



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, April 08, 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

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; and Wendy Winkler, Management Assistant.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No speakers

## **AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA**

None.

### **A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

#### **A.1 Planning Commission Minutes for the Special Planning Commission Meeting of March 6, 2019**

**Approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the Special meeting of March 6, 2019.**

[2019-03-06 Special PC Minutes - Unapproved](#)

MOTION: Vice Chair Miller/Commissioner Maynard to approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the Special meeting of March 6, 2019, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following unanimous voice vote:  
Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None.

#### **A.2 Planning Commission Minutes for the Planning Commission Meeting of March 11, 2019**

**Approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the meeting of March 11, 2019.**

[2019-03-11 PC Minutes - Unapproved](#)

MOTION: Commissioner Maynard/Commissioner Shelor to approve the Planning Commission Minutes for the meeting of March 11, 2019, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following unanimous voice vote:  
Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None.

### **B. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

#### **B.1 Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance - RV Parking, Parking Reductions, Signs, and Lighting**

**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 57-66 of the Key Issues Guide (Parking and Loading, Signs, and Lighting).**

[B.1 PC Workshop 5 CAR 4-8-19](#)

[B.1 PC Workshop 5 Att 1 Key Issues Guide Consolidated Final](#)

[B.1 PC Workshop 5 Att 2 2019-02-26 DRB Minutes - Approved](#)

[B.1 PC Workshop 5 Att 3 2019-03-12 DRB Minutes Draft FULL](#)

[B.1 NZO Workshop 5 -- Staff Report](#)

[B.1 NZO Workshop 5 -- PRESENTATION](#)

[B.1 NZO Workshop 5 -- PUBLIC COMMENTS 21-32](#)

**Staff Speakers:**

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager

Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner

J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner

David Pierucci, Counsel, with Best Best & Krieger

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review

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 5 of 7, Presentation By Peter Imhof, Anne Wells, Andy Newkirk, J. Ritterbeck, April 8, 2019".

After each topic was presented individually, staff responded to clarifying questions from the Planning Commissioners, the Planning Commission then accepted public comment, followed by Planning Commission discussion and deliberation on the topic.

**TOPIC: PARKING AND LOADING**

**Public Comment:**

Michele Fox stated that she just sold RV that was owned for 13 years and stored at Lake Cachuma. She questioned setbacks because the space from one home to another is close for tract houses in Goleta that are sixty years old, where she lives. She commented that setbacks were originally made to create space between homes and for privacy and safety. She noted in 2016

there were concerns about difficulties that first responders may encounter if RVs were in setbacks. She expressed concern that the convenience for a neighbor to park a RV on setbacks can impact the living value as well as dollar value for surrounding homes. She read an excerpt from a code in the City of Santa Barbara with regard to outdoor storage regulations unless there is a permit. Ms. Fox questioned how many RVs or trailers can be parked on a property, and whether the owner of the property must be the owner of the RV.

Jim Fox commented that he does not support the new regulations for RV parking, and he mirrors comments from his wife, public speaker Michele Fox. Mr. Fox expressed concern that if there are relaxed standards it seems like no standards, for example, with regard to size limitation, a 9-foot tall motor home could be parked at the edge of a neighbor's adjoining property on a side setback. He questioned whether RVs could park on gravel. Also, he noticed that the photo examples provided by staff are not from Goleta, and he stated that he has provided some photos showing the real situation in Goleta. He suggested interested persons take a look regarding the situation on Ardmore Drive. (Chair Smith circulated photos provided by Mr. Fox).

Jeff Wayco, Goleta resident commented that Goleta is a coastal community and a lot of young families want the experience a lot of people have had to own a boat, RV or camper. Mr. Wayco noted there is no local storage and people have complained they can only find storage in Oxnard or Santa Maria, if at all. He noted that lots of people have boats and campers for recreation. He commended the work that has been done and believes it is appropriate.

Barbara Massey commented:

1. The onsite parking for single-family dwellings should be three spaces for anything over 3,000 square feet;
2. Credits for on-street parking spaces in Old Town should be removed, noting Old Town businesses are already hurt by the lack of adequate parking, and the property owners must be required to provide the necessary parking on their property or an offsite location;
3. Parking reductions should only be allowed as part of a discretionary review;
4. Transportation Demand Management is questionable as usually more credit is given than the actual reductions that are achieved.
5. Transit accessibility does not mean people are not going to use their cars, noting people run errands during lunch and on their way home from work, and need space to take home groceries, cleaning, etc.
6. There is a reliance on cars because the routes and hours of the transit system currently are limited and barely available in some locations.

7. Parking reductions in Old Town Development is wrong thing to do as this is the time to improve Old Town and not continue substandard parking that hurts the entire community;
8. The provision to allow trailers and RVs to be parking in the front setback should be removed. Neighbors' yards should not be allowed to become vehicle storage areas. At the minimum, all RVs stored on residential property must be screened from view by a 6-foot fence.
9. City streets should not be permitted to be used to meet off-street parking requirements.
10. She believes the majority of Goleta citizens do not want RV parking and storage in the front setback, and just because the RV owners are well-organized and show up at meetings, doesn't mean they represent the citizens of Goleta.
11. She believes that no parking restrictions are appropriate.

Bill Master commented while allowing RV parking in front setbacks is appreciated by owners, there is also the problem of a lack of RV storage parking lots. He was only able to find one storage lot in Goleta and it was full. He noted that other storage facilities closed because of zoning issues and RV owners were forced to park on streets or residential properties. Mr. Master recommended staff and the Planning Commission look at the opportunity to place RV storage lots on commercial and business park zones, as well as industrial zones; and noted RVs are a low impact and would hardly ever move. He also noted he does not own an RV but he would not want to park an RV on a front setback and be a bother to neighbors. (Mr. Master stated he submitted a comment letter).

