Uses in Different Zones* was added as a planning issue. Add water impoundments for residential use as a tension. Add 'minimize creation of non-conforming uses' as a tension.
- LU-10 *Sustainability* was added as a planning issue.
- LU-11 *Consider Additional Permitted and Conditional Uses as an Incentive for Higher, Long-Term Protection of Land* was added as a planning issue.
- LU-12 *Consider Introduction of New Overlays* was added as a planning issue.
- LU-13 *Review Relevant Existing and Proposed Ordinances* was added as a planning issue.
- VIS-1 *Maintain & Enhance Rural Character* was changed to *Defining and Sustaining Rural Character*. Add definition and variability of rural character as a tension. Add preservation of rural character as related to agricultural buildings as a tension.
- VIS-2 *Review Visual Resources Policies in the Context of the Gaviota Coast* was changed to *Review Existing Visual Resources Policies in the Context of the Gaviota Coast*.
- VIS-3 *Strong Design Review Process & Standards to Guide Optimal Scale and Siting of Development*. Add visual protection and minimizing grading as a tension. Add stakeholder buy-in as a tension.
- VIS-4 *Tailor Private Driveway & Roadway Standards; Tailor Development Design for Fire Management*. Add CalFire as a stakeholder.
- VIS-5 *Appropriate Single-Family Dwelling Size*. Add logic of determining a visual resource as a tension.
- VIS-6 *Limit Development on Coastal Bluffs* was changed to *Consider Limitation of Development on Coastal Bluffs*.
- VIS-7 *Prioritize Preservation of Properties Seaward of Highway 101* was changed to *Consider the Prioritization of Preservation of Properties Seaward of Highway 101*.
- VIS-8 *Removal of Abandoned Utilities. Undergrounding New Utilities Associated with New Large-Scale Alternative Energy Projects*. Add UPRR as a stakeholder.
- VIS-10 *Consider Landscaping and Vegetation Standards* was added as a planning issue. Add State Parks as a stakeholder, add vegetation screening as a tension. Add brush clearing vs. screening as a tension. Add planting native vs. invasive species as a tension. Add Caltrans landscape architects as a stakeholder.

Public Comment:

Bill Giorgi: The County's agricultural viability policies can effectively 'down-zone' land. Land zoned for agriculture can't always be viably used for agriculture. County services are paid through property taxes, allowing for additional large homes would provide more revenue for the County. Screening requirements for agricultural buildings should be less restrictive than they would be for residential structures.

Nathan Alley representing the Environmental Defense Center (EDC): Encourages community-scale renewable energy projects for distributing energy.

Lee Ann French: Water conservation should be a priority when developing sustainability goals. Native plants should be considered over non-native plants when landscaping.

Brian Trautwein representing the EDC: Suggested the GavPAC look to the Goleta Valley PAC for guidance on re-zoning land from agriculture to mountainous. Suggested Staff coordinate a presentation on the proposed waste to energy facility at the landfill for the GavPAC. The GavPAC could also look to



Ventura County's wildlife corridor overlay as an example of a planning tool. The EDC supports expanding the transfer of development rights (TDR) program.

Chris Shaeffer representing Caltrans: For LU-2, LU-3, and LU-4, consider transportation access points and the safety of at-grade crossings at Highway 101 when considering allowing additional housing opportunities in the planning area. Caltrans has landscape architects who can be a stakeholder in this planning process.

Lanny Stableford: Suggested that the GavPAC and County Staff read all ordinances and provisions in State and local law protecting agricultural land use. This information is found in a single document called "Land practices for better management of agriculture".

7. Strategy Discussion for Policy Issue Area Deliberations

Deliberation: The GavPAC acknowledged that in order to guide further deliberation on planning issue areas, it would be helpful to develop 'guiding principles' around which to frame discussion and whereby to keep discussion focused. Staff suggested that a subcommittee be formed to draft such principles and transmit that information to Staff for inclusion in the next meeting packet.

ACTION: Baer, Lloyd, Feeney, and McKenna will prepare a draft of the guiding principles to guide further discussion and deliberation, as a sub-committee, prior to the mailing of the upcoming GavPAC meeting No. 16 packet. Boise-Cossart moved, seconded by McNabb, and carried by a vote of 9-0.

8. Discussion of Long Term Meeting Schedule

Public Comment: None

Deliberation: None

Meeting Adjournment – 8:50 p.m.

