

From: [Fermina Murray](#)
To: [Kim Dominguez](#); [City Clerk Group](#)
Cc: [Lisa Prasse](#); [Peter Imhof](#)
Subject: Planning Commission - Letter about Historic Preservation & Cultural Resources Ordinance
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 8:44:38 AM
Attachments: [Goleta Historic Preservation and Cultural Resource Ordinance - 12-13-20.doc](#)

Dear Mr. Dominguez and Honorable City Clerk:

Healthy greetings on this Monday morning, Dec. 14, 2020 (8:34 a.m.)!

I am sending you my letter (attached as word document) for distribution to the Chair and Members of the Planning Commission before their meeting tonight.

I request that the letter be acknowledged and a summary of it be **read into the record** during the Planning Commission meeting.

Thank you very much,
Fermina Murray
cellphone: 805-448-4011
442 Danbury Court
Goleta, CA 93117



Virus-free. www.avg.com

December 13, 2020

From: Fermina B. Murray
Historian, volunteer draft reviewer of Goleta Historic Context Statement
442 Danbury Court
Goleta, CA 93117

To: Goleta City Planning Commission
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Subject: Goleta Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Ordinance
Planning Commission Meeting, December 14, 2020

Dear Chair Katie Maynard and Commissioners:

I am writing to express deep gratitude to the City Council, the Planning Commission, and City Staff (Peter Imhof and Lisa Prasse) for continuing the diligent work on the Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Ordinance, despite daily challenges of the pandemic.

I am a local historian, former member of DRB, whose profession deals with historic resources studies, the same as the Historic Resources Group consultants who helped the City with the Historic Context Statement and this Draft Ordinance before you.

I concur with staff that even though the cultural resources provisions are not quite ready, it is wise for the Planning Commission to start the Preservation Ordinance discussion on the historic resources provisions. Implementing the foundation of the Ordinance today, followed by sessions in January and February 2021, will make it easier to incorporate the provisions of the cultural and landscape resources when the work in progress is completed.

The Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Ordinance is a robust preservation ordinance that the City should be very proud of. The community of Goleta has its own long and proud history of preserving and protecting its historic resources. In the mid-1960s the Stow House and Lake Los Carneros Preserve were slated to be developed as a golf course with luxury homes, and a grand driveway winding from the freeway to the front of the 1872 ranch house. In the 1990s Santa Barbara County declared Old Town Goleta to be a “blighted area” whose ills would be cured by gentrification. In both cases Goletans rose up and saved the ranch that is today’s jewel of the city; and Old Town has been embraced by the new city and became its first heritage district.

This ordinance is a milestone in the way it codifies the need to preserve and protect cultural and historic resources in our city. The sections of the ordinance dealing with historic context, identifying, listing, inventorying, and designating resources are well

thought out and clearly expressed. However, the part of the Ordinance that needs further consideration is that dealing with the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

The most visible problem I see concerning the creation and functioning of the Historic Preservation Commission concerns its powers and its relations with other City agencies and departments. As stated on page 7 (staff report) in the discussion of the Commission and the review process, it will be the primary body advising the City Council, the Planning Commission, the DRB, the City Manager, and all City departments on matters of preservation of historic resources. But: it cannot possibly protect our City's historic resources without being given the authority, the "teeth" if you will, to do so. Within the Commission's purview, on matters relating to historic preservation and resources, its decisions should be not "advisory" but binding, subject to appeal to the City Council. The HPC should not stand in a junior or supporting role to the DRB: it is an independent commission, equal to others in the City. Its expertise and areas of responsibility are of a different order than those of the DRB or the Planning Commission, for example.

The Staff report asks (p.10) whether a good model for the Commission is to be an advisory body that makes "recommendations" to the DRB following review of projects, or whether the HPC should use a review process more similar to that of the City of Santa Barbara [and its Historic Landmarks Commission]. I served 12 years on this Commission, and can vouch for its main strengths and effectiveness in protecting historic resources. Crucially, it has the power to enforce the policies of Santa Barbara's historic resources ordinance.

