



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, March 21, 2019**

6:00 PM  
City Hall  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California

***Members of the Planning Commission***

*Jennifer R. Smith, Chair  
Robert K. Miller, Vice Chair  
Ed Fuller, Commissioner  
Katie Maynard, Commissioner  
Bill Shelor, Commissioner*

*Peter Imhof, Secretary  
Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney  
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

**CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Smith at 6:00 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Present: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, \*Commissioner Fuller,  
Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor  
Absent: None.  
\*Commissioner Fuller entered the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Staff Present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner; David Pierucci, Counsel, with Best, Best & Krieger, Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No speakers.

## AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

### **A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

#### **A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of February 25, 2019**

**Approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the meeting of February 25, 2019.**

#### 2019-02-25 PC Minutes - Unapproved

**MOTION:** Commissioner Miller/Commissioner Shelor to approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the meeting of February 25, 2019, as amended.

**VOTE:** Motion approved by the following voice vote: Chair Fuller, Vice Chair Smith, Commissioner Linn, Commissioner Maynard, and Commissioner Miller. Noes: None.

### **B. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

#### **B.1 Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance - Open Space, Height, Floor Area, Fences and Hedges, Outdoor Storage, and ESHA**

##### **Recommendation:**

**Receive a presentation, allow public comments, and provide feedback on the Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) with focus on the questions and issues that are highlighted on pages 43-55 of the Key Issues Guide (Open Space, Height, Floor Area, Fences and Hedges, Outdoor Storage, and ESHA).**

**Please bring the color copy of the Key Issues Guide that was included as Attachment 1 to the Planning Commission staff report for the February 25, 2019 workshop. Alternatively, the Key Issues Guide is attached here or is available in hard copy at City Hall and City Library, or can be downloaded at <http://www.GoletaZoning.com>.**

#### [B.1 NZO Workshop 4 -- Staff Report](#)

#### [B.1 NZO Workshop 4 -- PRESENTATION](#)

#### [B.1 NZO Workshop 4 -- PUBLIC COMMENTS 18-20](#)

**Staff Speakers:**

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review  
Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager  
Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner  
J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner  
Martha Miller, New Zoning Ordinance Consultant

The staff report was presented by Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; and J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner; including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "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".

After each topic was presented, the Planning Commission accepted public comment, followed by Planning Commission discussion and deliberation on the topic. Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners and public speakers during the workshop.

**TOPIC: ESHA (Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas)**

**Public Speakers:**

Brian Trautwein, environmental analyst and watershed program director with the Environmental Defense Center (EDC), representing EDC and the Urban Creeks Council, commented regarding the creek setback issue in Section 17.30.070 as follows: 1) studies indicate that the 100-foot setback is the bare minimum needed to protect water quality and creek habitat; 2) setbacks include vegetation, leaf litter, and soil which filter out and break down pollutants such as oil and grease sediment, fertilizers and harmful pathogens in order to protect the clean water and minimize water pollution; 3) setbacks protect habitats for nesting birds including birds of prey such as the white tailed kite which has also been lost because its habitat has been nearly eliminated; 4) setbacks minimize impacts to endangered species as steelhead trout in the creeks; 5) setbacks protect life and property from flooding given climate change and the increase in fires and floods; and 6) setbacks reduce the adverse impacts of noise, lighting, and non-native species on adjacent creek habitats. Mr. Trautwein stated that in 2014 EDC conducted an analysis of setbacks, focusing on setbacks imposed for developments by prior City decision-makers, and found creekside projects were approved without addressing General Plan Policy CE 2.2. Mr. Trautwein stated that a letter was drafted to the City summarizing the research and findings. Mr. Trautwein noted that after meeting with the City and other environmental groups he determined that there is no clear

process for making determinations of feasibility with regard to creek setbacks. Mr. Trautwein also stated that in 2018 the EDC worked with the Urban Creeks Council and the City of Goleta to develop a creek protection ordinance that sets forth a process for determining feasibility for the 100-foot setback, which he believes must be applied both equally in the both in the coastal zone and inland areas.

