




# City of Goleta

## Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance

Planning Commission Workshop 4 of 7



**Presentation By:**  
**Peter Imhof**  
**Anne Wells**  
**Andy Newkirk**  
**J. Ritterbeck**

**March 21, 2019**

# Public Outreach

January 31<sup>st</sup>: Release of Revised Draft NZO

February 4<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup>: NZO Open Houses

- *More Open Houses to be scheduled, if needed*

**February 25<sup>th</sup> – April 18<sup>th</sup>: PC Workshops**

- *Stakeholder Meetings to-date: EDC, SyWest, Bacara/Ritz*
- *Future Stakeholder meetings: Goleta Chamber of Commerce, Goodland Coalition*
- *Public Comment Summary*

May 7<sup>th</sup>: Joint Planning Commission / City Council Workshop

Mid-year → end of 2019: NZO Adoption Packet Prep & Hearings

# Public Comments

[www.GoletaZoning.com](http://www.GoletaZoning.com)



## Welcome to Goleta's New Zoning Ordinance

The City of Goleta's New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) project is a collaborative process that will revise citywide zoning regulations to implement the General Plan, update development and design standards and permitting procedures, and help realize the community's vision for the future – a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community with a robust local economy and a sustainable relationship with the environment.

The City has completed outreach activities on the Public Review Draft Zoning Ordinance (NZO) and Map. All comments received on the Public Review Draft were considered collectively. In consideration of public input and guided by the City's adopted General Plan, the Revised Draft NZO was released to the public on January 31, 2019. Release materials include:

- [Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance \(NZO\)](#)
- [Zoning Map](#)
- [Zoning Overlay Districts Map](#)
- [Overview of Changes](#)
- [Response to Planning Commission Comment](#)
- [Response to Public Comment](#)
- [User's Guide](#)
- [Key Issues Guide](#)
- [Underline-Strikethrough Revised Draft NZO Comparing Prior Draft](#)

Hard copies are available for viewing at Goleta City Hall (Planning Counter) and at the Goleta Library. Hard copies are also available for purchase at Goleta City Hall (Planning Counter).

## News

### Revised Draft NZO

The City has released the Revised Draft NZO for public review. Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

Open houses and public comment. Refer to the [Documents](#) page for more information.

## City Council: Project Update and Adoption Process

On April 17, 2017, the City Council discussed a proposed schedule for adoption of the New Zoning Ordinance and provided a revised schedule for staff



## Public Comments

**Please Note: All comments received will be published on this page.**

### Submit Public Comments

To submit your comment on the zoning ordinance program, enter your contact information below.

Name: \*

Email: \*

Enter email address

☐ Check here to receive email updates

Subject: \*

Message: \*

Submit

## Contact

Home Project Documents Meetings FAQs Public

## Comments Received

All public comments received for the New Zoning Ordinance project have been listed below.

2019  
Public Comment Log (received by March 18)  
Response to Public Comments (received by March 18)

**March**  
Robert Atkinson - 3/7  
Tara Messing - 3/8  
Cecilia Brown and Barbara Massey - 3/9  
Eileen Monahan - 3/12  
Cecilia Brown - 3/15  
Eric Torbet - 3/18  
**February**  
Cecilia Brown - 2/8  
Mike Pollard - 2/8  
Cecilia Brown and Barbara Massey - 2/11  
Fermina Murray - 2/11  
David Low - 2/13  
K. Graham - 2/13  
Cecilia Brown and Barbara Massey - 2/21  
Thomas Toomey - 2/21

City Responses to Public Comments

Comments	City Response
<b>Comment:</b> The current text of the ordinance regarding the use of the term "substantial" is inconsistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community. The term "substantial" is not defined in the ordinance and is not used in the general plan. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.	<b>City Response:</b> The term "substantial" is defined in the ordinance as "a project that is not consistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community." The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.

City Responses to Public Comments

Comments	City Response
<b>Comment:</b> The current text of the ordinance regarding the use of the term "substantial" is inconsistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community. The term "substantial" is not defined in the ordinance and is not used in the general plan. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.	<b>City Response:</b> The term "substantial" is defined in the ordinance as "a project that is not consistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community." The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.

