
Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 16

Monday August 9, 2010
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium

Meeting Called to Order: By Chair Kimbell at 6:33 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Bowman, Feeney, Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Baer, Boise-Cossart

County Staff Present:

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie London, Long Range Planning Division Planner

2. Public Comment for Items not on the Agenda:

Les Freeman: Will anyone on the GavPAC be giving public comment at the upcoming California Coastal Commission (CCC) hearing in San Luis Obispo?

3. Administrative Briefings

Staff: Santa Barbara County's Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) will go before the CCC for certification at a hearing this Thursday August 12, 2010. Staff provided the GavPAC with the Board of Supervisors' (BOS) comment letter to the CCC dated August 3, 2010. The letter outlines those proposed modifications to the LUDC which the BOS can accept and those on which the BOS cannot come to a consensus. The BOS will ask the CCC for a continuance until the November hearing to allow time for public workshops.

Committee: Chair Kimbell represented the GavPAC at the last BOS hearing on the LUDC suggested modifications. Since the Chair is authorized to represent the GavPAC at hearings, Chair Kimbell will also represent the GavPAC at the upcoming CCC hearing. He will submit a copy of the GavPAC's June 24, 2010 letter to the BOS regarding the proposed LUDC modifications to the CCC before their upcoming hearing. The committee continues to be concerned about the lack of public process and limited amount of review for the proposed LUDC modifications.

4. Meeting Minutes from Meeting No. 15 on July 21, 2010

Deliberations: The GavPAC requested that the roll call be amended to accurately reflect who was in attendance at the meeting. McNabb's remark on page 2 was changed from "residential thresholds should be examined. . ." to "all thresholds should be examined . . .". Nathan Alley's comment on page 3 was changed from "Encourages community-scale renewable energy projects for distributing energy . . ." to "Encourages community-scale renewable energy projects for distributed energy."

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



5. Discussion of Planning Area Boundary

Deliberation: The BOS has authorized the GavPAC to make minor adjustments to the plan area boundary. The GavPAC can only suggest major boundary adjustments to the BOS, but is not authorized to make major changes. Tautrim remarked that it is important for a landowner to know what the GavPAC's goals and principles are before they make a decision about whether or not to be in the plan area. Chair Kimbell clarified that the intent of Staff is to move the plan area boundary discussion to the end of the deliberative phase so that landowners can have a better idea of the policies that would be applied within the plan area. McKenna commented that not all landowners have the ability to exclude themselves from the plan area, even though more landowners might like that opportunity.

Feeney remarked about the ability of people to know exactly where the plan area boundary is if the boundary traverses their property. He recognized six landholdings that are currently split by the plan boundary where the Committee could make minor adjustments to the boundary. The six landholdings are 1) Rancho San Julian, 2) Las Cruces Ranch 3) Nojoqui Falls Ranch 4) Rancho Dos Vistas 5) Young America's Foundation 6) Synod of Southern California. McNabb concurred with Feeney's suggestion of making minor boundary adjustments for those six landholders and she stated that Louise Hansen's ranch of approximately 10,000 acres, is distinct from the rest of the plan area and stretches inland significantly farther than the rest of the plan area boundary. Van Leer suggested making the minor modifications to the boundary now, and discuss any major changes at the end of the deliberative phase. McGinnis wants to see the principles that were used for determining the plan boundary along with an aerial map showing property boundaries so as to have a better understanding of the topography as it relates to landholdings and the plan area boundary. The committee acknowledged that including the Gaviota Creek watershed has resulted in a plan boundary that 'bulbs out' from the coastline, beyond the ridgeline.

Staff will send a staff report in addition to postcard notices to the nine individual landowners with parcels split by the plan boundary prior to the next GavPAC meeting to discuss potential minor boundary adjustments.

Public Comment:

Bill Giorgi: Submitted a letter to the GavPAC for the administrative record. He does not want his landholdings to be included in the plan area, regardless of the outcome of the deliberative phase of this process. He believes it is a misnomer to call the plan the "Gaviota Coast" Plan, when the plan boundary extends up to seven miles inland from the actual Gaviota coastline. Additionally, he remarked that the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan did not get approved until the planning area was greatly reduced in size.

Tilden Claursen representing Ms. Parsons: Stated that Ms. Parsons wants her land to be excluded from the plan area, regardless of the outcome of the deliberative phase of the planning process.

Greg Hackenfall: Believes it is a misnomer to call the plan the "Gaviota Coast" Plan, when the plan boundary extends up to seven miles inland from the actual coastline. He is also concerned about the effectiveness of the County's outreach and notification procedures for GavPAC meetings and requested that Staff provide additional information via mail to certain landowners in the planning area.

Marget Mang: Cannot see the Gaviota coastline from her house, therefore does not feel her property should be included in this Gaviota Coast planning process, as the term "coast" in the plan name is misleading.

Ben Williamson: Wants the coastline preserved and an open and transparent process for developing this plan.



MOTION: The GavPAC will reagendaize this item for Meeting 18 or 19 and Staff will provide higher resolution images of landholdings, which may be considered minor boundary adjustments.

ACTION: Lloyd moved, seconded by Bowman, and carried by a vote of 9-0, to approve the motion.

6. Discussion of Guiding Principles and Subcommittee Report

Deliberation: The following changes were made to the draft goals and guiding principles:

- **Goal 3** – *Promote the continuation, economic viability, and environmental sustainability of agricultural land use* was changed to *Promote the sustainability and economic viability of agricultural land use.*
- **Goal 6** – *Develop productive, flexible land use policies and tools that integrate the interests and values of property owners with the ecological and agricultural integrity of the land* was changed to *Develop a range of productive, flexible land use policies and tools that integrate the interests and values of property owners with the ecological and agricultural integrity of the land*

MOTION: Accept draft core goals and principles with minor adjustments. Draft goals and principles are non-binding and do not include the example policies proposed for each goal.

ACTION: McKenna moved, seconded by Bowman, and carried by a vote of 9-0, to approve the motion.

7. Discussion of Long Term Meeting Schedule

Deliberation: Staff will send additional postcards or letters, on an approximately quarterly basis for milestone events (workshops, beginning deliberation phase, etc). Noticing will include information about the five planning issue areas under deliberation (Public Recreation, Keeping Agriculture on the Land, etc).

Public Comment:

Mark Chaconas: Will Staff be mailing additional letters to the public for upcoming meetings?

Meeting Adjournment – 8:45 p.m.

