
Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 33

***Wednesday May 11, 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 (arrived after roll at 6:31 p.m.), Bowman, Feeney, Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis(arrived after roll at 6:31 p.m.), McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim, Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: None

County Staff Present:

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

Chair Kimbell stated that Hollister Ranch is having a BBQ a week from Saturday to which Staff is invited. Staff suggested the GavPAC could incorporate a BBQ or some type of social function into the last GavPAC meeting prior to the summer break. McNabb inquired about the purpose of the recent postcard mailing, and Staff responded that the mailing was a general notice affording the public notice of the upcoming meetings and that a more detailed noticing effort will be done prior to further discussion regarding consistency re-zoning.

3. Public Comment:

Les Freeman: Acknowledged the GavPAC for their dedication and hard work on this planning process.

4. Meeting Minutes from April 27th, 2011

Deliberation: Regarding Item No. 4, Chair Kimbell requested that amendments to the minutes be described in a more expansive manner. In particular, clarify that the changes to the minutes include a statement that directs Staff to develop a policy that would make it clear that legal lots, despite being nonconforming in size, are conforming for all purposes under County Ordinances, except for land division manners. Van Leer requested that the GavPAC's direction to the Agriculture Subcommittee to discuss brushing on slopes 40 percent or greater and the potential application of the Resource Management Zone be reflected in the minutes.

The Committee agreed that the minutes should reflect discussion in chronological order, rather than the order listed on that meeting's agenda. McGinnis requested that the minutes reflect her request to Staff for the avigation easement language for the Cojo-Jalama Ranches.

Public Comment: None



ACTION: Boise-Cossart moved, seconded by Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 11-0 to approve the minutes with modifications.

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

Agriculture-Residential Cluster (ARC) Overlay Zone Discussion

Staff Presentation: Staff presented a history and overview of the Agriculture-Residential (ARC) Overlay Zone. The ARC is a nearly 30-year old tool, applicable only to the Cojo-Jalama Ranches, that was adopted prior to the County developing environmental thresholds for subdivision of agricultural lands. The likelihood of widespread subdivision of this property is greatly reduced with these environmental thresholds in place. The ARC tool allows for residential development on two percent of the gross acreage of landholdings and has provisions to set aside one percent of the gross acreage for public access.

Public Comment:

Susan Petrovich: The ARC is a tool that we should keep in the tool kit, but we should be looking at it as a flexible planning tool.

Eva Turenchalk: Not sure about supporting a 30-year old overlay that only applies to one landowner. We should try to incentivise the types of development we want to see through a “carrot” approach.

Anne Coates: Believes this is an opportunity to explore and implement incentives for agricultural land preservation. The Resource Conservation District (RCD) has the ability to hold easements.

Lee Ann French: Is not sure why we want to keep this ordinance on the books. We should scale this opportunity so that it can be taken advantage of by different landowners.

Mike Lunsford: Is concerned about the age of the ARC Overlay and does not think this Overlay takes us in the direction we want to be going regarding residential density and the associated infrastructure.

Carl Steinberg: Thinks the previous comments are appropriate. A coordinated Resource Management Plan between property owners would be more difficult for agricultural areas without some sort of overlay.

Deliberation: McNabb asked for clarification regarding the “North Planning Area” as described in the ARC Overlay. Staff explained that the North Planning Area is a descriptor that refers to the Gaviota Coast north of Point Conception. Also, the ARC Overlay only applies to the Coastal Zone and is therefore not applicable to the Hansen property. Tautrim wants more clarity on the development potential for existing parcels on Cojo-Jalama. Tautrim believes an Overlay such as the ARC would not be written as it stands if it were written today. Van Leer stated that the Cojo-Jalama Ranches are a unique property and therefore deserve a specific overlay or planning tools. He supports the clustering concept. McGinnis is concerned about impacts of increased traffic on Jalama Rd. with the residential densities afforded by the ARC Overlay. McGinnis made a motion to completely eliminate the ARC Overlay. Baer’s main concern with the Overlay is the overall increase in residential development potential.

McKenna objects to Lloyd deliberating and voting on the ARC issue because he is an agent/consultant for the landowner to which the ARC applies. Lloyd did not interpret County Counsel’s opinion in the same manner as McKenna, and was under the impression that if someone had direct financial interest in a property and sat on a decision making body, then that person would have a conflict of interest. Lloyd stated that the GavPAC was only a recommending body to the Board of Supervisors. Bowman



believes the ARC could be a springboard or tool for further policy development and therefore the ARC should stay in place for now. Chair Kimbell thinks the GavPAC should come up with planning area-wide incentives, rather than something which only applies to a single landowner.

ACTION: McGinnis moved, seconded by McKenna, and carried by a vote of 10-0, with Lloyd abstaining, to table further consideration of the ARC Overlay Zone until the GavPAC has completed the discussion of land use issues and any other related incentives that would apply throughout the planning area.

