



Notice of Public Meeting

Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee (GavPAC) Meeting No. 39

Note: This agenda lists discussion topics for the GavPAC meetings on:

Tuesday, July 19, 2011 – 6:30 p.m.

Attendees: GavPAC Members, County Staff, and Public Participants
Please review: Meeting Materials Packet for Meeting on 07/19/11
Please bring: Meeting Materials Packet for Meeting on 07/19/11
Location: Vista de Las Cruces School - Auditorium, 9467 San Julian Rd, Gaviota, CA 93117

Agenda Item	Discussion Topics
CALL TO ORDER	
1	Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call
2	Public Comment <i>The Public Comment period is set aside to allow public testimony on items not on today's agenda. The time allocated to each speaker will be set at the discretion of the Chair.</i>
3	Administrative Briefings <i>Staff updates regarding local or other legislative activities, local planning decisions, or other updates of interest to the Committee.</i>
4	Meeting #37 Minutes Review and Approval
5	Discussion of Policy Direction Summary
6	Discussion of Gaviota Terminal Company Property and Landowner Presentation
7	Discussion of Long-Term Meeting Schedule
Adjourn	

Questions or comments about the Gaviota Coast Plan may be directed to Brian A. Tetley at 805-884-6848 or btetley@co.santa-barbara.ca.us and further information may be obtained on the following web site: <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/gaviota/gaviota.php>

Writings that are a public record under Government Code § 54957.5(a) and that relate to an agenda item of a regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee that are distributed to a majority of all of the members of the Planning Advisory Committee less than 72 hours prior to that meeting shall be available for public inspection at Santa Barbara County Planning & Development Department, 123 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA, and also on the County's website at <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/>

Attendance and participation by the public is invited and encouraged. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Hearing Support Staff (805) 568-2000. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Hearing Support Staff to make reasonable accommodations.

ATTACHMENT 1

Gaviota Coast Planning Advisory Committee

REVISED DRAFT MEETING MINUTES MEETING No. 37

**Wednesday June 29, 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, Kimbell, Lloyd, McGinnis, McKenna, McNabb, Tautrim (arrived at 6:40 p.m.), Van Leer

GavPAC Members Absent: Feeney

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

Bret McNulty, Long Range Planning, Planner

2. Administrative Briefings:

Brian Tetley informed the GavPAC that he would be making a presentation to the Central Board of Architectural Review (CBAR) on July 8th to update them on the work of the Visual Sub-Committee regarding the visual principles and draft policy defining critical view shed. Tetley announced staff changes with Katie Haldeman leaving the County and expressed regret at her leaving and gratitude for Haldeman's good work as a member of the project team. Tetley introduced Bret McNulty an experienced planner in Long Range Planning who is joining the project team. He noted McNulty recently worked on the recently completed Los Alamos Community Plan. Chair Kimbell thanked Haldeman on behalf of the GavPAC for her good work and for keeping the PAC organized.

ACTION: Kimbell moved to commend Haldeman for her for work with the GavPAC and wish her the best in her next endeavors, seconded by Boise-Cossart and Van Leer, and carried by a vote of 10-0, Tautrim absent.

3. Public Comment:

None

4. Meeting Minutes Review and Approval

The GavPAC reviewed the minutes from Meeting No. 35 on June 7th, 2011 and Meeting No. 36 on June 15, 2011.

ACTION: Feeney moved to approve the Meeting No. 35 minutes with modifications, seconded by Baer, approved 10-0, Bowman abstained.

ACTION: McGinnis moved to approve the Meeting No. 36 minutes with modifications, seconded by Bowman approved 10-0, Feeney abstained.

The Meeting No.34 minutes with modifications will be reviewed during the next meeting.



