
Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 19

***Wednesday September 29, 2010
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

Meeting Called to Order: By Chair Lloyd at 6:32 p.m.

1. Roll Call

GavPAC Members Present: Baer, Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Feeney, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Kimbell

County Staff Present:

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie Haldeman, Long Range Planning Division Assistant Planner

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

3. Administrative Briefings

Staff: Four public information sessions on the LUDC certification process, per the Board of Supervisors (BOS) request, will be held in the County in the upcoming month. California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff has been invited by the County to attend these sessions, but CCC staff attendance has yet to be confirmed. Noticing of these public information sessions has been conducted through Community Plan Area interested parties email lists, and display ads will likely be run in local newspapers.

4. Meeting Minutes from Meeting No. 17 on September 1, 2010 and Meeting No. 18 on September 15, 2010

Deliberations: The Committee asked that the italicized boilerplate language on the GavPAC agenda be revised to reflect the Committee's new policy on introducing information and documents before a GavPAC meeting.

ACTION: Boise-Cossart moved, seconded by McNabb, and carried by a vote of 7-0, with 3 abstaining due to an absence from Meeting 17 or 18, to approve the minutes without modifications.

5. Visual Resources Planning Deliberations

Deliberation: The GavPAC listed additional items the subcommittee should consider when deliberating about visual resource issues. The visual resources subcommittee will be reporting back to the committee and visual resources issues will be reviewed in the context of the other issue areas. The additional items for the subcommittee to consider include:

- Landscaping and the identification of appropriate landscaping guidelines.
- Compatibility of residential structures with existing home sizes. McKenna requested that Staff provide the results of their research on current home sizes on the Gaviota Coast to the subcommittee.



- Potential Exemption of agricultural structures from visual resource policies or guidelines.
- Size, bulk and scale of development across the Plan Area, regardless of whether it is in the public viewshed or can be seen from Highway 101.
- Adopting thresholds for residential development in the Plan Area that would trigger CBAR review.
- Ways to ensure that building materials are compatible with the existing setting.
- Working within the context of existing County policies, provide clarification and refinement of these policies so that they are tailored for the Plan Area.
- Standards to minimize visual impacts of road grading for access roads and structures.
- Creating separate road grading standards for agricultural and residential roads.
- Creating incentives for utilizing green building practices.
- Looking to the guidelines/process used by the Hollister Ranch design review committee.
- Visual impacts from existing and proposed wind and solar energy projects, water impoundments, the County landfill, and eucalyptus trees.
- That optimal siting of structures is the key to protecting visual resources.
- Obtaining Officially Designated State Scenic Highway status for Highway 101, in coordination with Caltrans.

Public Comment:

Bill Giorgi: Agricultural operations, such as reservoirs, fire breaks, and agricultural employee housing, should be treated separately from residential development, when the subcommittee develops visual resource guidelines.

Chris Shaeffer representing Caltrans: Bob Carr, Caltrans landscape architect, is available to work with the subcommittee on visual resource issues and Caltrans can provide further input on subcommittee and GavPAC efforts.

ACTION: McGinnis moved, seconded by McKenna, to amend the GavPAC Visual Policy Preferences, as presented by Staff, to replace the word “should” with “shall”, and to change the wording of item c) of the Grading & Visibility Preferences, to express that limiting visibility of development would not necessarily take precedence over minimization of grading volume. The Motion failed to pass with a vote of 3-7.

Deliberation: The Committee elicited four volunteers for the visual resources subcommittee. McNabb asked whether a member of the public could be on the subcommittee and Staff responded that the General Planning Advisory Committee (GPAC) guidelines state that subcommittee members must also be a member of the GavPAC). Feeney encouraged the public and people with experience with visual resources to stay involved with the visual resources subcommittee.

ACTION: McNabb moved and Feeney seconded to accept the four volunteers: McGinnis, Boise-Cossart, McKenna, and Lloyd, for the visual resources subcommittee. Motion passed with a vote of 10-0.

7. Discussion of Plan Area Boundary

Deliberation: Staff explained that seven landholdings are bisected by the current Plan Area Boundary (PAB). Staff has identified three of those seven landholdings where “minor” adjustments could be made to the PAB, as directed by the BOS resolution. Those three landholdings identified were: Pueschel, Presbyterian Camp and Conference Centers, Inc (Synod), and Nojoqui Falls Ranch. A draft Gaviota Coast Plan is anticipated to be released in the Spring or Summer of 2011, and any major changes to the PAB



could be packaged with other Gaviota Coast Plan materials going to the BOS for initiation.

Feeney commented that what could be considered a “minor” or “major” PAB change is a matter of semantics. Baer suggested defining the PAB using a singular rule: the watershed boundary, without exceptions, so that the protocol for delineating the PAB is clear and easy to explain to the public. Baer recommended amending the boundary to strictly follow the watershed boundary, such as in the Vista de Las Cruces area. Feeney stated that the boundary issue should be settled now. McNabb is concerned about the PAB splitting existing development envelopes, such as the telecommunications installation on the Young Americas Foundation property. The Committee recognized that adjusting the PAB to an Assessor Parcel Number (APN) boundary, which is not the legal lot boundary, particularly for a parcel internal to a larger landholding, may cause bisecting of parcels in the future, if the legal lots boundaries were determined.

Public Comment:

Bill Giorgi representing Nojoqui Falls Ranch: Submitted mailing addresses for Louise Hansen (Lloyd’s Bank property) and her nephew for Staff’s records. He stated that the agriculture, weather, and topography seven miles inland are quite different from the conditions on the Gaviota Coast. Mr. Giorgi requested that the PAB end at the Gaviota Tunnel and that his family’s landholdings be located outside of the Plan Area.

ACTION: Baer moved, seconded by McKenna, to have the PAB follow the watershed boundary only, and the PAB to be adjusted to follow the watershed boundary where it currently does not. The motion failed to pass by a vote of 4-6

ACTION: Lloyd moved, seconded by Van Leer, to adjust the PAB to strictly follow the watershed boundary, and to make adjustments to the PAB only in areas where the current PAB bisects an existing development envelope or an existing conservation easement development agreement. If the majority of the development envelope is within the Plan Area, then the rules of the Plan Area would apply to the entire development envelope, and if a majority of the development envelope was outside the Plan Area, then the rules of the Plan Area would not apply to that development envelope. The determination of whether or not the rules of the Plan Area applied to a particular development envelope would be determined by a planner once development is proposed on a development envelope that is bisected by the PAB. This motion is made as a first layer recommendation and a guiding principle. The motion failed to pass by a vote of 4-6.

ACTION: Feeney moved, seconded by McNabb, to accept Lloyd’s previously proposed Motion, with an amendment to the motion that would keep the existing PAB as adopted by the BOS, and therefore the PAB would not be adjusted to strictly follow the watershed. The motion passed by a vote of 9-1.

8. Discussion of Long Term Meeting Schedule

Public Comment: None

Deliberation: None

Meeting Adjournment – 9:38 p.m.

