

Subject: FW: GVPAC Eastern Goleta Valley Tour Highlights
From: "Kenan Ezal" <kezal@toyon.com>
Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2009 15:19:11 -0800
To: "Kenan Ezal (Home)" <Kenan.Ezal@cox.net>

Hello,

A clarification is in order on the San Marcos Foothills: The area is zoned for 75 homes, but only 15 are planned on 40 acres with 210 acres of public open space. The remaining space (127 acres) is for a private conservation area.

In addition, while visiting the San Antonio Creek Rd./Park Hill Estates areas there were some questions about why those areas have such low densities. There was also a comment about sharing some of the burden of higher density with areas like those. I believe the unofficial minutes of the workshop gives some good reasons why this is true. However, another reason is that planning usually only considers maximum densities that are allowed, not minimum densities that must be met, this gives the developer some freedom in choosing the type of housing that will be built.

-Kenan

Kenan Ezal
1109 North Patterson Avenue
Work: (805) 968-6787 x180
Home: (805) 964-2694
Email: Kenan.Ezal@cox.net

From: Kenan Ezal [mailto:Kenan.Ezal@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 3:43 AM
To: Kenan Ezal (Home)
Subject: GVPAC Eastern Goleta Valley Tour Highlights

Hello,

The GVPAC took a tour of the Goleta Valley on January 24, 2009. The public was allowed to attend and some joined us in the vans while others followed on their own.

Because there was no audio recording of the event and because I did not take a great deal of notes during the tour and instead tried to listen to what was being said I will point you to the very complete Unofficial Minutes of the Van Tour:

<http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/goleta/documents/GCP/Meeting%208%20Materials/Binder%20Material>

You should also take a look at the excellent Guidebook compiled by County Staff (Erika Leachman):

<http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/planareas/goleta/documents/GCP/Van%20Tour/Guidebook.pdf>

I've added a few more observations for each of the stops below:

1. *Turnpike Shopping Center:* It was noted that recent planning design methods require more trees and "structure" in shopping centers. For example more buildings are placed around the circumference of a shopping center with a parking lot in the middle. Circulation within the parking lot is intentionally restricted to slow traffic down. The Turnpike Shopping Center is due for a facelift and some renovation. Mixed use development was considered at one time but has not been pursued. Some members of the public noted that they did not want to change the way things are today.
2. *Hollister Ave/Upper State St. Commercial Area:* The railroad bridge is a known "choke point" for traffic. Local residents stated that they re-arrange their schedules whenever possible to avoid Hollister at certain times of the day. This is also the entryway to Upper State Street and the City of Santa Barbara. Planning should be done in cooperation with the city. One business is a result of a successful conversion from a gas station and is now a café.

3. *San Marcos Foothills/Preserve*: 75 homes are planned within a 377 acre area with a county-owned open space. The primary concern is the single exit over a bridge violating the multiple egress/ingress requirement desired by the Fire Department.
4. *San Antonio Creek Rd/Pozzato Grassland*: The neighboring area was burned down during the Painted Cave fire and larger, two story homes were built instead of the more modest ranch-style homes that had existed earlier. This is a gated community and many of the homes require sprinkler systems for fire protection due to their size. The development of this area has occurred as planned by the 1993 Goleta Community Plan.
5. *Park Hill Estates*: This site is still in the process of being sold for development. A tentative tract map has been approved.
6. *Tuckers Grove County Park*: It was noted that there are very few neighborhood parks south of Highway 101 compared to north of Highway 101. However, the difficulties in obtaining funding to maintain a park were mentioned as a potential problem to overcome.
7. *Turnpike and Calle Real Commercial*: The In-N-Out parking lot was the original destination, but due to overcrowding a neighboring lot was used as the meeting point. This led to a discussion of trying to minimize Highway Commercial zones, especially in such close proximity to residential areas. Local residents did not believe that the Level of Service (LOS) rating could be as good as stated (A/B). A Carl's Jr. has been suggested for the empty lot on the corner of Turnpike and Calle Real. We also noted first-hand the extremely short light when travelling along Calle Real across Turnpike. This is due to the fact that highway traffic needs to clear the intersection at a faster rate than traffic on Calle Real.
8. *Forte Ranch*: Market-rate townhomes range between 1700 sq. ft. to 3500 sq. ft. Some affordable housing is also available. The flooding problems on the neighboring MTD property were discussed and attributed to the drainage problems of the Forte Ranch development.
9. *MTD*: There was a great deal of interesting discussion on the history of the MTD property. Much of this lot is now filled with soils from the Forte Ranch development. A lot to the west of the MTD property is designated as Multiple Family Residential 20.0 units per acre. Forte Ranch is 8.0 units per acre.
10. *Tatum/Santa Barbara School District*:
11. *San Marcos Growers*:
12. *Lane Farms*:

The history of these properties was discussed. One possibility mentioned (among others) was the creation of a park for a portion of the Tatum property. Many obstacles to development were mentioned including circulation and ease of access. The fact that some of these problems could be overcome if all three lots were planned coherently was also mentioned. It is also apparent that there is a great deal of resistance to any rezoning of Agricultural land by local residents. It was noted that San Marcos Growers does a significant amount of below-ground agriculture (in addition to above-ground agriculture). However, it was also recognized that the primary determination in agricultural viability is the soil quality, not the type of agricultural use currently being conducted on the land.
13. *South Patterson Agricultural Properties*: This area is restricted from residential development due to overhead air traffic to and from the Santa Barbara Airport. Commercial development is possible.
14. *More Mesa*: This area is currently undergoing an environmental study as permitted by the existing Community Plan to determine if the number of homes that can be built on the property can be increased from 70.

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.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG.

Version: 7.5.552 / Virus Database: 270.10.15/1923 - Release Date: 1/29/2009 7:13 AM

	Content-Description: "AVG certification" Content-Type: text/plain Content-Encoding: quoted-printable
--	---