5. Agricultural Subcommittee Report

Van Leer briefed the GavPAC on the process by which the committee determined the list of activities that would be recommended as appropriate for exemption. He clarified for the record that the list of activities is not the sole list of allowed uses and that all currently exempt and allowed uses remain. The committee's list of activities were developed using the guiding principle of what is appropriate for the Gaviota Coast and currently have no exemption, are currently either not permitted, or have onerous permitting requirements deterring people from applying. The problem is that there is no scalability in the current process. These activities are not at an industrial scale and that no opportunity for start-up business. Scalability became another guiding principal and the committee focused on exemptions and added some additional standards in the permit tiers. The GavPAC reviewed each of the use categories and deliberated and asked questions the uses in each beginning with Outdoor Recreation.

Deliberation:

Outdoor Recreation: McNabb inquired about the intent for wastewater treatment for campgrounds and Walker responded that the intent was not to provide exempt uses that would require waste discharge on the property, portable waste discharge would be allowed. McNabb asked whether horseback riding would be rental or owned and Van Leer answered that it was not defined. Feeney asked how limits on vehicle trips would be monitored. McGinnis responded monitoring would be through neighbor complaints. Tautrim described the purpose of the exemptions to address what is currently broken with the system, he discussed how you can grow agricultural products, but product preparation is not allowed. He described how they tried to identify thresholds under which non-agricultural production activities would not have an impact on agricultural production and at what intensity these activities would have an impact. The discussion should focus on about the thresholds and zoning enforcement should be a separate discussion. He detailed how some non-agricultural endeavors are being proposed, as long as they remain under the thresholds which would trigger a permit and significantly increased costs and discussed how to assess the merits of the threshold. Tiering ensures that more intense uses would require a permit and receive the proper environmental review. McGinnis reiterated that the committee focuses on exemptions and not permits. Van Leer stated that the tiers were developed with visual principals in mind. Baer noted that some of these activities are already occurring on properties around the County without permits and not causing issues and they should be exempted. Boise-Cossart expressed concerns that if all properties were allowed to take advantage of the exemption for overnight camping how that would look and what problem is being addressed. She also wanted to know if that was the intent. Van Leer responded that there is a shortage of campsites and the thresholds would keep the scale small. McGinnis noted that the committee struggled with the size issue and solicited input from the PAC on the topic. Bowman pointed out you could have 15 sites and two cars that add up to 30 cars and only 10 trips allowed. The math does not add up. Baer noted that bicycle campers were part of the consideration and that staff was going to refine the description. Lackie noted that trips starting point to express the scalability and it would be more appropriate to use sites and not trips. McGinnis noted that the 10 trips in this category were not to be included. McKenna noted that vehicle trips are not a good measure and that each use should be considered. Baer and Van Leer solicited input from the PAC regarding the metrics that should be used, noting that trips or number of employees were some of the items they identified.

Public Comment:

Susan Petrovich: Suggested that the title of the Permit Scalability document be clarified that it applies to "Agriculturally Zoned" land. She recommended clarifying in



Fishing between commercial and “just inviting a friend over.” In Campgrounds, why no tier one. If its tent camping, why are you locating outside the critical view shed. She recommends adding a new category of Fire and under number 5 clarify that plumbing is necessary for sanitation.

Mike Lundsford: He expressed concerns that new commercial uses are not demonstrated to be necessary and believes that the discussion jumps ahead of the conclusions that the uses are necessary in the first place. He inquired what baseline, economic or otherwise of what is going on now. He noted the process was started to look at how to protect the coast. He noted that there is no inventory or vision statement showing where we are going. He stated if the PAC adopts the changes to the County, they would go countywide. He noted there is no basis to jump into processing and tourism.

Susanne Perkins: She noted that the purpose is to provide supplemental income to support struggling agricultural and ranch uses. She believes that overnight stays are a great supplemental use as long as there is a low threshold to keep impacts low.

Bill Georgi, Nojoqui Falls Ranch: He was unwillingly drug into the coastal plan process. He would like to have vehicle trips analyzed, for example on Jalama Road you have large number of vehicles that impact adjacent uses. Their ranch is experiencing impacts from traffic on Nojoqui Falls Road with vehicles crossing the property. He supports allowing additional uses on agricultural land and provided examples. He also expressed support for RVs since they are self contained, have sanitation onboard and would have fewer impacts.

