

## Goleta Valley Planning Advisory Committee (GVPAC)

### Recording Secretary Tom Elliott Notes.

Feb 27, 2010: Introducing the Conceptual Community Plan

Public comment: The following is a summary of the public comment presented at the GVPAC Workshop as recorded by Tom Elliott the GVPAC Recording Secretary. To hear the complete public comment period please access the Santa Barbara County Long Range Planning website, listed below, and listen to the audio of the workshop.

<http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/goleta/gvpac.php>

Oscar: Suggested that more of the GVPAC meetings be held in the Goleta area instead of down town, and maybe more people would attend.

No Name: No the City of Goleta annexation of parts of the EGV, we like things the way they are.

June: Commented that there was not enough notice for the meeting, and if there would have been more people would have attended. Concerned about expanded growth and undesired change. Do not give up the rural areas; the farm area saved us from the fires. Favored no growth, and keeping the EGV as it is.

Mary: CSP: We have not heard the words rezone or density used once, concerned other wording (small town neighborhood) being used is referring to rezoning and high density growth. Supported use the Goleta Visioning document. Supported no high density development or rezoning in the EGV. Concerned about changing the character and quality of life in the EGV.

Shelly: Asked why we are rezoning to Mountainous area. It can still be used for agriculture and it should be. Concerned that we may need to farm more of our area and as the price of oil goes up we need to farm locally. (Mountainous areas can still be farmed)

Heather: Asked about making parcels smaller if rezoned to mountainous. No.

Jack: Voiced concern about planners pushing the GVPAC in the wrong direction. Supported no redevelopment projects in the EGV. Mentioned that we need numbers (numbers of homes) to put things in perspective. Supported changing nothing in the EGV, no rezones and no high density development.

Jim: Supported no rezoning. No high density development. Concerned about broad brush approach. Concerned about infrastructure, water etc not supporting

development. Also mentioned the need for numbers (for suggested development) to have a perspective.

Mark: (Represents 30 people in the neighborhood). Have a petition on not pushing through San Simeon. Voiced concern about of San Simeon through to Turnpike. Concerned about traffic past school. Do not open for cars through too Turnpike. Supported no changes, no rezones and no high density development in the EGV. Do nothing is the best answer.

Patricia: Live in area because do not want to live in the city. Did not support the concept of a "Heart of the City". We don't need to have a commercial center, no heart of the city, the city' are close enough. Leave EGV as is. Fix area near the railroad bridge on Hollister.

Mary: Comment on Traffic and Circulation. We should use Traffic figures from local statics. Do not use (count) streets (compete streets) as open space. Concerned that rezoning will cause increased traffic. Concerned about double talk and not going in the correct direction.

Mike: Thanks for presentation, though it was informative and involving the public: Supported number 4, expanded use of agriculture land to other uses.

Patty: Supported a bike path only through San Simian, no through street for cars to turnpike. # 4 no general statements, make specific recommendations for expanded uses for the agriculture sites so public can comment. Did not support expanded use of agriculture land, keep it as agriculture.

Greg: Like idea for a "Heart of the City". Need continuity through area. Asked if it is only the farmers that have asked for change to urban agriculture land (expanded use) because they are having trouble with profitable business. Questioned the need for walking bridge over 101. Green way, include Ciengutas Creek in discussions about bow tie area. Like idea of expanding Page Youth Center, add tennis courts, expand hiking in the area. Curious about public trails in county campus area.

Argen: Voiced support for expanded use and other opportunities for Agriculture land #4. Like to use for the MTD property for agriculture and other agriculture based uses. Transportation: supported lower speed limit on Turnpike (35 mph) so electric vehicles can be use. Support for alternative fueling stations in the future (designate the land). Supported the idea of food security, needs to be stressed in the plan.

John: Regulations for waste plant is behind schedule. Need info for community planners for (prior to) increase in residential development. Plants could be affecting the water supply in the area. This could be a public safety area.

Mike: CEC: Thanks for the information and involving the community. Liked suggestions 3 5 6 16 17 21. Commented on people commuting to the area. Concentrate any

development in already developed area. Did not support High Density Development, but though we needed some housing to keep people in the area.

Lauren: Comment on breaking down north south barriers to traffic. Not in favor of opening El Sueno to Cathedral Oaks. Perhaps not consider at all opening streets or use fire barriers to allow access in an emergency. Questioned comments on the Community Campus and asked what would change? Much of the County Campus is land fill. Asked if it would include housing, replacement of community buildings. What do we need that we do not already have?

Charles: Supported #13, low impact development of all projects. Include with environmental issues, solar, water capture etc. Do not let developers push cost for added infrastructure on the public when developing in the area.

Caster. Commented that the County is broke, has no money to do all the items on the list. To get the money we need development. Did not support development to get money, supported doing nothing. Keep the EGV as it is. Will provide more in writing.

Christine: CDC: Complemented staff on the presentation. Expanded urban uses of agriculture land supported #4, all but retail or antique shops, shops bed and breakfast maybe, if it does not interfere with ongoing agriculture operations. Suggest a permanent farmers market. Possible farm workers housing.

Eric: Question on Complete streets and bicycle boulevard? Does it include cars? Answer Yes.

Dave: #6 no to Bike Boulevard. Not good to share with cars. Bikes only on San Simeon through to Turnpike, no cars.

Dave: Thanks to all for volunteering time. Please support the GVC 2020 document, to protect us from developers. Concerned that we have departed from the document spirit of the document. We are not urban we are sub-urban. Public also needs time to digest the recommendations.

Jack: No money: Making Safe Streets: Need County to help make streets safe, but do not use developer money to support.