Tara Messing, staff attorney with the EDC, stated that the EDC submitted proposed revisions to Section 17.30.070 to the City on March 8, 2019, that would set forth a process to determine whether the factors are met to determine feasibility for the 100-foot setback. Ms. Messing believes the proposed revisions will provide clarity and transparency that will benefit the City, applicants, and interested members of the public. Ms. Messing noted that the proposed revisions mirrors suggested modifications previously made by the California Coastal Commission such as for the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan. She recognized that the proposed language, or something similar, may be applicable to other sections of the ordinance as long as it is clear that the requested findings also apply to Section 17.30.070.

Barbara Massey commented as follows: 1) a minimum for all ESHA buffers should be 50 feet and not lower; 2) the trigger for a biological study should be within 300 feet of an ESHA; 3) requested that a site specific biological studies are required to be up-to-date; 4) performance security should be in the amount of 150 percent of the estimated cost of mitigations; 5) she does not believe that the reduction of the streamside areas to 25 feet is what the citizens of Goleta want, and she requested it be returned to the original 50 feet; 6) minor pruning should be the only item not prohibited in the prohibition of the removal of vegetation; 7) buffers should never be reduced for the Monarch section and should never be less than 100 feet; 8) requested that the language in the Monarch section include the requirements for a survey by an expert in preparation for a plan to protect the specific site in General Plan Policy CE 4.6.a and b; 9) the language “when feasible” and “to the extent feasible” should be removed from all documents; 10) there should be no exemption for the grading and grubbing activities, and a Conditional Use Permit should also be required within and adjacent to ESHAs.

Dan McCarter, president of the Urban Creeks Council, commented that he believes the following issues also need to be discussed for the functionality of the creeks for clean water and habitat: 1) animal poisons because rat poisons have been observed adjacent to ESHA areas, which can kill other animals that would be taking care of the rats, and it is disruptive to the food chain; 2) maintenance of herbicides near ESHAs so ESHA plants are not being killed; 3) lighting should be directed away from ESHAs, or directed

downward and outward; 4) plantings in all ESHA areas need to be native low maintenance, drought-tolerant, stabilizing for creek banks, etc; and 5) there needs to be connectivity between pockets of ESHAs and creeks because they all need to flow together so there is communication all the way to estuary area.

George Relles suggested that the word “default” be removed with regard to “100-foot default setback” in Section 17.30.070.B and replaced with the word “minimum” or, if not, “default minimum” because he believes “minimum” fits better and that this would be true throughout the document. Mr. Relles also suggested that the document mentions what the 100 feet setback is being measured from for clarity. Mr. Relles supported comments from the EDC.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox commented: 1) requested clarification regarding the four factors that could adjust the stream setback in Section 17.30.070.B; 2) questioned whether staff could make the decision with regard to reviewing the language allowing for SPA buffer reduction to further clarify in what instances staff could approve a reduction in Section 17.30.07.B; 3) she believes 100-feet should be the bare minimum for setbacks (and agreed with the comments from public speakers Brian Trautwein and George Relles); 4) staff should not have authority to review the language allowing for SPA buffer reduction which she believes should go to the Planning Commission or City Council, and not the Planning Director or Zoning Administrator; 5) requested clarification regarding who is the person in the City who could alter the distance from ESHA that triggers a Biological Study in Section 17.30.030; 6) noted a typo of “ESHA”; and 7) requested clarification of the type of material that is planned for the fencing in Section 17.30.070.J.

Anne Burdette, secretary of the Urban Creeks Council, urged development of an ordinance that effectively implements the creek protection policies requiring a minimum 100-foot creek setbacks. She noted exemptions to the setback have been approved in the past without analyzing feasibility. She stated that Goleta’s creeks provide the habitat for many threatened or endangered species such as the steelhead trout, red-legged frog, and the western pond turtle. She expressed concern that development too close to the creek will result in bank erosion, pollution and other damage which overall will make the area less optimal habitat for these organisms, and will subject property and residents to flooding, debris flows, and other hazards. Ms. Burdette noted that once a riparian eco-system is damaged, it is extremely difficult to restore it back to its natural state. She also spoke in support of protecting the natural eco-systems for people in the community to be able to explore.

Staff responded to comments from the public speakers and Planning Commissioners.