Bob Field: Discussed how the winery ordinance was the first in the county that added non-agricultural commercial uses to agricultural zoning. He discussed direction from the Board of Supervisors to planning as a number one priority to work on the winery ordinance. He is concerned about adding non-agricultural commercial uses without an adequate monitoring mechanism to keep them under control and provided examples of a winery in Santa Ynez that holds events without County oversight that they meet the permitted number of events. He noted that trust based systems will not work, and provided an example of winery representatives not being forthcoming regarding the number of events they are holding. Events are not being monitored by the County. He disagrees that scaling will address the issues and believes that monitoring, enforcement and a meaningful penalty are required.

Subcommittee Responses: Baer responded to Susan Petrovich’s comment noting that the issue of Fire Department review for fire code consistency is addressed in the footnotes. Van Leer responded to Mike Lundsford by noting that most of the activities three are agricultural related and the rest that benefit agricultural uses and are very much needed. For farm stands they are following the state guidelines which have clear standards to follow. Anyone who tries to go beyond the requirements would be required to get a permit. They are also trying to get more visitors to the farms to give tours so people understand what they do. As for non-agricultural uses, he provided examples of how the exemptions incorporate thresholds and detailed how in some instances, such as guest ranches, they did not allow an exemption and went right to a permit. He noted that he welcomes comments. Kimball emphasized that the actions are necessary to help assist agricultural viability by providing for supplemental income.

Public Comment:

Mike Lundsford: Reiterated his concerns that the decisions be fact-based.

Les Freeman: Noted that no one is making money in agriculture on the coast.



Subcommittee Responses/Deliberation: McGinnis asked for further input on campgrounds noting the intent is to provide additional opportunities, and avoid unintended impacts. Bowman described the challenges of operating a campground within the rules and the time spent monitoring guests is a significant issue. She believes additional discussion is warranted and that control and monitoring issues need to be addressed for the sake of the rancher. Tautrim noted that it is not an easy thing to do. These are intended to be back country, low-impact sites. These issues can be addressed in the purpose and intent. He does not want a land owner to be breaking the law accommodating a request from the Boy Scouts to use their land for camping. He noted that most of these uses are currently allowed with a permit. He also responded to Bob Field noted he believes enforcement is important, but that this discussion is not focus on enforcement. Currently, the system is complaint driven and can be improved. McGinnis, responded to Susan Petrovich, that there were no exemptions in Small Scale Guest Ranch category because there were too many considerations and that small scale camping was not allowed in the view shed because of the cars accompanying the use.

Kimball inquired of the GavPAC whether they had further modifications to the uses. Feeny expressed he did not have a problem exempting fishing and horseback riding. He agrees that in regards to 15 camps with 2 cars will add up to more cars. He would prefer 10 sites and one car per site or campgrounds should require a tier one land use permit. Caltrans will have a concern about trips on the highway. McKenna asked whether the users would be required to notify the county. Boise-Cossart would like an over-the-counter permit to be required and the number of campsites be reduced to five and limiting days per year to ninety. Kimball asked whether to forward the issue to staff to resolve

Tautrim recommended tabling the issue and sending it back to the agricultural subcommittee to resolve and bring back at a later date. The chair agreed and the item was tabled.

Agricultural Production:

Walker described the exemptions for greenhouses and clarified the number of greenhouses allowed and the cumulative number of structures allowed in response to questions from the GavPAC. Lackie noted that the Uniform Rules for Agricultural Preserves notes a distinction when there are multiple parcels between premises and parcels. McNabb requested more information about how the grading element affects what is going on. She also noted small and all animal keeping should be a category since it is a rural use. Van Leer noted that the discussion was on uses that don't already have exemptions, and therefore Bee Keeping and Small Animal Keeping could be removed from the list because they already exist and the committee members concurred. Feeny expressed that the previous concern over car trips and expressed that it's hard to know what is going on inside of buildings. He does not want to include unenforceable standards in regards to where a product is coming from and wants to know why we care where it comes from. Tautrim indicated that restricting the area which produce comes from is a cap on scale. Feeny noted that a cap on building size achieves the limits on scale. Van Leer, McGinnis and Tautrim pointed out the notes cite the Agricultural Commissioner's limits for transport of certain crops across boundaries to limit disease, such as sudden-oak death and that restricting where produce comes from also limits carbon emissions. Boise-Cossart asked for better definitions for greenhouses, is concerned about the term "structure" in regards to the use potential, and expressed support for the definition of product preparation.