The main benefits of an independent Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for Goleta would be:

- To foster public appreciation of, and civic pride in, the beauty of the City of Goleta and the accomplishments of its past;
- To assist owners of historic resources properties with guidelines for repair, maintenance, remodel, or other exterior alterations proposed for the resources. To take the staff's example of a paint color of a historic structure, the HPC should help applicants in determining a proper paint color that is historically and architecturally appropriate to a historic resource --- it should be a quick free service that falls under repair and enhancement of a historic resource.
- To govern all the procedures, processes, and enforcement in all historical matters from the historic context statement, including such items as archaeological and cultural resources, cultural landscapes and historic trees, and identifying, listing, inventorying, and designating historic resources. It would also include demolition, adaptive-reuse, removal of properties from historic lists, preservation standards and treatments, and incentives for preserving historic resources (Mill Act)...all these endeavors become the tasks and duties carried out by the Historic Preservation Commission. It centers matters concerning historic resources and

preservation in a single body and saves the City from overlapping bureaucracy in its various departments, commissions, and advisory groups.

The Historic Preservation Commission represents the City's serious commitment to preserving and protecting cultural and historic resources for now and future generations. Therefore, I highly recommend that its make-up should have at least five members consisting of 1) an archaeologist or tribal member of the Band of Barbareno Chumash Indians (BBCI, Goleta holds their ancestral lands) 2) a qualified historian or architectural historian, 3) someone with knowledge of trees or landscape, and 4 & 5) two members of the public at large.

Thank you very much for your consideration of my letter. I am happy to assist you and the city staff in answering questions or providing useful information about the Ordinance work forthcoming in the next two months.

Sincerely yours,

Fermina B. Murray
Consultant Historian

cc: Lissa Prasse, Current Planning Manager, City of Goleta
Peter Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director, City of Goleta
Goleta Valley Historical Society Board of Directors
The Goodland Coalition

Public Comment No. 2
Item B.1 Historical Preservation and Cultural
Resources ORD

From: [Peter Imhof](#)
To: [Lisa Prasse](#)
Cc: [Kim Dominguez](#)
Subject: FW: Historic and Cultural Resource Ordinance and Resolution. Case no. 16-092-ORD
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 10:12:57 AM

From: George Relles <grelles@cox.net>
Sent: Saturday, December 12, 2020 11:37 AM
To: Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Fwd: Historic and Cultural Resource Ordinance and Resolution. Case no. 16-092-ORD

Peter,

I'm forwarding this because when I sent the original I listed you at the incorrect email address. I hope this time I have the right one. Best wishes.

----- Original Message -----

From: George Relles <grelles@cox.net>
To: efuller <efuller@cityofgoleta.org>, jfullerton <jfullerton@cityofgoleta.org>, "Smith, Jennifer" <jsmith@cityofgoleta.org>, Katie Maynard <kmaynard@cityofgoleta.org>, Ireyes-martin <lreyes-martin@cityofgoleta.org>
Cc: pimhoff@cityofgoleta.org, lprasse@cityofgoleta.org
Date: December 12, 2020 at 11:21 AM
Subject: Historic and Cultural Resource Ordinance and Resolution. Case no. 16-092-ORD

Dear Goleta Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to register my complete and total support for this important Historic and Cultural Resource Ordinance. In addition, by copy I want to offer my congratulations to Goleta staff and members of the public for their hard work in bringing forth this project to fruition.

Thank you for your careful consideration and approval of this ordinance.

Sincerely,

George Relles

Goleta Resident

Kim Dominguez

Subject: Support for Historic Preservation Ordinance

From: kathleen werner <kemily.werner@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 10:52 AM

To: City Clerk Group <cityclerkgroup@cityofgoleta.org>

Cc: Ed Fuller <efuller@cityofgoleta.org>; Jennifer Fullerton <jfullerton@cityofgoleta.org>; Jennifer Smith <jsmith@cityofgoleta.org>; Katie Maynard <kmaynard@cityofgoleta.org>; Ireyes-martin <Ireyes-martin@cityofgoleta.org>

Subject: Support for Historic Preservation Ordinance

City of Goleta Planning Commissioners,

I am in support of a "yes" vote on the planning commission's resolution to recommend adoption of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Goleta has worked hard to preserve many of our local historical sites. They are a big part of what makes Goleta such a special place. When family and friends visit, I am delighted to share with them my town, and many of the historical sites that our community has valued enough to preserve. The Stow House, the Railroad Depot, the Sister Witness tree help me to share the pride I have in my city.

This ordinance, if approved, will solidify the past work and continue to protect our local history.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Werner
Goleta

South Coast Railroad Museum

At the historic Goleta Depot



December 14, 2020

To: Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager
Planning Commission Members

Lisa and Commission Members –

The South Coast Railroad Museum is deeply interested in the Landmark Ordinance. We have been following the progress and have participated in the workshops and previous meetings of the Planning Commission and the City Council. We are glad that this process is moving ahead and is, in fact, nearing adoption of the ordinance.