### **Planning Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Shelor requested staff provide a map that would display the mapped ESHAs with an overly showing the 100-foot setbacks for the ESHAs, and show within the areas the properties by zone that are affected.

Commissioner Fuller suggested that the language in the first sentence in Section 17.30.070.B Buffers be changed to: "The SPA upland buffer must be at least 100 feet outward on both sides of the creek, measured from the top-of-bank of the outer limit of wetlands and/or riparian vegetation, whichever is greater".

Commissioner Maynard suggested that Planning Commission may recommend language to indicate that given the current General Plan, this is the current recommendation of the Planning Commission, but note for the minutes that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council look at the recommendation and consider a General Plan Amendment, if appropriate.

Commissioner Maynard suggested consideration regarding movement of the creek banks.

### **ESHA Questions for Consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. NZO incorporates the objective development standards from the General Plan, but allows case-by-case analysis of potential impacts through the CEQA process.

Commissioner Shelor recommended making standards that are as clear and objective as possible for applicants and stressed the importance of the initial consultation process with staff and concept review, if needed. He suggested set guidelines that are firmer and that would create an appealable ministerial review. Also, Commissioner Shelor stressed the importance not to stray too far from the original intent of the General Plan.

Commissioner Shelor recommended continuing discussion on the determination of what is project infeasibility and what would be the viability of a project modification.

Commissioner Maynard recommended adding more detailed findings to assess financial infeasibility. She spoke in support of the requests from

the Environmental Defense Center's letter to consider comparable profit and loss projections and other requests with regard to financial infeasibility. She stressed the point that a loss of profits does not equate to protect infeasibility. She noted caution regarding investor-backed expectations as a consideration.

Commissioner Maynard recommended emphasizing City approved third-party biological and economic review.

Commissioner Maynard recommended adding language in Section 17.30.070.A and in Section 17.30.070.B.1.a to include protection of water quality.

Commissioner Fuller requested further definition of "the "biotic quality of the stream" in Section 17.30.070.B.1.a.

Commissioner Maynard recommended removing "beneficial" from Section 17.30.070.B.2 Buffers, noting that the language "beneficial" is too broad.

Commissioner Fuller commented with regard to feasibility and infeasibility that he is reticent to codify case law and recommended making the applicants aware of the case law, rather than rewriting or creating standards.

Commissioner Maynard and Chair Smith disagreed with Commissioner Fuller's comment regarding case law. Commissioner Maynard commented that additional information is needed to make a determination of feasibility and infeasibility.

Commissioner Maynard requested clarification of the definition of "reasonable development" in Section 17.30.100.A.2.

2. Should the 14-inch fence clearance for animal passage be retained, removed, or modified?

Commissioner Fuller requested clarification and examples of what other type of fencing would be acceptable as a perimeter boundary for property to allow for animal passage, with regard to Section 17.30.050.J.

Commissioner Maynard recommended leaving this decision for the environmental review process to determine the appropriate fencing based on the environmental review process.

Commissioner Fuller agreed with Commissioner Maynard's recommendation.

Commissioner Shelor commented that there may be different circumstances in residential areas with roaming pets vs. commercial and industrial areas. Commissioner Maynard supported this comment.

Chair Smith commented that it seems like there could be multiple factors and considerations, and not sure if one set standard set would address all situations and would lean towards removing the section. However, she would be open to some modifying language to describe other circumstances such as regarding pets.

Commissioner Fuller hopes the biological reviewers would provide information to allow decision-makers to come up to an appropriate solution to the situation.

Commissioner Miller commented that he would support strict standards for fencing whether this could be done with specificity in the ordinance or through the review process. He noted that the 14-inch and 40-inch standards make sense given wildlife needs. .

Commissioner Fuller commented that not allowing planting non-native species would eliminate eucalyptus trees from Monarch butterfly preserves, which does not seem like a great idea in all cases.

Chair Smith agreed with Commissioner Fuller's comment regarding not allowing the planting of non-native species.

3. Are the Grading and Grubbing standards sufficient?

Commissioner Fuller agreed with the proposed standards.