Public Comments/Questions and Responses:



Mike Lundsford: Expressed concern regarding the size of structures and wishes to restrict the volume of use and believes that size would achieve that. He is concerned about visual impacts along the main corridor.

Bob Field: Expressed a need for the distinction between large and small impacts. He cited the lack of monitoring of winery events compared to frequent reporting on water quality and stated the key is to require the person with the privilege to pay for the monitoring.

Susanne Perkins: She would not place a 10,000 square feet condition the size of a barns, since it is not very big. Rather the burden should be on the property owner to protect the view shed through design and visibility. She is opposed to restricting horse use and would like the small animal exemption expanded.

Susan Petrovich: Questioned the purpose of having no new structures requiring a permit and understands the purpose of conversions and size limits. Baer responded that the focus is on exemptions and preparation facilities that could be accommodated in existing buildings, however new buildings would need a permit. Petrovich indicated permitting is more expensive.

Bill Georgi: Questioned the definition of critical view shed. Kimball explained that it is a mapped area from the highway and public view points. McKenna explained that the critical view shed is south of 101 and extends to the ridgeline north with exceptions for brief views of some interior valleys and clarified that agricultural buildings are exempt. Tautrim indicated that it applies to residential buildings only. McKenna clarified, that a building can be located in the view shed if you can use natural landforms to ensure it can't be seen its fine.

Plant Nursery/Farm Stands and Firewood Processing

Van Leer reviewed the uses and discussed the appropriateness of nursery use and the addition of scalability and deferring to state guidelines for farm stands. Tautrim discussed existing buildings and electricity needs and farm stands. He described a trend toward local food movement and that farm stands were difficult to permit. He cited the new state regulations for farm stands which are more permissive than local rules. He expressed a desire to allow sales of artisanal goods. Van Leer noted that you currently cannot grow native plants, these rules will allow that. The existing sizes for the farm stands in the coastal zone is limited to 200 square feet and inland area 600 square feet to address scalability.

Public Comments/Questions and Responses:

Susan Petrovich: Questions why commercial plant nurseries are not allowed in the coastal zone and inquired why a new building is not permitted. Kimball noted that the discussion is in regards to exemptions but it does not apply to new structures.

Mike Lundsford: Definitions of incidental or subordinate should use an economic measure. In regards to firewood sales, his concern is in regards to tree cutting on properties and having an unintended impact. Van Leer noted there are rules applicable to. McGinnis expressed that limits should be added to limit native trees that are downed or diseased. Van Leer noted trimming oak trees is beneficial.

Agricultural Processing

Kimball inquired whether the GavPAC had comments or questions, seeing none, opened public comment.

Public Comments/Questions and Responses:



Susan Petrovich: Noted a typo in the table on number 4. Van Leer noted it should be deleted from the table.

Les Freeman: Noted that slaughtering is subject to strict federal regulation. Lackie noted that the Gaviota agricultural processing overlay is a tool to apply to certain uses and could benefit the agricultural community. He noted that processing beyond the raw state is not currently allowed. During the Uniform Rules language defining the activity was developed, and although not adopted, is a good starting place.

Educational Experiences

Kimball opened the discussion by members of the GavPAC. McNabb inquired as to why educational experiences were included in rural recreation. She supports it and inquired as to whether the County has a Visitor Serving Zone District. Lackie clarified it is its own zone district with regulations. Tautrim pointed out the problem they were addressing is the conditional use permit required for educational experiences, such as teaching children about farms is too strict. In response to a question about the definition, Lackie noted a need to make an edit. McGinnis noted an edit to the text.

