

**Community Plan Update  
Goleta Vision Committee  
April 5, 2006 6:30 – 9:00 pm**

Location: Goleta Valley Community Center  
5679 Hollister Avenue  
**Draft Workshop Notes**

---

<b>Attending:</b> Ted Adams Michael Brown Oscar Carmona Gary Earle Tish Gainey Susan Grgich	Lauren Hanson Hal Hill Eva Inbar Valerie Olson James Richard	<b>County Staff Support:</b> Terri Maus John McInnes Derek Johnson Rosie Dyste
---	--	--

---

**Facilitator:** John Jostes

### **1. Welcome and Participant Introductions**

Facilitator John Jostes opened up the workshop and led the introductions of those members of the Vision Committee in attendance. He provided a brief overview of the agenda and reminded participants that this was the third of four workshops initiating the visioning effort. He also noted that there would be ample opportunity for the public to have input into the process given the workshop nature of the evening's meeting.

### **2. Housekeeping and Administrative Matters**

The meeting notes from the March 22<sup>nd</sup> Workshop were reviewed by the committee. Several members raised concerns about the wording regarding emergency access for those personnel who do not live on the South Coast during times where an incident is occurring or has occurred. They requested that the wording be clarified to minimize confusion over those issues. John Jostes indicated he would make the revisions along with the correction of minor typographical errors. With these changes, the committee adopted the meeting notes from the March 22<sup>nd</sup> workshop.

Derek Johnson provided a short overview of the meeting handouts that had been provided to the group, highlighting two examples of visioning efforts that had taken place in North Hollywood and Santa Ynez Valley. He noted that these documents would provide the committee members with good examples of what types of issues, recommendations and language visioning efforts could yield and suggested that each of the committee members review the documents for what might be useful or transferable to the Goleta valley process.

He briefly touched upon matters related to the need for an additional meeting, the ability of committee members to attend the meeting scheduled for August 23<sup>rd</sup>, given vacation schedules, and the possibility of establishing a writing subcommittee. He also noted that County staff is working to identify a meeting location that is more conducive to the work of the committee and with better acoustics for the public, as well as the Goleta Residential Design Guidelines process that is underway. Discussion of these items was deferred to the end of the meeting to provide time for the invited speakers to address the committee and field questions.

### **3. Public Comment Periods**

A short period for public comment was provided. Two members of the public addressed the committee on issues related to the designation of housing sites, urban design and transit oriented development.

#### **4. Staff and Guest Presentations – Demographic and Socio-economic Trends and Issues**

Terri Maus, Assistant County Executive Officer provided an overview of the demographic indicators, issues and trends impacting the planning area as well as the South Coast in general. A meeting handout was distributed to accompany her presentation, which highlighted issues related to household size, average age of homes, changes in population density, and relative acreages dedicated to the various zoning classifications within the project area.

Bill Watkins, a consultant to the County and Executive Director of the UCSB Economic Forecast Project then provided an in-depth look at South Coast trends related to employment base and job growth, housing prices, public assistance and other community indicators. He showed comparisons of the local indicators to those on a nation wide basis. He then responded to questions from the Committee as well as individuals in the audience. A lively discussion ensued. He indicated that he would share his Power Point presentation with County Staff later in the month so that it could be distributed to committee members.

#### **5. Round-Table Discussions – Demographic and Socio-economic Trends and Issues**

Members of the public and Vision Committee members then broke into small groups of 5-6 individuals to discuss each of the topics and issues as they related to three focus questions: 1) What existing conditions and emerging trends with respect to demographic and socio-economic issues are most important? 2) Where are we headed and is that the right direction? 3) Where should we be going over the next 5, 10- or 15 years? After the focus group discussions, each group presented their findings and conclusions to the broader group as a whole. The following observations and commentaries were presented:

(Facilitator's Note: The observations below have been reorganized to provide for greater topical consistency.)

##### Existing Conditions, Trends and Needs

- Population decreasing, but growing older – more polarized with no middle class (i.e., bimodal population trend)
- Increasing wealth on the south coast due in part to escalating home values
- More people buying homes for use as second homes, only living in the community for a fraction of the year.
- Skilled middle-income workers and young families in the 30 – 50 age bracket leaving because of high housing prices
- Eastern Goleta Valley provides housing for those who work in the two cities – Goleta and Santa Barbara
- High desirability of coastal environment results in expensive housing prices because of high, non-local demand.
- Jobs-Housing imbalance
- Traffic is increasing due to long distance commute to Ventura, Lompoc and Santa Maria
- Traffic is increasing along surface streets (e.g., Hollister, Cathedral Oaks, etc.) parallel to U.S. 101 due to rush hour congestion on 101
- Housing

##### Current Direction/Emerging Trends – Where are we headed?

- Continued exodus of young families and skilled workers out of the area
- Decreasing diversity in favor of the rich and poor

- Government and other service jobs are increasing
- Increased internal (within the Planning area) and external (through and between areas) traffic
- Bigger houses, fewer people in upscale development
- Smaller houses, more people in apartments and smaller units (multiple families in a small housing units)
- More demand for high density by the State
- Slow growth can still support the local economy

#### Future Directions – where should we be going?

- More balanced community in terms of age diversity and other factors
- Sustainable community based upon living within available resources
- Focus on planning the community for the population expected in the next 15 years
- Focus community planning on providing for a more diverse community in the future
- Need more entry level housing – use public lands for employee housing
- Focus on well planned and strategically placed second units
- Provide a range of entry-level housing to increase diversity
- Focus on providing more alternative transportation
- Provide size standards that result in smaller houses
- There is a need to address the underlying issues related to housing demand – do firefighters really want to live in the South Coast or do they prefer to live elsewhere and commute in for four day work weeks?

### **6. Committee Discussion on Process and Emerging Issues**

After finishing the discussion of demographic and socio-economic issues, the Committee revisited some of the issues raised earlier in the evening. Led by Derek Johnson, the Committee expressed a desire to meet in the latter part of April to hear presentations from other agencies/institutions including the City of Santa Barbara, UCSB, the City of Goleta and Cottage Hospital on how actions by these agencies could influence planning issues and trends within the unincorporated eastern Goleta Valley. The Committee agreed to forward to the facilitator their preferred dates for a meeting on either Monday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, Tuesday, April 25<sup>th</sup> or Wednesday, April 26<sup>th</sup> no later than Friday.

There was also strong support for establishing a “Writing Subcommittee” to work with County staff and the facilitator to help craft some of the initial wording that would be incorporated into the recommendations of the vision process. Members agreed to forward their ideas of who might serve on such a committee to the Facilitator so that he could check in with people on their availability and willingness to serve. It was generally agreed that the subcommittee would not make decisions on behalf of the Committee, but rather would meet between regular committee meetings to identify draft language from the committee’s discussions and from other processes like the Valley Blueprint and North Hollywood vision to use in this process.

### **7. Next Step and Adjourn**

Due to time limitations, the meeting was adjourned promptly at 9:30 pm with the understanding that County staff and/or the facilitator would provide early notification of the next meeting date and location.