

**Community Plan Update
Goleta Vision Committee
Thursday August 3, 2006 and Tuesday, August 8, 2006
6:30 pm – 9:00 pm**

Location: Public Health Auditorium
300 North San Antonio Road

Final Meeting Notes – Informal Discussions of Growth and Development Issues

Vision Committee Members

Attending 8/3/06 Meeting:

Ted Adams
Michael Brown
Gary Earle
Tish Gainey
Lauren Hanson
Hal Hill
Eva Inbar
Valerie Olson
Tim Schmidt

Vision Committee Members

Attending 8/7/05 Meeting

Oscar Carmona
Hal Hill
Susan Grgich
Valerie Olson
Lauren Hanson
James Richard

County Staff Support:

Derek Johnson

Facilitator: John Jostes

1. Welcome and Participant Introductions

Both informal meetings were called to order at approximately 6:30 pm and Facilitator John Jostes led the group introductions. John noted that the meetings were intended to provide Committee members with an opportunity to informally discuss growth and development issues and their responses to the surveys distributed prior to the August 2nd meeting.

2. Initial Public Comment Period

Four members of the public addressed the group at its first meeting and one member of the public addressed the group at its second meeting. Durin the first meeting, several members expressed frustration with the facilitator's interpretation that the meeting was intended to provide members of the GVC to have a discussion among themselves, rather than a more open dialogue with the members of the public that attended that meeting.

3. Growth and Development Issues Discussion

There was a wide ranging discussion of growth and development issues at both of the two meetings. A one-page summary of smart growth principles was distributed to the group to aid in the discussion. John Jostes suggested that some organizing questions for the discussion might address the following issues:

1. *What kind of growth and development should happen in the next 10 – 20 years; where, in what time frame, with what conditions and for whom?*
2. *How much and what kinds of housing should be developed; where, when and for whom?*

During the first meeting, several themes emerged from the discussions that everyone in attendance expressed concurrence over. These themes were as follows:

- ☑ Preserve the special character of our existing neighborhoods; Neighborhood compatibility includes:
 - Scale & Bulk
 - Density
 - Building Heights.
- ☑ Maintain the current inventory of housing within the Goleta Valley.
- ☑ We should find ways to encourage the development of infill rental housing on small undeveloped and underdeveloped sites (e.g. churches).
- ☑ A little bit of the right kind of growth – growth that minimize cumulative impacts – might be OK.

One member commented that the considerable detail and time involved in solving the “Housing Problem” is too big for the GVC to address comprehensively.

However, there was not consensus over the issue of the size of development. While a large majority of the group felt that only small infill development was appropriate, two members felt that there were locations that could support larger, denser development adjacent to arterial corridors with access to transit.

During the second meeting, the discussion of these issues continued. The themes that emerged from the second meeting built on those that were identified in the first. These themes were:

- ☑ Proposals to increase density or intensity of use above that allowed by existing zoning should be evaluated based upon objective criteria or a competitive grading system which measures the project’s “conservation coefficient”.
- ☑ As the planning area approaches build-out, environmental thresholds need to be made more stringent to pace growth to be responsive to increasingly limited natural resources and infrastructure capacity.
- ☑ Innovative solutions to providing affordable and entry level housing require an uncommon level of creativity, critical thinking and open-mindedness.

Members asked for a clarification of the term open-mindedness. The facilitator suggested that open-mindedness might be interpreted to mean an unconditionally constructive approach to developing and assessing options.

The meeting was concluded with a general understanding that the Writing Subcommittee had important work to do in crafting the section and that the input of all members of the Committee was important to that task. An invitation was extended to all members of the GVC to contact one or more of the Subcommittee members with ideas, questions and afterthoughts from the group discussion over the two meetings.

4. Wrap-up, Next Steps and Adjourn

Both meetings concluded in the 9:00 pm – 9:15 pm time frame.