Public Comments/Questions and Responses:

Susan Petrovich: Inquired whether English as a Second Language trainings that are very beneficial to agriculture that is not a school be considered.

Mike Lundsford: Definitions of incidental are again needed. Not clear if you are limiting to education facilities or for profit. He asked for clarity regarding exemption and Tier I and between commercial and non-commercial. Baer clarified it could be for profit or not for profit. Tier I is defaulting to existing zoning.

Bob Field: Described temporary special events that were described as incidental to relatively minor agricultural uses that resulted in a defacto rezone to commercial. Agrees that an economic test (hours, square feet) as to what is incidental.

Susanne Perkins: Described an example of having urban children attend a foaling on the ranch. She supports bringing people out to experience farms and ranches.

Ann Coates: Provided an example of the Botanical Gardens charging a stipend for tours. She hazarded that such fees and profits should not preclude this type of activity.

Tatrum and Field clarified that the winery noted in Field's example was actually not permitted but denied by the County. McNabb sought further clarification regarding equipment definitions. Lackie described non-agriculture related temporary uses such as pipe storage or crab traps identified during the exempt use discussions. Bowman noted that should be a time limit to storage. McKenna cited the exemption for non-agricultural storage and expressed that he would rather see zero (none).

Mike Lundsford: Described an example of pipeline storage at Refugio State Beach that destroyed a section of coastal sage and recommended there be a requirement to restore storage sites after construction.

Les Freeman: Stated that requiring staging areas to be located far from a project site is not practical.

Kimball noted the PAC is focusing on exemptions not permits for projects that would include temporary storage areas. Boise-Cossart inquired further regarding storage. Baer noted the subcommittee went in the direction of limiting storage to certain areas. Tautrim inquired as to whether storage areas should be located outside the view shed. Boise-Cossart expressed that this exemption would allow permanent commercial storage uses in the view shed.



Linda Tild: Expressed that she did not want storage areas located in the view shed. Lackie described current regulations and Van Leer expressed a clear understanding of the issue and direction on the issue.

Small Scale Guest Ranch

Kimball opened the discussion by members of the GavPAC. McGinnis described the committee's efforts to avoid permitting a building and having it convert to a guest ranch. Tautrim noted the intent was to keep the use subordinate to the principal agricultural use and asked for input from the GavPAC. Lackie added that the numbers of persons came from state regulations and that the state Department of Conservation approves of guest ranches as a use on agricultural preserves.

Public Comments/Questions and Responses:

Nathan: Asked and Lackie verified that currently a CUP is required. The speaker expressed a concern that the 5 year requirement be abused, such as a barn that could be converted to a guest ranch. Van Leer noted the intent to avoid abuse. Tautrim noted this is a potential loophole.

Anne Coates: Recommended including the word "habitable" to the existing structure description to avoid unwanted conversions.

Susanne Perkins: Supports the changes and provided an example of a small guest ranch on an equestrian facility outside the County that generates revenues and is a huge benefit to the owner. She noted that it did not generate a lot of traffic.

Michael Lundsford: He notes that the previous example the use is not agriculture, in that it does not produce food and fiber. It would result in hard work that is a diversion from the primary agricultural production. The use was not approved as part of the Uniform Rules for a reason. He sees an advantage in small scale home stays, but is concerned about the scale and questioned whether if you had multiple parcels you could have multiple facilities and should be clarified.

Susan Petrovich: Noted she was on the Uniform Rules committee and expressed that the committee was moving in the right direction on the issue of farm stays. They are happening all around the country and supports agricultural viability. She also expressed that she thought that stays of four or fewer guests should be exempt and would avoid permitting costs, be manageable for property owners and have no impacts.

Bill Georgi: Expressed support for the approach and the way the language is structured. He questioned the viability of reconstructing a barn into a habitable structure. He wanted to know if a provision could be added that says "...or legal parcel." He noted that they opted to not renew their agricultural preserve contract when the Uniform Rules did not allow the use.