City Responses to Public Comments

Comments	City Response
<b>Comment:</b> The current text of the ordinance regarding the use of the term "substantial" is inconsistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community. The term "substantial" is not defined in the ordinance and is not used in the general plan. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.	<b>City Response:</b> The term "substantial" is defined in the ordinance as "a project that is not consistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community." The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.

City Responses to Public Comments

Comments	City Response
<b>Comment:</b> The current text of the ordinance regarding the use of the term "substantial" is inconsistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community. The term "substantial" is not defined in the ordinance and is not used in the general plan. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.	<b>City Response:</b> The term "substantial" is defined in the ordinance as "a project that is not consistent with the general plan's vision for a safe, beautiful, vibrant and livable community." The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community. The term "substantial" is used in the ordinance to describe the impact of a proposed project on the community.

# Agenda

## Staff Overview, Questions, and Comments by Topic:

- ESHA
- Open Space
- Height
- Floor Area
- Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges
- Outdoor Storage


*Agenda Suggestion: Commission discussion and public comment to follow each topic listed above*

# ESHA



# ESHA

## Streamside Protection Areas



### Reduces Flooding

Riparian areas lessen the damage from flooding by slowing runoff, enabling water to soak into the ground, and absorbing excess flow during flood events.



### Filters Pollutants

Vegetated areas filter and trap sediments, chemicals and other pollutants from runoff. Dissolved nutrients, such as nitrogen or phosphorus, chemically bond with soil and are taken up by plants before they can enter an aquifer.




### Helps Wildlife




Riparian forests in California support a greater diversity of wildlife than any other habitat type and function as primary migration routes for most wildlife. Only 1 percent of the land is riparian, yet over 90 percent of the animals are dependent on these areas for survival.



# ESHA


Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Overall Framework			
<b>Chapter 17.30</b> (page IV-39)	ESH-GOL and RC-GOL overlays taken from the County's 1993 Goleta Community Plan for development within mapped ESHA.	ESHA-specific Chapter added. Includes standards for various ESHA, requirements for Initial Site Assessment Screenings and Biological Studies, and specific mitigation, restoration and monitoring requirements.	The standards and procedures in the draft NZO are designed to fully implement the General Plan Conservation Element.
<b>Section 17.30.070(B)</b> (page IV-45)	No specific standard in Inland.  In Coastal, 100 feet for streams in urban areas, which can be adjusted up or down based on four factors (not based on proposed development).	100-foot default setback  Can be reduced, but not less than 25 feet, with approval of Major CUP.  	Allowance to reduce SPA buffer consistent with General Plan policy CE 2.2 with high burden of Major CUP, for a setback less than 100 feet, which will trigger CEQA review. Staff could review the language allowing for SPA buffer reductions to further clarify in what instances the Planning Commission could approve a reduction.

# ESHA

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Initial Site Assessment			
<p><b>Section 17.30.030</b> (page IV-40)</p>	<p>Development within ESHA Overlays require application information to determine potential impacts to ESHA.</p> 	<p>Trigger for Biological Study is development within 300 feet of ESHA.</p> <p>In previous draft, the trigger was for a Biological Study where development within 100 feet of ESHA.</p> 	<p>Trigger expanded to include development beyond the actual ESHA. This reflects the reality that new development outside of, but near ESHA could still have negative impacts on the ESHA.</p> <p>The City could alter the distance from ESHA that triggers a Biological Study so as to impact fewer projects that may be less likely to impact ESHA, similar to the previous draft NZO.</p> <p>Staff could also develop an additional ESHA overlay. However, such an overlay may not include all actual ESHA and would need to be updated whenever ESHA is either identified, changed, or removed. In addition, the General Plan already includes a figure for mapped ESHA that can guide enforcement of this development standard (see General Plan Figure 4-1).</p> 



# ESHA

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Fencing			
<b>Section 17.30.050(J)</b> (page IV-44)	No specific fencing regulations with potential to impact ESHA.  	Prohibited in EHSA or ESHA buffer.  Where potential to impact ESHA, height limit of 40 inches; 14-inch ground clearance, no solid or chain-link fences allowed.	Intent of regulation is to ensure adequate passage for animals accessing ESHA, which are common wildlife corridors. Planning Commission comment did note concern regarding rodents from gaining access to private yards.  The standard could be removed or further limited so as to not have such an impact on private property owners.

