

From: Ingeborg E. Cox MD, MPH

City Council meeting March 20, 2018 Item C1

Draft General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan 2017 Progress Report

City of Goleta

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

On November 6, 2012 the residents of Goleta voted in favor of Measure G2012. Why is it that the Goleta Heritage Farmlands Initiative that prohibits the change of land use designation for “Agriculture” lands which are ten acres or more is NOT integrated into the General Plan? It appears that it is a stand-alone policy and runs the risk of being overlooked.

The General Plan has been amended a total of seventeen times since its adoption in 2006.

Staff states in the fifth paragraph of the Introduction on page 13 of the 162-page document regarding Measure G 2012 “This amendment to the General Plan added a new Land Use policy”, in my opinion this should NOT be a standalone policy but should be added to the General Plan in the Land Use Element.

Only the planners that have been with the City for more than seven years would remember that this happened. Anything that is an amendment to the General Plan should be placed in the General Plan where it belongs.

According to Table B *Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress Permitted Units issued by Affordability* in 2017 only Above Moderate Income Level Units were built. Why are these units NOT Deed Restricted? In the other categories: Very Low, Low, and Moderate Income Level you see that they can be Deed Restricted. The Table also shows ZERO units being constructed in the Very Low, Low, Moderate income level. Have the citizens that need low income and very low income housing been forgotten in 2017? Who benefits from this?

HE 1.3 Monitor and Preserve Assisted Affordable Housing Units. In the explanation it is stated that “when units are determined to be at risk of conversion to market rate status, the City will work with the property owners and other parties to extend the affordability covenants to the extend feasible. Can deed restriction be used?

LU-IA-5 Transfer of Development Rights Ordinance/Program. According to staff “this measure is intended to create an ordinance...for transfer of development rights from parcels within Goleta that may not be buildable due to policy limitations.” Why is this ordinance even mentioned? The City should not create this new Ordinance.

OS-IA-1 Preparation and Adoption of New Zoning Code. It states in the explanation “the new zoning code may include an open space overlay”. BUT in the Summary for 2017 we read the New Zoning Ordinance **does not include** an Open Space Overlay section. If that is the case, should not OS-IA-1 be

deleted?

SE-IA-1 Safety Element New Zoning Code. It states in the explanation that the new zoning code should include regulations for an airport approach overlay zone. Regulations creating an “AE” Airport Environs Overlay District will be included. Has the City currently regulations for an overlay zone for airline approach and take off? Are they being followed?

Deborah Lopez

To: Deborah Lopez
Subject: RE: GP/Coastal Land Use Plan 2017 Progress Report

From: Victor Cox
Sent: Monday, March 19, 12:20 PM
Subject: GP/Coastal Land Use Plan 2017 Progress Report
To: Kyle Richards, Stuart

Salutations Kyle and Stuart,

The so-called 162-page "progress report" that apparently was attached to the March 20th Council agenda only last week raises many questions for me.

First, and perhaps most important, what effect does it have on City policies to include proposed but unofficial new ordinances, such as the one on merging development rights of parcels, into a housing progress report for the state? It seems to me that some of these ideas need full public airing and Council consideration before they should even be mentioned to state agencies like the OPR or HCD.

What happened to the Council policy of giving ample public notice for upcoming lengthy and complex documents? This "report," which is scheduled for the afternoon session, makes a sham of that oft-proclaimed procedure, especially if the City is truly "required" to submit the annual update by April 1.

The Planning Commission only considered it on its Feb. 26 session. While it voted in favor of forwarding it with minor changes, there was only minor discussion of the report's content.

However, there is at least one mistake with the resolution's text you'll be considering:

The ninth "whereas" clause in the resolution before the Council has a false date: "WHEREAS, on March 20, 2018, the Planning Commission considered the contents of the General Plan 2017 Progress Report ("Progress Report") a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1, considered oral and written comments from interested persons, and recommended that the City Council approve and direct submittal of the Progress Report to the OPR and HCD, consistent with the requirements of California Government Code Section 65400(a)."

If the housing element's data is correct it also seems to reveal an emphasis on permitting and building upscale, expensive housing first. You may note that moderate to low-cost housing was virtually unrepresented in 2017. Why is that?

A modest suggestion: Since this report is said to be due in Sacramento on April 1, seek an extension of the deadline. This would provide the public and the Council a fuller opportunity to digest the progress report's contents and how adequate are its housing plans. What do you think?

Thank you,

Vic Cox
805-968-1109