Bob Field: Noted there was no restriction on these uses in the Uniform Rules. The proposal was one per parcel, raising the question whether people with multiple parcels could build multiple units. The issue of building age and adding the term "habitable" begins to close the loophole. He believes that a habitable building could be converted and expanded and that they need to be supplemental. He doesn't believe they don't pencil out.

Les Freeman: Expressed the purpose of the committee was to support agricultural uses on the coast. He would like to provide for future generations. He asked that the committee be careful about what they are doing.

McKenna does not see 15 persons as being incidental and believes the "per parcel" issue needs to be addressed. Boise-Cossart agrees and would like to add limitations to the number of days and that multi-generation uses be addressed. McNabb noted these are not



exemptions and the existing permits will still be in place. Multiple parcels would not get a permit. Tautrim noted his support for the local food movement and industrialization of food. The impact to the agricultural use is the issue, therefore no exemption. He would entertain discussing an exemption. He described working farms that had overnight stays and noted that agriculture was the primary use.

Special Events and Temporary Uses

Kimball opened the discussion by members of the GavPAC. Van Leer described the committee's process in changing the existing permit requirement to allow for profit. Tautrim described that the county's existing standard deterred by not allowing for profit, we capped it at 10. Feeny expressed that the number of people and event days are too many to not require a permit. McGinnis agreed and expressed the intent was to allow for one day to set up, one day to hold event and one day to tear down. Tautrim and McGinnis solicited input. The GavPAC discussed the merits of certain constraints and benefits. McGinnis noted the current cap of 300 is in the regulations. She is interested in capping it further.

Public Comments/Questions and Responses:

Nathan: Event should be defined.

Bill Georgi: Noted it is a way of bringing in extra income and cited examples and his support.

Bob Field: He supports the concept. Each event day is counted as an event by the county. He suggests that to protect the Gaviota Coast they need to make the definition for events and address the incidental, supplemental question.

Michael Lundsford: He wants better definitions and appropriate scale. Do it small if you do it all. There are enforcement problems too.

Susan Petrovich: She believes you should consider minimum parcel sizes. She also feels this is not a lot of events and that the scale is not too big.

Les Freeman: As a neighbor to the State Park he doesn't see a problem as long as they are not throwing trash and starting fires. Van Leer summarized the changes the Agricultural Subcommittee would address.

Nathan: He believes ten events are just right. Baer noted the July 12 Ag Subcommittee meeting to discuss non-agricultural uses and invited public participation.

9. Long-Term GavPAC Meeting Schedule: Staff proposed to have two more meetings in July. July 6th discussion will be on the CCC's suggested non-agriculture LUDC use modifications and rural clustering tools. On July 13th staff would present a policy summary of GavPAC direction to staff, the Gaviota Terminal Company will make a presentation. The GavPAC discussed the topics and asked staff to bring a broader summary of incentives to landowners along with the clustering tools. The GavPAC tentatively rescheduled the July 13th meeting to July 19th.

Adjournment – 9:57 p.m.



