

---

# Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

---

## ***DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 32***

***Wednesday April 27, 2011  
Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium***

**Meeting Called to Order:** By Chair Kim Kimbell at 6:30 p.m.

### **1. Roll Call**

**GavPAC Members Present:** Baer, Boise-Cossart, Bowman, Feeney (arrived after roll at 6:31 p.m.), Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Van Leer

**GavPAC Members Absent:** Tautrim

#### **County Staff Present:**

Glenn Russell, Planning & Development Department Director

Jeff Hunt, Long Range Planning Division Director

David Lackie, Long Range Planning Division Supervising Planner

Brian A. Tetley, Long Range Planning Division Senior Planner

Katie Haldeman, Long Range Planning Division Associate Planner

### **2. Administrative Briefings**

Staff did not have any administrative briefings.

### **3. Public Comment:**

**Brian Trautwein representing the Environmental Defense Center (EDC).** Asked whether land use planning deliberations specific to the Cojo/Jalama Ranches would be on the agenda.

Chair Kimbell replied that deliberations would occur on the ARC overlay, which is only applicable to Cojo/Jalama, but that land use issues pertaining specifically to that property would not be discussed.

### **4. Meeting Minutes from March 30th and April 6th, 2011**

**Deliberation:** Amendments were made to the minutes from March 30<sup>th</sup> to clarify the discussion on Non-Conforming Uses. Minutes from April 6<sup>th</sup> were amended to clarify the role of the County Fire Department implementing State Fire code. The text "Feeney is concerned that avocados would not be able to be planted on steep slopes in resource protection zones" was changed to "Feeney has seen avocados planted on steep slopes".

**Public Comment:** None

**ACTION:** Lloyd moved, seconded by Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 10-0 to approve both sets of meeting minutes with modifications.

### **5-7. Land Use, Zoning, and Housing Planning Deliberations**

**Deliberation:** Staff presented a draft map that identifies areas with characteristics normally associated with the Mountainous (MT) Zone. The GavPAC and members of the public gathered around tables to review and discuss the draft maps. Van Leer inquired



about mapping grazing areas. Staff responded that the mapping technicians did not feel they had the ability to accurately represent active grazing areas on the map, without resorting to a very detailed aerial photo analysis. The map does not include the western portion of the planning area due to time and constraints. McNabb is concerned about parcels with varied topography having a MT overlay, which may not accurately represent some areas on a parcel with level topography.

Staff further clarified the definition of an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN) along with its functionality. The underlying zoning designation for an EDRN would likely be converted from AG-II to AG-I, or some other inner-rural or residential designation to reflect the existing configuration of the parcels within.

**Public Comment:**

**Les Freeman:** Are these Resource Management Zones (RMZ's) or MTs extending into the Coastal Zone?

**Mike Lunsford:** Where does the 40% slope number come from?

**Les Freeman:** Cattle has historically been run from the ridgeline to the ocean in the eastern part of the planning area.

**Brian Trautwein representing the EDC:** What is the effect of overlays or land use designations on Federal Land? To what degree would these overlays restrict brushing?

**Mike Lunsford:** Finds the MT zone to be confusing. Would the overlay allow for appropriate agricultural activities?

**Suzanne Perkins:** Some areas with slopes of 40% or greater could be grazed. The MT-TORO designation does not allow grazing, but that is because Toro Canyon does not have active grazing operations. Do not disallow grazing in Gaviota.

**Mike McGinnis:** Believes in the integration and compatibility of watershed and resource protection values, while supporting agriculture.

**Brian Trautwein representing the EDC:** The Goleta Community Plan included private landholdings in the MT zones. Brushing issues could be addressed in development standards for areas with 40% slopes or greater within the MT zone.

**Mike Lunsford:** Will Ordinance 661 zoning be converted to LUDC zoning?

**Mike Lunsford:** What problem is trying to be solved by applying the EDRN designation and what will this help us prepare for in 20-30 years?

**Carl Steinberg representing Coastal Management Resources, LLC (Cojo/Jalama Ranches):** Gave a short presentation to begin discussion on the Agriculture-Residential Cluster (ARC) Overlay Zone. Gave a general conceptual overview of policy direction which he feels is moving in the right direction to support agriculture with targeted landowner incentives.

**Mike Lunsford:** The ARC overlay is an antiquated policy and it depends on understanding the true development potential of the property. The Bixby family sold entitlements to the Air Force, so before having further deliberations, the GavPAC should understand what is the baseline development potential.

**ACTION:** Feeney moved, seconded by Lloyd, and carried by a vote of 10-0 to direct Staff to consider a land use designation for U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands to clarify that these are not agricultural lands and that they should be considered land for watershed protection.



**ACTION:** McNabb moved, seconded by Baer, and carried by a vote of 10-0 to direct Staff to look at the ramifications of re-zoning existing 661 parcels into LUDC coupled with policies that would clarify that non-conforming parcels as to size have the same benefits as conforming parcels, except as it pertains to land divisions. These issues would be brought back to the GavPAC after land owners with 661-zoned property have been notified of the significance of the pending re-zone.

**ACTION:** Lloyd moved, seconded by Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 10-0 to direct Staff to look at areas that would be appropriate for an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN) designation and an underlying re-zone, and then report back to the GavPAC.

## 8. Visual Resources Subcommittee Report

**Deliberation:** McKenna, Chair of the Visual Resources Subcommittee, gave an overview of the proposed policy language which the Subcommittee had created over the course of 10 meetings. That language was provided to the GavPAC in the information meeting packet and is also available online. Staff presented a draft map of the proposed critical viewshed corridor, which roughly extends south of Highway 101 and north of Highway to the first ridgeline and stops at the Gaviota Tunnel. The Subcommittee stopped the corridor at the Gaviota Tunnel because this was what they perceived the public views as the most scenic and highly traveled part of the planning area.

### Public Comment:

**Les Freeman:** Why was the area west and north of the Gaviota Tunnel left out of the critical viewshed?

**Mike Lunsford:** Was Jalama Rd. purposely left out of the critical viewshed corridor?

**Les Freeman:** What is the definition of a public viewing area and what does it include?

**ACTION:** McKenna moved, seconded by McGinnis, and carried by a vote of 10-0 to accept the Visual Resources Subcommittee recommendations for further refinement by Staff.

## 9. Long-Term GavPAC Meeting Schedule

**Deliberation:** At the next GavPAC meeting, land use, zoning, and housing deliberations will begin with a discussion of the ARC Overlay Zone followed by a discussion on home size.

**Adjournment** – 9:44 p.m.