We do have a few questions for you to consider. We are approaching the ordinance from a particular viewpoint as the operator of the Goleta Depot which is already on the National Register of Historic Places and would be adopted as a landmark under section 17.33.080 of the proposed ordinance. I say operator as the Goleta Depot is actually owned by the City of Goleta under the current lease agreement between the South Coast Railroad Museum and the City of Goleta.

1. Is the historical designation of the depot limited to the structure only?

Our Depot was originally located near the railroad and was moved to Lake Los Carneros Park in 1981. As such, the Depot building is the only historical part of the registration. There may be other historic buildings in the Goleta area which

have been moved or whose site holds little or no historic significance. Can a designation under the ordinance be limited to just the structure?

2. Will the ordinance impact or otherwise limit the development of the surrounding property as currently planned?

We have several structures on our leasehold that are not historic like our visitor center, storage sheds and the track for the Goleta Short Line miniature railroad. Would the ordinance limit any rehabilitation or replacement of such structures. This might apply to other properties which wish to add structures to their designated property. Another example is the Sexton House which has added most of their hotel rooms to the back of the historic house.

3. What about the use of the depot for onsite events (weddings and fundraising)?

Will the ordinance limit the use of a designated property or can other compatible uses take place on the property? The Goleta Historical Society often hosts weddings and concerts on the grounds of the Stow House. These activities seem completely compatible with the historic nature of the structure.

4. Will the ordinance limit our ability to convert the Freight & Baggage room to a meeting space as planned?

The Goleta Depot has changed internal configurations several times - most recently when the Depot was relocated to Lake Los Carneros Park in 1981. At that time the large freight room was subdivided and used for office, store, theater and model railroad exhibit. We have been planning to open up the space more towards what it was originally and make it into a community meeting room. This appears to be a "restoration" under the definitions within the ordinance. This might also be a question of addition of electrical systems to today's code and installation of fire suppression equipment when appropriate – all while maintaining the historical character of the structure. Would such changes be acceptable under the ordinance?

We will probably have other questions as the process progresses. We appreciate your work toward preserving the historical nature of parts of Goleta that add to the character of the area we value as the Goodland.

Thanks for your consideration.

Bruce Morden, Vice-President
South Coast Railroad Museum

Public Comment No. 5
Item B.1 Historical Preservation and Cultural
Resources ORD

From: [Lisa Prasse](#)
To: [Kim Dominguez](#)
Subject: FW: Historic Preservation Ordinance
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 3:30:01 PM

Here is another letter in case you did not receive it directly.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mary Ellen Brooks <mebrooks@sbceo.org>
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Lisa Prasse <lprasse@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Historic Preservation Ordinance

Dear Ms. Prasse, Citizens Planning Association supports the process for establishing a historic preservation ordinance for the City of Goleta. We hope to have formulated our suggestions by the next scheduled meeting in January 2021. CPA looks forward to participating throughout the planning process. Regards, Marell Brooks, President, Citizens Planning Association, 916 Anacapa Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93105

From: tom.modugno
To: Lisa.Prasse
Subject: Goleta History
Date: Saturday, December 12, 2020 8:51:56 AM

Hi,

I was looking over the list of historic "structures" and it lists the corner of Hollister and Coromar, and it mentions the Hollister Arch, but does it include the arch? It's at a different location. I think the arch is very important historically and I hope it will be included.

Also, I see the Witness Tree, but again no mention of Kate's Cactus. Here is a link to a story I did on it and why it's historically significant.

[Kate Bell's Cactus – Goleta History](#)

Thanks,

Tom Modugno
www.goletahistory.com

From: [chris.madsen](#)
To: [Lisa Prasse](#)
Subject: Re: December 14, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda Materials
Date: Thursday, December 10, 2020 6:59:54 PM
Attachments: [image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Lisa Prasse

12/10/2020

As per our correspondence I understand that the cottage on my property at 50 S. Fairview is being considered to being placed on a list of historic structures.

Please feel free to share my sentiments on the above consideration, prior to the scheduled December 14 hearing.

