

Subject: GVPAC Meeting Minutes: May 20, 2009
From: "Kenan Ezal" <kezal@toyon.com>
Date: Mon, 1 Jun 2009 02:45:20 -0700
To: "Kenan Ezal \ (Home\)" <Kenan.Ezal@cox.net>

Hello Everyone,

Reminder: The GVPAC Community Workshop will be held on July 11, 2009 at the Vieja Valley School, 434 Nogal Drive in Goleta. While the workshop is an all-day event, you can stop by anytime during the day after 9:00 am. *You* will be the star of the show since the sole purpose of the workshop is for you to tell us your opinion on just about anything!

There will be seven tables at the workshop with each table representing a specific area of interest including: Environmental Protection; Residential Land Use; Parks, Trails, and Open Space; Agricultural Land Use; Mobility Circulation, and Parking; Commercial Land Use; and Public Safety and Infrastructure. Each table will be manned by one GVPAC member who will also record the ongoing discussions. Residents can visit all, some or just one of the tables. No one person or group will be allowed to dominate the discussion at any table, and residents will be periodically asked to rotate to another table.

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

Meeting Notes for May 20, 2009:

1. Next Meeting:
 - a. *Date:* June 2, 2009
 - b. *Time:* 6:00 pm
 - c. *Location:* Planning Commission Hearing Room
 - d. *Agenda:* Sustainable Goleta Valley
 - i. Goleta Transportation Improvement Plan (GTIP) update
 - ii. Planning for Environmental, Economic, and Social Sustainability
 - iii. Energy Efficiency, Air Quality, Climate Change
 - iv. Natural Resource Management, Protection and Use

2. Main Overview: The primary purpose of this meeting was to learn about Cumulative Projects and Area of Interest.
 - i. *Citizens' Access Portal:* The County demonstrated the permit application tracking tool available at the County website. This tool makes it possible to track new applications and ongoing development applications and is found at:
<https://aca.sbcountyplanning.org/CitizenAccess/>
Select the Planning Cases tab and enter the information you are interested in such as street names, zip codes, etc...
 - ii. *Planning for Cumulative Projects and Impacts:* Two or more projects, when considered together, can have cumulative impacts that are considerable, whereas any single one of those projects may have inconsequential impacts when analyzed separately. The Community Plan Update needs to consider regional impacts on our community.
 - Projects are categorized as different tiers, or classes, depending on the *type* of project and its origin: Tier 1 projects are policy initiatives and programs such as the 2008 UCSB Long Range

Development Plan (LRDP) and the City of Santa Barbara General Plan Update; Tier 2 projects are traditional discretionary projects; and Tier 3 projects include speculative projects such as proposed annexations.

iii. *City of Santa Barbara:* The City of Santa Barbara is currently completing its General Plan update (www.youplansb.org) which is called PlanSB. They expect to have it completed and approved by 2010. It is currently undergoing an environmental review.

- Some policy drivers for PlanSB are growth management, energy and climate change, community character; and economic and fiscal health.
- The Growth Management Element Goal is to balance growth with available resources such as water, energy, food, housing, and transportation. Neighborhoods will provide access to daily necessities, some commercial activity, transit and open space.
- The Housing Element will place new homes along or adjacent to transportation corridors for ease of mobility and will provide a wide range of housing options to retain the workforce and the City's cultural and ethnic diversity. The City needs to plan for 4888 new units as required by the State of California. Certain areas will be encouraged to build second units and other areas will reduce the size of residential units.
- PlanSB calls for establishing certain portions of Highway 192 as a State Scenic Highway.
- Upper State Street Study recommends maintaining and enhancing the character of upper State Street, including the streetscape, and focusing on multi-modal transportation opportunities.

iv. *City of Goleta:* The City of Goleta is also updating its General Plan: www.cityofgoleta.org.

- The Housing Element is being updated so that it can be approved by the State of California.
- It proposes changes to the Sphere of Influence, but the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) denied expanding its sphere of influence without actual plans for annexation.

v. *UCSB:* The 2008 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) has the potential to create a serious impact on Eastern Goleta Valley: www.ucsbvision2025.com. While the LRDP determines the physical development and change of the campus, the County of Santa Barbara provides the public services and infrastructure to support those changes: fire protection, public safety, roads, jail, mental health, etc...

