Subject: GVPAC Meeting Summary for April 7, 2009

From: "Kenan Ezal" < Kenan. Ezal@cox.net> Date: Mon, 20 Apr 2009 01:55:12 -0700

To: "Kenan Ezal \(Home\)" < Kenan. Ezal @cox.net>

Hello Everyone,

<u>Reminder</u>: There will be an <u>all-day</u> GVPAC Workshop held on July 11, 2009. The exact location has not been determined at this time. The purpose of the workshop will be to solicit input from the community on a wide variety of issues that the committee will be considering. An online community survey will precede the workshop. The Community Plan update will be based on the feedback the GVPAC receives from the community. *If you can attend only one GVPAC meeting, this is probably the one to attend.* 

The following summarizes the general issues discussed during the last GVPAC meeting.

Meeting Notes for March 18, 2009:

- 1. Next Meeting:
  - a. Date: April 22, 2009
  - b. Location: Planning Commission Hearing Room
  - c. Agenda: Commercial Land Use
    - i. Identification of Economically Vital Areas
    - ii. Identification of Needs
    - iii. Revitalization and Economic Development
    - iv. Accessibility and Convenience
- 2. <u>Main Overview</u>: The primary purpose of this meeting was to learn about the Community Development Super Element of the 1993 Goleta Valley Community Plan (GCP), and in particular Residential Land Use.
  - a. *Residential Land-Use Planning*: The purpose of land-use planning is to provide amenities for people while protecting people from the environment and vice versa.
    - The scale of development planning is hierarchical and ranges from a single house to a cluster of homes, apartments, condos, walkable communities with mixed non-residential use, and villages, towns or network of towns and cities.
    - ii. Planning considers the location of residences, the type/design of homes, adjacent land use, density, and zoning designations.
    - iii. The 1993 GCP attempted to protect environmentally constrained areas such as More Mesa while preserving the character of existing neighborhoods, providing housing equity, and open space. It identified a number of neighborhoods and developed specific policies for each area.
    - iv. The 1993 GCP was driven by the fact that the pace of commercial development created an abundance of jobs relative to the number of homes.
    - v. The Goleta Growth Management Ordinance (GGMO), which was repealed in 2001 by the Board of Supervisors, attempted to balance the ratio of residential development to commercial development by placing an annual limit on each.
    - vi. Today, residential development in Eastern Goleta Valley outweighs existing commercial development. There are relatively few jobs in Eastern Goleta Valley and existing residential areas are mostly built out.
    - vii. Focus on redevelopment and small-area planning may be necessary for this planning cycle.

- The Turnpike and Calle Real area is currently designated as Highway Commercial (fast food, gas, hotels). This designation is being phased out in many other communities in favor of C-2 Commercial.
- b. Residential Land Use Trends and Projections: The 2007 Regional Growth Forecast (RGF) conducted by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) provides some insight into the potential growth under current zoning regulations.
  - i. The projected population growth through 2030 for the *entire* South Coast is 7.9% (cumulative).
  - ii. South Coast projected construction rate is 13 houses per year, with 20% of that projected for Eastern Goleta Valley or 2.59 houses per year (on average). This projection assumes no change in zoning.
  - iii. There are currently 10,181 (legal) homes in Eastern Goleta Valley. There are a total of 1,359 potential future homes in our planning area *if* every possible vacant parcel found in a residential zone is developed. However, the maximum number of homes that can be *realistically* developed under current zoning is 596 (total). The corresponding realistic maximum population increase is 1,621 people. However, only about 10% of these potential homes are projected to be built by 2030.
- c. GVPAC Discussion: Various issues were discussed by the GVPAC members related to residential land use.
  - Members discussed our impressions of the values of our community including the importance of the
    environment to the community and the types of commercial development that may be desired or not
    desired.
  - ii. The vast majority of homes in our area are single-family homes and most people would like to keep it that way with improved multi-modal transportation capabilities.
  - iii. Improving specific neighborhoods and corridors through planting of trees, better bicycle lanes and traffic calming measures protecting pedestrians, bicyclists and school children.
  - iv. The importance of providing identities for different neighborhoods, strengthening the neighborhood character and unity.
  - v. Maintain neighborhood compatibility, keep lower heights, maintain existing infrastructure.

## 3. Public Comment:

- a. *Anne Crosby*: Pointed out that SBCAG has agreed that residential growth and commercial growth needs to occur in the same area: *cities that generate jobs need to provide housing for the workers that they attract*. The County should not have to provide homes for jobs created by the City of Santa Barbara or the City of Goleta. Otherwise, the County is burdened with additional infrastructure demands without a revenue source to provide the required funding for that infrastructure.
- b. *Patti Close*: Stated that she is concerned about any mention of growth in Eastern Goleta Valley and the costs associated with some of the potential improvements discussed by the GVPAC. She does not see a need to change Santa Barbara and does not want higher densities.
- c. *Mary Whalen*: Mentioned that the City of Goleta and Montecito both have growth management ordinances. She also noted that Eastern Goleta Valley is suburban, not urban, or rural. This implies that lower housing density requirements should apply to Eastern Goleta Valley as compared to urban areas.
- d. Craig Minus: Thanked the GVPAC for envisioning for our community.

For additional information, the official minutes, and the meeting audio, please see the county website:

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

Once again let me know if you do not wish to receive these e-mails, and feel free to forward them to others.

Thank you!

-Kenan (Kenan.Ezal@cox.net)

Note: I am fully responsible for any errors you may find in the above—no one else.

GVPAC Meeting Summary for April 7, 2009

Kenan Ezal

Email: kezal@toyon.com Tel: (805) 968-6787 x180 Fax: (805) 685-8089