I am opposed to the idea of crediting the cottage with a historic status for the following reasons:

- 1) While the cottage is vintage (my understanding is that it is 1920's) it is certainly not in pristine **original** condition, and may not do a good job of representing the original construction design.
- 2) It was originally constructed as a low quality, budget style cottage, with no recognized designer, and completely lacking of any quality construction characteristics.
- 3) The cottage, along with some others on the property, are deteriorating to, or beyond their intended and expected life span. The building was originally constructed as an absolute economy, low quality cottage. It was never intended to last this long, and it certainly has a limited number of usable years of use left. As a landlord I have to ensure safe, and healthy living conditions. Due to dry rot, termites, the low quality of the original construction, and simply the limited life span of the construction materials, renovation is not a feasible option. To replace siding, simply exposes framing that needs to be replaced which involves removing the interior plaster- at which point there is no building. The raised foundation is in similar condition. But to replace it would mean lifting the house, which would be a herculean project, and as stated the house is not worth saving. The only feasibly, sensible way to "preserve" this style cottage would be to remove all of the old wood and replace it with new wood – basically start from scratch and clone the cottage; which is in nobody's best interest.

I love history and preserving it, and I have an extensive knowledge of vintage woodwork construction. I spent 6 years, 20,000 hours rebuilding a sixty foot 1916 sailboat and published and extensive, multi-award winning book about the project. (see rowdystory.com if interested) and I can guarantee you there is nothing worth saving or preserving on this cottage. It doesn't have the pedigree, it is of poor construction, and there are no good "bones".

- 4) Prior to this conversation my analysis of the property indicated a limited number of useable years left in the structures (including 50 So. Fairview). Being a lover of history, if I thought preservation was an option, I would have considered it. But I determined that for the health and safety of tenants, what was best for tenants and the City of Goleta was to eventually demo

the aging structures and rebuild with multi-family units that would accommodate more than three times the number of tenants. I have already had a consultation with the City of Goleta on such a redevelopment, and they were very receptive and indicated, with the desperate need for more housing, the project would probably be well received and have the support of the City of Goleta.

5) In summation I think consideration has to be given to what is more in the best interest of the City of Goleta:

A) To remove existing aging structures which house 7 families and replace with living accommodations for 20 families or

B) Assign a historic designation to an economy budget, low quality, poorly constructed cottage, that is in aging condition and has but a limited number of years left in its usable lifespan – which would have a negative impact on the above.

Thank you

Chris Madsen

On Thursday, December 10, 2020, 04:23:49 PM PST, Lisa Prasse <lprasse@cityofgoleta.org> wrote:

The technical issues has been addressed and the links in the Agenda are working here:

https://goleta.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=goleta_469f0f168d2d852a4573fecbacba1ac0.pdf&view=1

From: Lisa Prasse

Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 3:51 PM

Cc: Kim Dominguez <kdominguez@cityofgoleta.org>

Subject: RE: December 14, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda Materials

I apologize that there appears to be technical issues with all of the embedded links in the Planning Commission agenda on the City's meeting page. The City Clerk's office is checking into this issue now. I will send another email when this technical issue is fixed. Once it is fixed, you should be able to click on the Agenda Item B 1 (Legistar Agenda Number 20-462), which will take you to all of the materials.

Also this same information has been published on the Historic Preservation Meetings and Workshop and Project Update webpages (<https://www.cityofgoleta.org/projects-programs/historic-preservation/news-outreach/meetings-workshops> and <https://www.cityofgoleta.org/projects-programs/historic-preservation/news-outreach/project-updates>). These links on these pages seem to be working currently.

Lisa

Lisa Prasse, AICP

Current Planning Manager

City of Goleta

130 Cremona Drive Suite B

City of Goleta CA 93117

lprasse@cityofgoleta.org

805-961-7542



During the current local public health emergency, City Hall offices are closed and staff is working remotely. We will respond to inquiries at our earliest opportunity. Thank you for patience during this challenging time.

From: Lisa Prasse

Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 3:01 PM

Cc: Kim Dominguez <kdominguez@cityofgoleta.org>

Subject: December 14, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda Materials

As promised, below is the link to the above Planning Commission Agenda which has the information regarding how to participate in the virtual meeting. The Agenda also includes an embedded link to the Staff Report and Historic Preservation materials.

https://goleta.granicus.com/DocumentViewer.php?file=goleta_e6a7aba43f474c43ae92c948a9493cd1.pdf&view=1

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Lisa

Lisa Prasse, AICP

Current Planning Manager

City of Goleta

130 Cremona Drive Suite B

City of Goleta CA 93117

lprasse@cityofgoleta.org

805-961-7542



During the current local public health emergency, City Hall offices are closed and staff is working remotely. We will respond to inquiries at our earliest opportunity. Thank you for patience during this challenging time.