# ESHA

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Grading and Grubbing			
<b>Section 17.24.100</b> (page IV-9)	<p>Inland:</p> <p>No standards unless within the ESH-GOL Overlay.</p> <p>Within ESH-GOL:</p> <p>LUP. Vegetation Removal of up to 1-acre or 50-499 linear feet of creek bank; grading of more than 50 cubic yards, but less than 1,500; or removal of native trees of over 6-inch DBH or in Butterfly habitat.</p> <p>Minor CUP. Vegetation removal of more than 1-acre or more than 500 linear feet of creek bank; or grading of more than 1,500 cubic yards.</p> <p>Coastal Zone. Standards for general sensitive habitat protections, prohibited uses within habitat area, and required buffers for new development.</p>	<p>Exempt. More than 500 feet from ESHA.</p> <p>Zoning Clearance. Between 100 and 500 feet of ESHA.</p> <p>LUP/CDP. Within 100 feet, but not abutting ESHA.</p> <p>Minor CUP. Blanket requirement within or adjacent to ESHA.</p>	<p>The NZO includes new provisions for grading and grubbing within the City even if not associated with a larger project, which would likely trigger different levels of review, depending on the development's proximity to any protected resource (e.g., ESHA, Cultural, Historic, etc.).</p>



# ESHA

## **Please consider the following:**

1. NZO incorporates the objective development standards from the General Plan, but allows case-by-case analysis of potential impacts through the CEQA process.
2. Should the 14-inch fence clearance for animal passage be retained, removed, or modified?
3. Are the Grading and Grubbing standards sufficient?
4. Are there other ESHA issues that need to be discussed?

# OPEN SPACE



# Open Space

Open Space Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Methodology	New Methodology	Explanation
Minimum Dimension			
Section 17.03.140 (page I-17)	None required.	<p>Private open space must have horizontal dimensions of six feet or more.</p> <p>Common open spaces must have horizontal dimensions of 20 feet or more and less than 10 percent average slope.</p>	Ensures that for common open space, the requirement isn't met by aggregating small areas, such as landscaping islands or detention basins, that are not truly for the use and enjoyment of all residents.

# Open Space



# Open Space

Open Space Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Methodology	New Methodology	Explanation
Required Amount			
Section 17.07.050(B) (page II-6) and 17.07.060(B) (page II-7)	<b>DR Design Residential District</b> 40% of net area of property as common open space; Private patios equal to 20% of gross floor area of residence (if condo, stock coop, or community apartments).  <b>PRD Planned Residential Development District</b> At least 40% in common and/or public open space.	<b>RM Medium-Density Residential District</b> 150 sq. ft. Common and 60 sq. ft. of private open space per unit.  <b>RH High-Density Residential District</b> 100 sq. ft. common and 60 sq. ft. of private open space per unit.  <b>RMHP Mobile Home Park District</b> 100 sq. ft. total per unit, at least 60 sq. ft. must be private open space.	The proposed methodology in the NZO relies on a requirement of open space per dwelling unit (or resident), rather than as a percentage of the lot for residential uses. This better reflects the intent of this requirement as an amenity for the residents on site.  The standard could be re-termed to "Amenity Space" to better reflect the intent of this requirement and not confuse it with City Open Space.
Table 17.08.030 (page II-15)	<b>VS Visitor-Serving Commercial</b> 40% public and/or common open space.	<b>VS Visitor-Serving Commercial District</b> 40% common open space.	
Section 17.24.120 (page IV-10)		<b>Mixed-Use Development</b> 60 sq. ft of common/private where 40% or less floor area is residential. If more than 40%, apply RH standard.	
Section 17.41.210(B) (page IV-142)		<b>Large Residential Care Facilities</b> 50 sq. ft. common open space per resident.	