- The County does not have jurisdiction over UCSB. The California Coastal Commission does have some say in the development plans. However, since UCSB does not pay taxes, the LRDP has the potential to cause significant financial difficulties for the County.
- The LRDP and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) were released March 20, 2008. Public review ended June 23, 2008. An updated draft EIR was released February 2009, and public review ended in March 2009. The County provided over 250 pages of comments to the University. The UC Regents will take up the plan during the Summer of 2009. The Coastal Commission will consider the matter by 2010.
- The UCSB LRDP anticipates a growth rate of 1% per year in student enrollment to a maximum of 25,000 by 2025. The current enrollment, including graduate students, is a little over 20,000. The total new added population is projected to be 11,106 including new students, faculty, staff and spouses. This total does not include indirect population growth that is required to support a new population the size of Carpinteria.
- Total new housing planned is 7,556 units/beds and 2.5 million square feet of new buildings: four times the size of the Camino Real Shopping Center.
- Concerns include the lag time in creating new housing for new students, faculty and staff; insufficient parking on campus, with most of the new parking being placed off-campus; growth inducing impacts and cumulative impacts; and public safety.
- 50% of crimes in the County are related to UCSB. The County will therefore require 11 new deputies for a total of 31, and nine new firefighters for a total of 24 to respond to the proposed new

development.

- The County estimates that 7000 additional peak hour trips will be generated by the new population, thereby having significant level of service (LOS) impacts on our local roadways.
- The resulting increase in water demand will be in excess of UCSB's service allotment.
- Estimated fiscal impacts to the County in capital improvements: \$90.4M for roads, \$12.7M for public safety, \$33.9M for miscellaneous including parks. UCSB has agreed to provide only \$1.1M of those costs.
- Estimated fiscal impacts to the County in operating costs: A deficit of \$8.3M annually. UCSB costs the County about \$17M annually but brings in about \$9M in revenue. UCSB has agreed to a one-time payment of less than \$1M.

vi. *Key Sites and Small Area Planning:* The 1993 Goleta Community Plan focused on Key Sites for development and planning. Only four of those Key Sites remain in Eastern Goleta Valley including More Mesa (Planned Development of 70 units), San Antonio Creak Road (Design Residential of 1 unit/acre, 29.45 acres), and St. Vincent/Cathedral Oaks (Design Residential of 1 unit/acre, 33 acres).

- The use of Key Sites helps on-site resource conservation for large areas/parcels. However, it misses opportunities to address area-wide neighborhood planning issues and is inflexible to community needs and is ill-suited for smaller parcels.
- The County Staff recommends that the new community plan be based on small area planning and form-based code. Such neighborhood plans are inclusive of many parcels and can cover existing development as well as future development or redevelopment. This also provides a means to recognize the unique needs, goals, and values of neighborhoods.
- Some small areas that can be considered for the new plan are the Hollister/Turnpike neighborhood including the Turnpike Shopping Center; Upper State Street/Hollister Avenue; and the Turnpike/Calle Real Corridors.

3. GVPAC Discussion: The GVPAC discussed several ongoing projects, including Haskell's Landing on Hollister Avenue and the update to the Santa Ynez Valley Community Plan. The definitions and intent of small-area planning and form-based code were further clarified. Form-based code requires more specificity for an area, not less. Considering a small area rather than a single parcel does not imply a new "zone" overlay for parcels within the small area under consideration. Neighborhoods can have various types of "overlays," including pedestrian overlays. Overlays do not necessarily have to be for development or zoning.

4. Public Comment:

a. *Shelly Cobb:* Ms. Cobb was interested in what was being done to publicize the GVPAC meetings. Mr. Johnson of the Office of Long Range Planning provided a general overview of what is being done, including sending of e-mail notifications to those who have signed up, and public announcements to the local newspapers as well as public television. Higher intensity public outreach efforts were done for select prior meetings and workshops and the update of the community plan in general. Similar efforts for public outreach will be conducted for future key meetings and workshops, including the July 11, 2009 workshop.

Ms. Cobb also wondered whether there would be a sufficient number of chairs for the upcoming workshop and whether or not the workshop was going to be recorded. She was also concerned that the workshop may be overly complex for the general public.

b. *Mary Whalen:* Ms. Whalen stated that she believes that holding the GVPAC meetings outside the boundary of Eastern Goleta Valley is preventing the residents from attending the meetings. She equated "nodes" for small area planning with zone districts. She also feared that overlays can open doors for future development that may be undesired. She suggested that commercial use of some land near Hope Ranch and the foothills may be appropriate to reduce traffic and congestion.

c. *Patti Close:* Ms. Close asked that the GVPAC consider the motivation of those who attend the upcoming workshop when weighing their input. She also questioned the rationale of rezoning agricultural land for the purpose of sustaining agriculture. She also suggested that if the 1993 Plan is sufficient, then it should not be

changed during this update.

- d. *Ann Crosby*: Ms. Crosby asked that the workshop questions be simple and easy to understand. She also suggested that the GVPAC and the County clearly state the manner in which the impacts of the UCSB LRDP will be mitigated. Ms. Crosby questioned the use of small area planning specifically in relationship to the Turnpike Shopping Center and the neighboring agricultural parcels. She preferred that certain sites, such as the Turnpike Shopping center be considered independent of neighboring parcels.

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.

Kenan Ezal, Ph. D.
Senior Scientist
Toyon Research Corporation
6800 Cortona Drive
Goleta, CA 93117-3021
Email: kezal@toyon.com
Tel: (805) 968-6787 x180
Fax: (805) 685-8089