

---

# Goleta Valley Planning Advisory Committee

---

## ***APPROVED MEETING MINUTES***

***March 17, 2011 at 6:00PM***

***Santa Barbara County Planning Commission Hearing Room***

**Meeting Called to Order:** By Chair Valerie Olson at 6:05PM

### **1. Roll Call**

**GVPAC Members Present:** Adams, Elliott, Ezal, Freeman, Mineau, True, Olson

**GVPAC Members Absent:** None

**County Staff Present:**

Glenn Russell, Director, Planning and Development Department

Jeff Hunt, Director, Long Range Planning Division

Vicki Parker, Deputy Director, Redevelopment Agency

June Pujo, Planner, Long Range Planning Division

Erika Leachman, Planner, Long Range Planning Division

### **2. Public Comment:**

**Mary Whalen** commented that there was a lack of noticing of the GVPAC meeting, that many residents are unaware that the community plan is being updated, and that the schedule lacks adequate opportunity for public input.

**Ann Crosby** suggested that there be another public workshop, that food prices are up because of higher commodity and energy costs, and that agricultural land should be preserved for local food security.

**Roberta Weissglass** commented that the draft Plan seems to reflect the desires of developers instead of residents, that there should be no net loss of agricultural land which should be protected to promote local food production and security.

### **3. Minutes of March 8, 2011 GVPAC Meeting:**

**Amendments:** Chair Olson recommended additional details to reflect that the GVPAC had agreed to no more than 70 units on the MTD property, and Committee Member Freeman offered the clarification that two GVPAC members desired more deliberation about long term potential land uses for the San Marcos Growers properties prior to denial of a rezone proposal.

**ACTION:** Ezal moved, seconded by True, and carried by a vote of 7-0 to approve the minutes, as amended, of the March 8, 2011 GVPAC Meeting.



Yea: Adams, Elliott, Ezal, Freeman, Mineau, True, Olson

Nay: None

Absent: None

#### 4. Calendar:

GVPAC discussed upcoming meetings including the plan-review meeting. Vice Chair Ezal suggested a track-changes version of the revised draft plan and possibly more than 2 meetings. Member Elliott asked: how long the PAC would have to review the revised draft, if extra copies will be made available, and if more than 3 minutes per public speaker will be allowed. The next GVPAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 22.

#### 5. Announcements:

Member Freeman commented that an article in *The Independent* did not include comments from an urban agriculture operator, that community input also comes from GVPAC members as they are representatives of the community and residents themselves, and that high costs of local housing have made it exceedingly difficult for local hospitals to find and hire interns in the area.

#### 6. GVPAC Discussion.

Staff provided a brief overview of the purpose and contents of Section II: Community Development and Land Use. The GVPAC then asked for public comment on Sections II.D: Commercial Land Uses and Sections II.E: Agricultural Land Uses.

##### Public Comment:

**Patti Close** commented that the public seems to be a bother to the GVPAC, that housing on agricultural land doesn't help sustainability, that food prices are the highest since 1974, and that disaster evacuation is harder with high density housing.

**Ron Caird** yielded his time to Suzanne Elledge.

**Suzanne Elledge**, representing the South Patterson Agricultural Flats Area landowners, listed some concerns raised by staff regarding the South Patterson Flats Area proposal: that the list of proposed uses was too expansive (the list was developed based on existing surrounding uses), that the timeframe for agricultural conservation easements was 20 years (which was chosen to parallel the life of the community plan), that staff does not want to rezone agricultural land during this update, that there could be conflicts with neighbors, and that agriculture was becoming less fiscally sustainable; she also requested that staff remove the Specific Plan requirement because it was too onerous.

**Barbara Kloos**, representing the Hope Ranch Annex, expressed concern about all of the housing and radical development proposed