# Open Space





# Open Space

Open Space Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Methodology	New Methodology	Explanation
Definition			
<p><b>Section 17.73.020</b> (page VI-42)</p>	<p>Common open space includes a variety of recreational space, but notably excludes “other developed areas”, which has caused confusion in the past.</p> <p>Private open space is defined as patios, decks, and yards for use of individual dwelling units.</p>	<p>Common Open Space is areas for outdoor living and recreation intended for the use of residents and guests of more than one dwelling unit. Typically, these areas consist of landscaped areas, walks, patios, swimming pools, playgrounds, turf, or other improvements to enhance the outdoor environment of the development.</p> <p>Private Open Space is areas for outdoor living and recreation that are adjacent and directly accessible to and for the exclusive use of a single dwelling unit. Typically, these areas consist of courtyards, balconies, decks, patios, fenced yards, and other similar areas</p>	<p>The updated definition of common open space provides some clarity as to the scope of what areas may count towards an open space requirement.</p> <p>Rather than excluding “other developed areas”, the proposed definition is broad enough to include areas that improve the outdoor environment.</p> <div>  </div>

# Open Space


## Please consider the following:

1. Should area requirements be adjusted
2. Should staff rename the “Open Space” requirement to “Amenity Space” in the NZO?
3. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?

# HEIGHT

# Height

- Rules of Measure (§17.03.100)
- Maximum Building/Structure Heights
  - *Residential* (§17.07.030)
  - *Commercial* (§17.08.030)
  - *Office* (§17.09.030)
  - *Industrial* (§17.10.030)
  - *Public/Quasi-Public* (§17.11.030)
  - *Open Space/Agricultural* (§17.12.030)
  - *Airport Overlay* (§17.16.060)
  - *Hospital Overlay* (§17.18.040)
  - *Accessory Structures* (§17.24.020)
  - *Exceptions to Height Limits* (§17.24.080)
  - *Fences, Walls, Hedges* (§17.24.090)
- Heights for Lighting (§17.35.050)
- Signs (Chapter 17.40)
- Telecommunication Facilities (§17.42.030)





# Height

## Height Comparison


### Measuring Height

### Existing Methodology

Currently, the height measurement is taken from average finished grade under the building to the highest points of the coping of a flat roof or the mean height of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof.

### New Methodology [Non-Sloped Lot]

Height measurement is taken from the average elevation of the highest and lowest point of existing grade under the building to the highest point of the roof, with a slight variation for structures on slopes.



# Height

## Height Comparison


### Measuring Height

#### Existing Methodology



Currently, the height measurement is taken from average finished grade under the building to the highest points of the coping of a flat roof or the mean height of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof.

#### New Methodology [Sloped Lot]

Height measurement is taken from the average elevation of the highest and lowest point of existing grade under the building to the highest point of the roof, with a slight variation for structures on slopes.



# Height



## BUILDING HEIGHT CALCULATIONS

Elevations taken from the finish grade to the mean height of the highest gable.

A = 20'      E = 26'  
 B = 26'      F = 20'  
 C = 26'      G = 20'  
 D = 26'

Total heights = 164  
 164 divided by 7

Building height = 23.5'

### Definitions


**Building Height:** The vertical distance from the average finish grade of the lot covered by the building to the highest points of the coping of a flat roof or the mean height of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof. For buildings constructed on stepped pads (with various finished grades and multiple roof heights), building height is determined by measurements taken every thirty (30) feet around the entire footprint so the highest roof height for a total average building height.

Chimneys, elevator and stair housings, church spires and similar architectural projections may be fifty (50) feet in height in all zone districts where such excess heights are not prohibited by the F(Airport) or VC (View Corridor) overlay districts.