Commissioner Maynard commented:

- a. Requested additional language and clarification with regard to consideration for agriculture.
- b. Requested a notation that some of the language about tree removal will be moved from the grading and grubbing standards to the Tree Protection Ordinance.
- c. If the grading and grubbing is more than 50 cubic yards, and there is a replanting component, recommended that native plants should be planted within 500 feet of an ESHA if there is a replanting component. Native plants should be planted within 500 feet of the SHA with the exception for non-native plants significantly contributing to the habitat



values. Provide clarification in Section 17.30.030.D Restoration of Monitoring Plan.

Commissioner Shelor requested staff research agriculture uses and flexibility with regard to ESHAs.

Chair Smith recommended moving Section 17.24.100.A.3.f to Section 17.24.100.A.4.b to require that “Grubbing less than 100 feet from any sensitive habitat or protected resource” would require a Minor Conditional Use Permit to strengthen the parameters. Members Fuller and Maynard agreed.

4. Are there other ESHA issues that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Miller stated that he would support a recommendation to the City Council to consider the 100-foot minimum SPA buffer.

Commissioner Maynard recommended strengthening the language regarding the 100-foot minimum buffer given the current General Plan by accepting the EDC recommendations as previously discussed. She requested the City Council consider opening up a broader conversation about changing streamside protection buffers to strengthen them in the General Plan. If there is consideration to discuss amending the General Plan, Commissioner Maynard recommended considering increasing both the 25-foot setback and the 100-foot setback so the minimums would be higher and the 100-foot standard setback would be higher. She supported adding language “at least” in Section 17.30.070.B for clarity that 100 feet is the current minimum.

Commissioner Fuller recommended considering adding a prohibition of the use of herbicides and other toxic chemical substances within 100 feet of ESHAs, regarding Section 17.30.060 Management of ESHAs.

Chair Smith supported recommending the City Council consider the creek setback language in terms of the General Plan. She commented that under the current General Plan, she would support generally the comments from the EDC and others regarding having more specificity regarding findings, noting it adds clarity to be able to make decisions and more transparency.

Commissioner Maynard recommended that a project located within 300 feet from an ESHA require a Minor Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Maynard recommended consideration to add and emphasize the finding “and cannot be restored” with regard to a wetland

that is a small and generally unproductive, with regard to Section 17.30.100.A.1 Protection of Wetlands Outside the Coastal Zone.

Commissioner Maynard recommended consideration to add language requiring that offsite mitigation should only be allowed when the mitigation cannot be done on site, with regard to Section 17.30.100.A.3 Protection of Wetlands Outside the Coastal Zone.

Commissioner Maynard recommended adding language that the Review Authority should also consider the potential to restore the wetland, with regard to Section 17.30.100.B.2 Buffer.

Commissioner Maynard strongly supported changing the ratio from 2:1 to 3:1 for mitigation of wetlands infill, in Section 17.30.110 Mitigation of Wetland Infill, and recommended also removing the last sentence: "However, in no event can the required mitigation ratio be less than 2:1".

Commissioner Maynard supported public comment from Barbara Massey to potentially remove Section 17.30.180.C.2 Buffer required: "The buffer may be reduced up to 50 feet in circumstances where the trees contribute to the habitat but are not considered likely to function as an aggregation site, such as along narrow windrows".

Commissioner Maynard expressed concern that ESHAs that are not SPAs can see buffer reductions without elevating the approval to a Conditional Use Permit.

Recess held from 8:08 to 8:12 p.m.

## **TOPIC: OPEN SPACE**

### **Public Speakers:**

Barbara Massey commented that calling "Amenity" has too many definitions, and suggested just calling it "Private Open Space". Ms. Massey also commented that she believes an archaeological site is being counted as open space in the proposal for the Heritage Village development.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox commented: 1) suggested it would be less confusing to indicate that open space is to be considered for apartments and condominiums because one would consider "open space" as being for private housing; 2) suggested mentioning the size of the housing that is going to be considered in this area; 3) she recalls that originally the bike trails in the Village at Los Carneros project needed to be built so the public

would have access to the bike trail for transportation; 4) requested that a definition of medium density with an example be provided in the document; 5) suggested designating 40 percent of the gross area, not the net area; 6) agreed that an open space area is not an amenity, and she agreed with Commissioner Miller's comment; and 7) noted that some areas in Goleta that are used for recreation are sloped areas that flood and are unable to be used, so the people use other parks.