ATTACHMENT 2

Gaviota Coast Policy Direction Summary

Ref.	Policy Direction Statement	Comments	Source
<u>Visual Resources</u>			
1	Visual Resources Subcommittee formed	GavPAC deliberated on visual policy preferences to be forwarded to Visual Subcommittee for further deliberation and refinement by the subcommittee	Meeting 19 Minutes
<u>Agricultural</u>			
2	Agricultural Subcommittee formed	GavPAC deliberated on agricultural policy preferences to be forwarded to Agricultural Subcommittee for further deliberation and refinement by the subcommittee	Meeting 21 Minutes
<u>Resource Stewardship & Open Space</u>			
3	Develop a mechanism to implement a countywide programmatic permit for habitat restoration projects, including the development of a safe harbor mechanism at the federal, state, and county level to protect landowners (landowners doing restoration and neighboring landowners) from the effect of restoring endangered species habitat and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA)		Meeting 24 Minutes
4	The county shall apply for grants to assist landowners in removing invasive or noxious species		Meeting 24 Minutes
5	Landscape plans and palettes in the Plan Area shall not include invasive nor noxious plants		Meeting 24 Minutes
6	Develop policy for watershed management based on the following principles: 1) Create a voluntary watershed management plan policy approach to management of watersheds with lands not seeking enhanced entitlements, 2) Although it is unlikely to come into play, consider policies for using a mandatory approach to watershed management for development, such as subdivisions, and use tolls such as development agreements, in-lieu fees, master plans, etc. to implement that policy, 3) Create plan area wide best management practices for water quality protection, 4) policy should reflect the GavPAC's desire to use watersheds as a central organizing concept for policy development		Meeting 25 Minutes
7	Develop policy to support the creation of an interagency council which would function as a clearinghouse for proposed projects in the plan area and to promote interagency coordination and engagement of public agencies, particularly those with landholdings within the plan area		Meeting 25 Minutes
8	Develop policy to 1) extend ESHA mapping to inland areas , 2) look at EHA regulations in the zoning ordinance to ensure that it is consistent with the Coastal Act, 3) any buffer policies should be flexible and consider the purpose and context of the buffer as well as the use of the land next to the buffer, 4) allow for maintenance and use of existing non-conforming development located within sensitive habitat buffers, 5) use a hierarchy construct to consider additional habitat types or		Meeting 25 Minutes

Gaviota Coast Policy Direction Summary

Ref.	Policy Direction Statement	Comments	Source
	individual species that could be protected to a similar degree as ESHA		
9	Environmental review of the plan should address wildlife movement areas and include a general identification of landforms and natural features that are likely to be potential wildlife movement areas		Meeting 26 Minutes
10	Develop policies that stress the importance of free wildlife movement within the Gaviota Planning Area. Environmental review of development proposals should evaluate and mitigate for the effects on wildlife movement caused by fencing, roads, lighting, and siting		Meeting 26 Minutes
11	Support existing development standards and policy that protects archaeological and historic resources		Meeting 26 Minutes
12	Consider opportunities to develop a community cultural center or other community cultural research and educational opportunities		Meeting 26 Minutes
<i>Transportation, Energy, & Infrastructure</i>			
13	Develop policy to: 1) reduce the impacts of the Tajiguas landfill on the Gaviota Coast, 2) not expand the landfill capacity, 3) only accept Santa Barbara County waste		Meeting 27 Minutes
14	Extend the enabling ordinance for commercial scale wind energy into the Coastal Zone, west of the Gaviota pass viewshed		Meeting 28 Minutes
15	Develop general policy language for: 1) restoration of coastal lagoons, 2) restoration of fish passage, 3) removal of barriers to fish passage on county roads, 4) improvement of coastal access, with a focus on access through public land, 5) management of invasive species		Meeting 29 Minutes
16	Use economic and environmental considerations to develop a prioritized list of specific areas (watersheds, lagoons, etc.) and specific invasive species (Arundo donax, etc.) for which to apply the above policy language. The GavPAC recognizes that this policy direction will also serve as guidance for the proposed Interagency Review Council for the Gaviota Coast		Meeting 29 Minutes
17	Encourage the county to keep Fire Station No. 18 active and viable to serve visitors, tourists, and residents on the Gaviota Coast		Meeting 29 Minutes