# Height

Height Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standard	New Standard	Explanation
Height Exceptions			
Section 17.24.080 (page IV-6)	Elevators and stair housing, antennae, flagpoles, monuments, oil and gas derricks, church spires, wind turbines, and similar architectural features can be up to 50 feet in all districts.	Projections based on height above structure, not an absolute height as is currently allowed.  Chimneys, decorative features, spires, and rooftop open space – 20% above structure height.  Elevator(s) and stair towers – 10 feet.  Flagpoles regulated in Sign Chapter.	Proposed standards better limit projections and regulate based on the structure to ensure they are proportional. For instance, in a district with a 35 foot height standard, architectural projections now are permitted to 50 feet. Under the proposed regulations, the projection would be allowed to go to 42 feet.
Section 17.03.100 (page I-12)	No existing standard.	When the roof of the structure exhibits a pitch of 4:12 (rise to run) or greater, an additional three feet may be added to the applicable height limit.	Due to change in how height is measured, this provision incentivizes non-flat roofs.

Roof Pitch:  
rise / span





# Height

Height Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standard	New Standard	Explanation
Height Modifications			
<b>Section 17.62.020(B)(1)</b> (page V-51)	Up to 10% increase in District height standard; approved by Zoning Administrator.	Up to 50% increase in District height standard, approved by Planning Commission	<p>Exceptions to Height (and Lot Coverage) standards must be approved by Resolution (pursuant to the General Plan). The Zoning Administrator does not adopt resolutions, so these two modifications must go to a higher review authority than in the existing zoning ordinances.</p> <p>Because of the higher Review Authority, the potential modification is higher (50%) than existing. This could be reduced closer to the existing allowed modification.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> If a project is processed through a Development Plan, the height standards could also be modified through that process and not bound to the stand-alone Modification limits.</p>
<div> <div> <u>10 percent</u>            25 feet = 27.5 feet            30 feet = 33 feet            35 feet = 38.5 feet         </div> <div> <u>20 percent</u>            25 feet = 30 feet            30 feet = 36 feet            35 feet = 42 feet         </div> <div> <u>30 percent</u>            25 feet = 32.5 feet            30 feet = 39 feet            35 feet = 45.5 feet         </div> <div> <u>40 percent</u>            25 feet = 35 feet            30 feet = 42 feet            35 feet = 49 feet         </div> <div> <u>50 percent</u>            25 feet = 37.5 feet            30 feet = 45 feet            35 feet = 52.5 feet         </div> </div>			

# Height

## **Please consider the following:**

1. Is there consensus on the new height methodology?
2. Any edits needed for the exceptions to the height requirements?
3. Any change to the “up to 50%” height Modification?
4. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?


# FLOOR AREA

# Floor Area


Floor Area Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
<p><b>Section 17.03.080</b> (page I-11)</p> <p>Applied throughout the Revised Draft NZO.</p>	<p>Floor area distinguishes between gross and net:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross is measured to the surface of interior walls and includes corridors, stairways, elevator shafts, attached garages, porches, balconies, basements, and offices.</li> <li>Net excludes vents, shafts, stairs, corridors, attics, and unenclosed porches and balconies.</li> </ul> <p>Gross is the common form of floor area use. Net are references only in a couple instances.</p>	<p>Floor area is calculated as one measurement taken from the interior of the surrounding exterior wall of a structure, with some exclusions (e.g., mechanical rooms, below-grade crawl spaces) and counting stair and elevator space once regardless of the number of stories.</p>	<p>The Revised NZO approach provides a clear standard for all floor area related standards throughout Title 17.</p> <p>Simplifying the term to use one rule of measurement provides clarity. However, the City could revise the definition, including lining up the Floor Area measurement with the existing definition of Gross Floor Area which is currently used extensively in the existing Zoning Ordinances.</p>

# Floor Area


**800 sq.ft**



**667.5 sq.ft**



**690 sq.ft**






# Floor Area

## Please consider the following:

1. Should the methodology for calculating floor area be revised?
2. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?