Todd Amspoker, attorney representing the Newland Family, owners of the property at the corner of Dearborn and Hollister Avenue, requested that the Planning Commission consider recommending to the City Council that the zoning for this property not be changed to Open Space but that the property owners be allowed to pursue an affordable housing project.

George Relles urged that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that rooftop space does not count as open space. Mr. Relles expressed concern that allowing rooftop space to count would allow for more development on the ground, or may possibly encourage the building of platforms for rooftop space. He also recommended that open space should be ADA compliant.

Ken Alker, owner of the Kenwood Village project, expressed concern regarding how changes in the New Zoning Ordinance will affect his project that is moving forward.

### **Planning Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Maynard requested clarification regarding replacing "maximum lot coverage" with "minimum common open space" in Section 17.08.030 Development Regulations, and removing percentages.

Commissioner Fuller requested clarification regarding the definition of open space areas, in particular describing the dimensions in both directions.

Commissioner Miller supported limiting the ability to aggregate in small spaces.

Commissioner Miller supported Commissioner Maynard's request to see how the existing and proposed standards compare for recent projects.

Commissioner Miller stated that he continues to believe that rooftop space should not be considered to satisfy the purpose of open space requirements.

Commissioner Maynard supported ADA compliance for common open space.

Commissioner Maynard recommended that rooftop space should not be counted as open space criteria. She noted that she believes it is not supported by the community.

Commissioner Maynard recommended that a building or community center within a residential district should not count as the open space requirement. Possibly a small gazebo or pergola could be acceptable, with a definition.

Commissioner Maynard commented she would not support moving the open space requirement to square footage from percentage at this point without more information to get a better understanding whether it is increasing or decreasing what is being required for open space.

Commissioner Maynard requested discussion of the Newland property at a later workshop.

Commissioner Maynard recommended that common open space related to residential projects should be contiguous with the property and project.

Commissioner Maynard does not support a move to the term “amenity”.

Commissioner Maynard commented with regard to ESHA stream protection buffers that consideration should be given to access and functional use of the space, and suggested if there is a path for the public on the buffer it could count as open space, but should not count if it is not accessible.

Commissioner Maynard recommended not removing, from the 2015 version, the requirements for maximum lot coverage in commercial uses, or adding some numbers within the minimum common open space requirements, as she believes there is a concern in the community regarding bulk. Commissioner Maynard noted that landscaping requirements in commercial uses have been substantially reduced from the 2015 version of the Zoning Ordinance. She believes there are too many reductions and is not consistent with the General Plan. She referred to General Plan Policy LU 1.2 and Policy LU 1.6 with regard to open space and the need for appropriate outdoor gathering spaces in retail and other commercial centers.

Commissioner Fuller supported Commissioner Maynard's request for a comparison how the 40 percent to square footage requirement would apply to recent past projects to see the effect, and noted he is open to a change to more usable space.

Commissioner Fuller suggested not using the word “open” and just use the term “private space” or “common space”. He believes the recreational definition for open space would cover hardscape or space that is not covered, and that space that is consolidated for use by all of the residents is common space and space for any individual unit is “private space”.

Commissioner Fuller recommended considering having a larger private space requirement for larger units, to be defined by the number of bedrooms.

Commissioner Miller disagreed that community rooms or centers should be considered part of open space which he believes is in contract to the concept of having open space.

Chair Smith commented that more information is needed regarding how the different standards could apply. She does not support the term “amenity space”.

Chair Smith expressed some support for rooftop gardens, but limiting how much they could count towards open space. She also noted it might be clearer just to not count them. She also suggested clarifying the definition of open space to be clear about what counts and what does not.

Commissioner Fuller supported excluding rooftop gardens from private open space but considering rooftop gardens on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Miller agreed that rooftop gardens should not be included in the open space calculations but can be acceptable as features.

Commissioner Maynard supported the term “common space”. Commissioner suggested including “functional” and “for all ages” in the definition of “open space”.

Commissioner Maynard supported increasing the amount of open space requirement for more bedrooms. She also supported limiting the percentage of common space that is hardscape.

Commissioner Miller noted his development uses “common area” and “restricted common area” and these terms may be useful.