Gaviota Coast Policy Direction Summary

Ref.	Policy Direction Statement	Comments	Source
18	Investigate the feasibility of developing rural volunteer fire brigade(s), and if possible, to assist or support their development		Meeting 29 Minutes
19	The county land use regulations regarding siting of improvements shall be mindful of defensible space and access requirements under the fire code. Buildings shall be at least 100 feet from environmentally sensitive habitat (ESH), unless extenuating circumstances exist (e.g., a parcel with only ESH)		Meeting 31 Minutes
20	Infrastructure improvements should be at a scale that is commensurate with the anticipated uses and kept to a rural standard to the extent feasible		Meeting 31 Minutes
21	While public safety is paramount, the Fire Department will encourage flexibility when implementing standards by use of various techniques to fit the improvements into the natural landscape		Meeting 31 Minutes
<i>Land Use, Zoning, & Housing</i>			
22	Consider a land use designation for U.S. Forest Service lands to clarify that these are not agricultural lands and that they should be considered land for watershed protection		Meeting 32 Minutes
23	Consider the ramifications of rezoning existing Ordinance 661 parcels to the Land Use & Development Code 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 landowners with 661-zoned property have been notified of the significance of the pending rezone		Meeting 32 Minutes
24	Consider areas that would be appropriate for an Existing Developed Rural Neighborhood (EDRN) designation and an underlying rezone, and then report back to the GavPAC		Meeting 32 Minutes
25	Develop policy approaches that follow the Gaviota Coast Residential Size Outline from May 5, 2011, with the exception of item nos. 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)		Meeting 33 Minutes
<i>Recreation & Trails</i>			
26	Modify existing policy language so that the county takes a more advisory and consultative approach in relation to state parks		Meeting 34 Minutes

Gaviota Coast Policy Direction Summary

Ref.	Policy Direction Statement	Comments	Source
27	Modify existing policy language so that the county looks at the feasibility of implementing existing policies		Meeting 34 Minutes
28	Revise existing policies to recognize limits on trails exaction "subject to prevailing law"		Meeting 35 Minutes
29	Trails Subcommittee formed	GavPAC deliberated on trails policy preferences to be forwarded to Visual Subcommittee for further deliberation and refinement by the subcommittee	Meeting 35 Minutes
30	Update Parks, Recreation, and Trails (PRT) maps for the eastern and western portions of the Gaviota planning area and consider updating the PRT maps with appropriate trail linkages between inland and coastal trails, including linkages between Baron Ranch, Arroyo Hondo, and El Capitan Canyon		Meeting 36 Minutes
31	Consider incentives for trail dedication, including reducing the existing permit requirement for a trail from a CUP to a CDP/LUP		Meeting 36 Minutes
32	Develop thematic scheme for trail development and consider the appropriate intensity of use for a trail and the trail audience		Meeting 36 Minutes
33	Consider policy to encourage specific plans for trail development on large landholdings		Meeting 36 Minutes
34	Consider issues related to Coastal Trails planning, including the proximity of the trail to the ocean and the Coastal Commission guidelines for the Coastal Trail and coastal access		Meeting 36 Minutes
35	Consider implications for desired infrastructure (e.g. parking) associated with trails development		Meeting 36 Minutes
36	Consider potential impacts of trails development from the landowner perspective		Meeting 36 Minutes
37	Consider minimizing the use of asphalt for trails		Meeting 36 Minutes

Gaviota Coast Policy Direction Summary

Ref.	Policy Direction Statement	Comments	Source
38	Consider County Riding and Hiking Trails Advisory Committee (CRAHTAC) adopted principles for trail development		Meeting 36 Minutes

ATTACHMENT 3



Gaviota Coast Plan GavPAC Meeting Schedule

Meeting Dates and Discussion Topics

[Meeting dates, times, and locations are subject to change]

July 19, 2011

Meeting/ Workshop Type	Date and Time	Location	Discussion Topics
GavPAC Meeting #40	TBD August, 2nd or 10th 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Final Topics Before Break
GavPAC Meeting #39	Wednesday, July 19, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Policy Direction Review Gaviota Terminal Company Property Discussion
GavPAC Meeting #38 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, July 6, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Non-Agricultural Coastal Commission LUDC Modifications Incentive Approaches for Landowners Development Clustering Tools
GavPAC Meeting #37 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, June 29, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Agricultural Subcommittee Report
GavPAC Meeting #36 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, June 15, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Recreation & Trails III
GavPAC Meeting #35 ***COMPLETED***	Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Recreation & Trails II
GavPAC Meeting #34 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, May 25, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Recreation & Trails I
GavPAC Meeting #33 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, May 11, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Land Use IV
GavPAC Meeting #32 ***COMPLETED***	Wednesday, April 27, 2011 6:30 p.m.	Vista de Las Cruces School Auditorium	Planning Goals Development: Land Use III/Visual Subcommittee Report