# FENCES, FREESTANDING WALLS, AND HEDGES

# Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges

Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Within the Front Setback			
Section 17.24.090(A)(1) (page IV-7)	<p>Exempt if fence or wall is 6 feet or less and gatepost is less than 8 feet in height.</p> <p>If greater than 6 feet in height, Minor CUP Required.</p>	<p>Same standard as existing, subject to ensuring adequate vision clearance and additional clarification for how heights are measured in different scenarios.</p> 	<p>The existing standard brought forward with the Revised Draft NZO to ensure consistency.</p> <p>The City could consider further limit the height of fences in the front setback to reflect the less rural nature of the City as compared to the County and to address the walling off of properties from the public right-of-way.</p> <p>PW staff supports requiring at least a Zoning Clearance for fences, walls, or hedges over 3 feet in height when located within a front or street side setback.</p>

# Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges

Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Materials			
Section 17.24.090(B) (page IV-8)	No existing standards.	With limited exceptions, limitations on the use of chain link and concrete/masonry block. Requirement for more-finished side to be facing outward.	Design elements added to ensure aesthetic quality of fencing as many fences and walls will not need permits and not get reviewed by DRB.
Hedges			
Section 17.24.090 (B)(4) (page IV-8)	Fence development standards include Walls, but not Hedges.	Hedges now included with fences and walls in terms of heights and permit requirements.	The addition of hedges is intended to clear up a gap in existing regulations within the City. The City could revise this section to provide different height standards and/or permit requirements for hedges.



# Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges






# Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges

Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Vision Clearance			
Section 17.24.090(D) (page IV-8) and Section 17.24.210	<p><b>Inland</b> – Corner lot vision triangle in all zones: 10 feet</p> <p><b>Coastal</b> – Corner lot vision triangle: AG &amp; RES Districts: 10 feet. All other zone districts: 7 feet.</p> <p>Height limit in vision triangle: Inland – 3 feet; Coastal – 4 feet.</p>	The NZO defers to the Public Works Department for determining the appropriate vision triangle dimensions for new development.	<p>The deference to Public Works reflects the reality that the vision clearance requirements in the existing Zoning Ordinances are inadequate.</p> <p>Staff could work further with Public Works to provide greater clarity with respect to codifying vision clearance dimensions.</p>

# Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges



# Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges

## Please consider the following:

1. Are there any recommended changes to the development standards for fences and walls?
2. Should the NZO retain standards for hedges that effectively treat them as fences/walls?
3. Should the NZO codify the Vision Clearance standard, or leave that review to Public Works?
4. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?


# OUTDOOR STORAGE

# Outdoor Storage

Outdoor Storage Comparison			
Revised NZO Citation	Existing Standards	New Standards	Explanation
Section 17.24.130 (page IV-10)	<p>No standards for outdoor storage.</p> <p>GMC Chapter 12.13 regulates the accumulation of materials visible from a public street, alley, or neighboring property as a public nuisance.</p>	<p>Standards apply to the storage of materials or goods for sale or use as part of a business outside of a building for more than 72 hours.</p> <p><b>Residential, Commercial, Office, and Open Space Districts:</b> No outdoor storage is permitted.</p> <p><b>Industrial and Public and Quasi-Public Districts:</b> Not permitted in front or street side setbacks.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Districts:</b> Allowable if associated with a permitted agricultural use, located outside of all required setbacks, and screened from adjacent residential properties and public rights-of-way.</p> <p>All allowable outdoor storage must be screened from public views.</p>	<p>The intent of the standards to is to limit the potential for negative visual impacts to the surrounding area and neighborhoods.</p> <p>The City could consider allowing more flexibility in certain zone districts for the outdoors storage of materials and goods or adjust some of the current NZO standards to be more-strict and limiting throughout all zone districts, or only in certain zones.</p>



# Outdoor Storage



# Outdoor Storage

## Please consider the following:

1. Are the NZO standards for outdoor storage adequate, too strict, or not strict enough?
2. Are there any changes needed to standards for outdoor storage in any particular Zone District?
3. Are there other issues within the area of Outdoor Storage that need to be discussed?

# NEXT STEPS

# Workshop Schedule

**Workshop 5: Monday, April 8, 6:00 pm**

**Topic: RV Parking, Parking Reductions, Signs, and Lighting**

Workshop 6: Thursday, April 11, 2019, 6:00 pm

Topic: Housing, Community Assembly, Mobile Vendors, Accessory Uses, and Energy

Workshop 7: Thursday, April 18, 2019, 6:00 pm

Topic: Remaining Issues and General Feedback