Chair Smith commented that “private open space” and “common open space” would serve to distinguish those concepts.

Chair Smith agreed with Commissioner Fuller regarding excluding rooftop gardens from private open space but considering rooftop gardens as a voluntary feature

Chair Smith shared Commissioner Maynard's general concerns regarding commercial open space.

Commissioner Shelor supported having the greatest amount of open space requirement that is reasonably practical and requested that additional information for additional analysis is provided; and hopefully will land on something that preserves and protects the most amount of open space for the community in the future.

Commissioner Shelor commented he believes the planning process has failed in regard to providing for adequate open space with regard to the number of new people living in the new developments on Los Carneros Road.

Commissioner Maynard requested further information and discussion regarding:

- a. The percentage to square foot proposals for open space.
- b. Open Space in commercial uses; and
- c. The impact of the NZO on the Newland Family property, if appropriate.

## **TOPIC: FENCES, FREESTANDING WALLS, AND HEDGES:**

### **Public Speaker:**

Brian Bosky requested staff clarify the definitions of a setback and road right-of-way.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox commented regarding Section 17.24.090.B, as follows: 1) assuming the citation is referring to a wooden fence, if there is a more finished side facing outward in a park, most likely it will increase the area for graffiti; 2) the police need chain link fences to see through into parks, as a wooden fence would block the view; and 3) some homeowners have chain link style fences to be able to see through to the other side.

## **TOPIC: HEIGHT**

### **Public Speakers:**

Barbara Massey spoke in support of keeping the building heights down. Ms. Massey commented as follows: 1) heights need to be kept at a minimum to

protect the views and maintain a more open feeling; 2) she does not support a variable height; 3) a three-foot addition in height should not be given for a 4:12 roof pitch; 4) expressed concern regarding the up to 50% in District height standard approved by the Planning Commission; 5) all height modifications should require Planning Commission or City Council hearing; and 6) modifications should be limited to 10%; and 7) the height in all Residential zones should be limited to 25 feet with chimneys limited to the minimum height required by the California Building Code for chimneys, which will hopefully not exceed 25 feet.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox supported comments by public speaker Barbara Massey regarding Height. Ms. Cox questioned why oil and gas derricks are included in Section 17.24.080 as she believes it is mentioned in another section. Also, she questioned the identity of the “higher Review Authority” that is mentioned in Section 17.62.020.B.1 and requested clarity.

Ken Allker stated that he disagrees with the previous two public speakers regarding height limitations. Mr. Alker spoke specifically regarding his home that is located in the DR District that will be replaced by the RS District zone. He believes that the 25-foot height is limiting to single-story home. He commented that building a home without a gable roof is difficult and may result in a flat roof. He requested recommending a 25 feet height with a 35 feet maximum, at least for the former DR District. (Mr. Alker noted he submitted a letter dated May 27, 2016).

### **Planning Commission Comments:**

Commissioner Fuller recommended that the maximum height standard for chimneys makes the chimney height allowable under the Building Code.

Commissioner Maynard requested clarification of the methodology for calculating the standards for height exceptions with regard to percentages as well as the exact number of feet.

Height questions for Consideration by the Planning Commission:

1. Is there consensus on the new height methodology?

Commissioner Fuller supported the new methodology for measuring height.

2. Any edits needed for the exceptions to the height requirements?

None.

3. Any change to the “up to 50%” height modification?

Commissioner Maynard recommended lowering the height modification to “up to 20% maximum modification” that will include the total of all height increases added together; and only considering going over 20 percent in building height on a development plan for substantial affordable housing.

4. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Maynard commented that the height of solar or other types of energy production should be allowed up to 10 feet or 20 percent above structure height, with regard to Section 17.24.080.

Commissioner Maynard supported clarifying comments to be added by staff regarding how heights are measured in response to correspondence from the Bacara with regard to Section 17.24.080.

By consensus, the Planning Commission recommended additional discussion regarding Height at Workshop 7.

## C. ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment at 10:00 p.m.

**Note: The video of the meeting is available on the City’s website at**

<http://www.cityofgoleta.org/i-want-to/news-and-updates/government-meeting-agendas-and-videos>