House Size Discussion

Staff presentation: Staff presented information to provide context on the house size discussion. The GavPAC and the public have identified long term land use issues associated with residence size, therefore Staff put together data on existing home sizes in the planning area and on home sizes for pending residential projects which have yet to be constructed. Issues regarding visual resources have been raised, particularly in regards to compatibility with the community and existing development. Under the Williamson Act, landowners are limited to one residence per contract, however with the 2007 updates to the Uniform Rules, up to three residences are allowed per contract if each residence is located on a separate parcel of at least 100 acres. Currently the only dwelling size limits are on guest homes (800 square feet) and residential second units (RSUs) (1,200 square feet), however RSUs are not allowed in the AG-II zone. The Coastal Commission's proposed modifications to the LUDC would have required a CDP-H for homes over 5,000 square feet, however a majority of the land, including the Hollister and Cojo-Jalama Ranches, in the Coastal Zone in the planning area is also in the CCC's appeals jurisdiction, therefore this additional requirement would only apply to some areas north of Highway 101 and east of the Gaviota tunnel.

Public Comment:

Anne Coates: Spent 4 years with the Hollister Ranch design committee and they ultimately determined that numerical size limits do not work.

Susan Petrovich: Has been speaking for the agricultural community for the last 35 years. Home size rules can come back to blow up in your face. We should not be nit picking how people conduct their lifestyle or encourage people to break the law by setting up additional restrictions without permits.

Eva Trenchalk: Stay away from getting hung up on a home size number. In a similar example of size restrictions, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) did an education program demonstrating how height limits do not work in an attempt to prevent the City of Santa Barbara's Measure B (building height limit) from passing.

Andy Mills: Homes need to be subordinate to their environment.

Mike Lunsford: The Gaviota Coast Conservancy (GCC) has worked with the issue of home size for some time and has tried to come up with a decent and fair rationale for size limitations. Numerical size limits are not workable. The trend on the Gaviota Coast is for people to come in and build big homes. Perhaps some incentives or limitations could be introduced, such as foregoing the right to a guest house or allowance for additional home size if the home is blended with the environment.

Lee Ann French: Perhaps landowners could receive some benefit if they plan to build a home below the average home size.

Deliberation: McKenna proposed a cap of approximately two times the median home size, or about 5,000 square feet, which could be considered a community standard.



Feeney wants to hear from the members of the community regarding the home size issue. He supports a system of review and guidelines for development that would not allow for an additional Ballantyne-type project. McGinnis suggested a home size limit would give the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) additional strength during project review. Although Tautrim said he does not necessarily support a cap in home size, a cap may prevent land owners who are incompatible with the rural lifestyle. McNabb is worried about additional nonconforming use issues if existing homes would be larger than a home size limit. Lloyd reminded the Committee that the County now counts square footage as area under trellises, porches, decks, etc.

Public Comment:

Seymour Fletcher: Owns a 30-acre parcel on lower Refugio Road, and his home cannot be seen from the road, although it is close to the road. He believes a good design can hide the visibility and noticeability of a home.

Eva Turenchalk: Square footage is not the best metric for a tiered system.

Les Freeman: House styles are varied and diverse along the Gaviota Coast, and you should not tell people what kind of homes they can build.

Anne Coates: Inquired about limitation on agricultural structures.

Seymour Fletcher: Has solar electric system on his home which has reduced his energy bill by 90 percent.

Anne Coates: there is not much of a review at the permit counter

Deliberation: McGinnis believes the home size issue will come up again when the Plan goes for certification by the CCC. McGinnis wants to give planners the tools to be able to do an elevated level of review for some projects. Lloyd recognizes the work of the visual resources subcommittee, and believes its principles would prevent an additional Ballantyne project. Lloyd is concerned about putting applicants through a more costly review process. Feeney wants more public exposure for permitting of projects having an elevated review.

ACTION: Lloyd moved, seconded by Van Leer and carried by a vote of 11-0 to direct Staff to develop policy approaches that follows the Gaviota Coast Residential Size Outline from May 5, 2011, with the exceptions of items No. 2, 3, and 4, of the outline. Item No. 5 of the outline would be amended to read "A tiered system of enhanced standards and elevated level of review designed to reduce the impacts of a large size residence to those of a median size residence (e.g., LEED energy standards, habitat restoration, siting out of the viewshed, recording an Agricultural Conservation Easement).

8. Long-Term GavPAC Meeting Schedule

Deliberation: The Wednesday June 8th meeting has been reschedule to Tuesday June 7th, as Vista de Las Cruces School is not available on the 8th due to graduation activities. Regarding the Gaviota Marine Terminal site, Staff is continuing to work with Energy Division Staff to get more information from the property owner, and this item will likely not be on the agenda for the next meeting. Staff has scheduled back to back weeks of meetings in June to keep the Committee on schedule. Further discussion on 661 consistency rezoning will be agendized for a future GavPAC meeting and affected property owners will be noticed well in advance of the meeting. Feeney asked if Staff will be engaging the appropriate stakeholders for the upcoming deliberations on recreation and trails. Staff responded in the affirmative.

Adjournment – 8:54 p.m.