Stan: Representing a number Patterson area agriculture land owners, flatlands: Thanked staff and GVPAC for time and opportunity to speak. Thanked for opportunity to make suggestions and meet a sub committee in the future if one is established. Supported staff recommendation #4, they need some options to keep operations viable. Gave a presentation on the agriculture land use in the Patterson lower area. Showed some of the possible uses of the area. Slide show available on County GVPAC Web Site.

Bonnie: Presented her findings from a meeting with local people in her neighborhood. Copy of presentation available on the GVPAC web site.

Steve: Representing Upper Patterson agriculture block. 396 ac. Goals focus plan for the area. Need diversity to be able to continue operations. Wants to stay in the area but needs to have some ability to make other uses of the currently zoned agriculture land.

Oscar: From GVC 2020 represented agriculture. Food and flowers are two different things. Viability: Potential to grow not return on investment. Flat lands are different than foothills. Food is more important.

Paul: South Paterson Agriculture area. Can we meet with them as a group, no it needs to be an open meeting.

Kristina: Should we not use the word Urban should we use suburban.

Dean: Dirgard Nursery: Need some plans for flexibility in the urban agriculture area.

Patty Close: Give compassion to the farmers; quit trying to build affordable housing. Help the farmers: they are a part the community.

Ron: Lower Patterson area, farms flowers not food. Food crops around his area. Farming in Santa Mareia is different that EGV. Farming in a farming community is different, we do not have the infstructrue here in EGV. Farming in urban area is difficult.

Mike: Remove 20 21 22 23 and 6 be removed from the community plan. They are not proven to be beneficial to the neighborhood.

Bonnie: What is clustered and what died it mean in density. Need more information on density to make additional comments. Clustered means not additional density but moving the units to part of the property and leaving the rest for open space.

No Name: Support the area agriculture staying as currently zoned, no changes.

Crag: Letter from San Marcos about previous zoning of the area. San Marcos above ground potted nursery: Tobes: Wants to have ability to other uses on the property: Given the length of the plan must build in some flexibility.

No Name: Support of MCS School.

Don: Support the MCS School. Good us of space does not require rezoning

Dave: Traffic on Hollister and San Simon would be bad if Tatum property is developed. This is a highly dense traffic area, no emergency exit, we a maxed out in the area.

Patty: Mentioned Tobes suggested development of the San Marcos farms and traffic it would cause. Supports keeping San Marcos as agriculture land, no development.

Beverly: Lane farm area near where the MCS School is going go. Supported school and alternated use of Agriculture land if it can not be sold to other farmers. Put M school area up for sale and no farmers want to farm it.

Eric: Support MCS School. Would like to continue to support agriculture in the area around MCS School.

Shelly. Expressed concern about peak oil and cost to import food. Suggested rezone of residential land to agriculture use. Supports food security. Concerned if we are cut off from the outside or it is too expensive to deliver it. We should protect all agriculture land and try to expand it. We need to find a way to get people out of their cars. Use raised beds on land to grow food. Any land that has not been developed should not be developed. Concerned that speculation is driving up cost of land so farmers cannot afford it.

Kristine: 22 keep as agriculture, 23, option 1. Mentioned that schools are a potential for being around agriculture land, operations.

No Name: Support MCS. School

George: Support MCS School

Nancy: Support MCS School, have small carbon foot print, support agriculture/green area around school.

George: Support MCS School.

Genie: Support MCS School. Farmer has moved operations to other area because this area is hard to compete from.

Nancy: Support MCS School, will run a green school. Keep the area as agriculture

Richard: Support MCS, Suggested opening the closed street to Hollister to take some of the pressure off of Walnut Lane. Concerned about added traffic from MCS.

Tom: Local agriculture. No high density housing. Need more information on clustered housing. How many, where, how dense. Who would redevelop the Hollister Turnpike shopping center, the government?

Mary W: Planning tools, suggested using the Montecito Community plan: Have not heard anything about protecting the residents, public health and safety issues. We should have a planning commission like Montecito. Why has EGV taken on all this responsibility, we should concentrate on our planning area only. Concerned the committee has been led away (by staff) from planning just for our planning area. The committee needs to concentrate on the quality of life for the EGV.

Sherrie Fisher: GM MTD. When MTD bought property it was zoned residential. No current plans. Support Transit orientated development on the MTS property.

Lauran: The MTD land was used for agriculture at one time and MTD did not renew lease. Neighbors have not asked for the area to be rezoned and used for high density. Suggested that it stay in agriculture for food growing.

No Name: Support Lauran on keeping MTD agriculture and mentioned that there is a local farmer that would love to farm the MTD property again.

Dave: Comment on State Street Bowtie. Supported the 2020 document. Not what he has heard today. Did not support the idea to join the areas. Many of the residents like not being close to SB. Do not grow the area. We have invested our lives and do not want the developers to be allowed to over develop the area. Suggested when making suggestions, that there is a large part of the community that do not want over development. Against the hotel at foot of 154. Resolve the 101 junction before changing the rest of the area. Against the store on corner of Puente.

Ted: Commented about the bad traffic along Hollister at State Street and the Modoc railroad bridge. Would not support any more business along State Street between Modoc and 101.

Shelly: Comment on traffic from the Modoc Bridge and 101. Against the hotel at 154. Against any redevelopment of the area. Would support a walkable center. Like to see a traffic study done on the area along Hollister.

Ted: Lives on Auhay: Concerned about traffic along Hollister from bridge to 101. Crazy to put more business along the area.

Ann: Commented against the proposed hotel at State and 101. Recommended people check the story polls when they are up, but that they would not be up long. Concerned that a development like the proposed hotel could set the bad precedent for the area. Will create a lot of low income jobs. Suggested adding onsite employee housing

Patricia: Against hotel, do not need any additional commercial along Hollister.