Dana Trout stated that he has a small trailer that is 13 feet long that he normally keeps in the back yard. He is concerned that the standards would prevent storing the trailer in the backyard because it is not close to the curb cut there is no access to the curb cut from his back yard, and he does hop the curb. Mr. Trout pointed out that in his neighborhood, which is in the Ellwood area from Pebble Beach Drive through Daytona, there are roughly one to three RV pads per block that are already installed. The majority of the pads meet the provisions of paved or gravel surface, but do not meet the requirement to use the city-approved driveway. Typically, because of the turning radius of the boat or trailer, it cannot be swung over to use the driveway exit or enter off the curb. Mr. Trout noted that travel trailers tend to be away from home for days at a time, and do not make the journey between the storage pad and the street very often. He requested further clarification whether hopping the curb was disallowed and noted his trailer weights less than his wife's car. He suggested that issues with regard to breaking down the sidewalk or alternatively allowing the ramps to be left in place need to be addressed with the owners. Mr. Trout questioned how all the property owners would be handled who already have a compliant pad

that was put in at great expense but will no longer be compliant because they cannot use the current curb cut.

Jaime Pierce commented that there are giant RVs on every corner in her neighborhood and expressed concern there would be no limit to front yard setbacks. She noted that the property next door has a camper in the back yard that looms over her six-foot fence and her property is set down lower. Ms. Pierce also expressed a safety concern that RVs that are not properly supported could fall over onto a sidewalk.

**Parking and Loading questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Are regulations of RVs in the Front Setback sufficient?

Commissioner Fuller commented:

- A. Suggested possible consideration whether an RV parked in a front setback could it be perpendicular to the front street, so an RV would not take up a large portion of the frontage of the property.
- B. Consider whether to possibly limit the number of vehicles depending on the type per lot.
- C. Consider whether the vehicles should only be owned by the owners of the lot.
- D. Pedestrian safety would be an issue; for example, if one of the large vehicles was backing out from being stored directly on the sidewalk onto the sidewalk, and was not giving a pedestrian chance to get out of the way, this would be an argument against having no setbacks.
- E. Supports adding vehicles storage in the Business Park (BP) zones.

Commissioner Maynard pointed out that there may be an enforcement issue in terms of the number of the units because the property would need to have the number of onsite parking spaces required for the single-family home plus room for the RV in onsite spaces that are not on-the-street parking.

Commissioner Maynard supports the concept that was brought up about potentially expanding the spaces where RV storage lots might be allowed and considering the Business Park districts as a potential area to have additional storage lots. She would not support RV parking lots in Commercial zones because she would want Commercial zones to be kept as more vibrant areas with people coming in and out.

Commissioner Maynard believes there should be more guidance to the City regarding flexibility to allow additional curb cuts where appropriate

to the design of the space and where there is an attempt to park an RV, instead of being resistant to curb cuts.

Commissioner Maynard requested consideration regarding whether there should be a preference to store an RV on the side setback vs. the front setback because concerns have been expressed regarding RVs parked in side setbacks.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering whether there should be an adjustment in the ordinance for the reality that cars park in the front setback.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she has seen a strong response from members of the community for more leniency with regard to storage of RVs and other recreational vehicles.

Vice Chair Miller commented at this time he is partial to the idea of prohibiting parking in the front setback. He noted his concerns include how it affects people in the neighborhood aesthetically. He requested staff look into finding locations that would be appropriate for RV parking but noted that commercial locations are not appropriate. He also recommended taking a stronger look at screening requirements and size requirements of the RV, particularly if they will be allowed in the front setback. He understands there are issues in connection with parking on the side setbacks.

Chair Smith commented she has some concerns regarding enforcement of proposed RV requirements and believes enforcement is largely complaint driven. She noted it appears there have not been a lot of complaints previously although there may be more with the proposed requirements. She expressed concern about individuals living in RVs. She commented there would need to be additional requirements if RV parking in the front setback is allowed. She would be open to staff looking for other places to store RVs in the community, and stated she is not entirely convinced allowing RVs in the front setback is the way to go.

Commissioner Shelor commented in support of continuing to use the standards in the previous draft ordinance. He believes the new proposed standards somewhat negate the General Plan priorities of maintaining aesthetics and neighborhood compatibility. He recognized that this creates issues for individuals that live in the city, and stated it is incumbent upon staff and the City Council to facilitate storing these large vehicles in some appropriate nonresidential zones.

Vice Chair Miller commented that he would need more information about what seems to be a lack of complaints from neighbors of RV owners before factoring that in to the decision-making.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she cannot support the additional size limitations and additional screening requirements, and noted that she has heard from many people. She believes notices should be sent to persons who have commented regarding RVs to notify them that there have been changes to the draft ordinance that has been provided and to make sure they have seen the changes. She recommended that persons on both sides of the issue should be contacted.

Vice Chair Miller questioned whether it is appropriate to notice prior persons who commented on this issue.

Commissioner Fuller stated that recommendations from the Planning Commission regarding the New Zoning Ordinance will be submitted to the City Council who will be the final decision-makers; and he encouraged interested persons to contact the City Council at the appropriate time.

Vice Chair Miller clarified that he does not want anyone's opinions not to be included and he supports ample noticing.

Chair Smith commented that the intent of the process is that the public has an opportunity to comment on all issues.

## 2. Are Parking reductions appropriate?

Chair Smith commented that generally she supports the reduction for low-income units most strongly.

Commissioner Fuller commented he does not believe low-income people do not have cars and he believes that elderly people have a car even if they don't drive it. He noted vehicle sales are at an almost record high. He would support a reduction in parking for mixed-use developments because it has the opportunity to provide for shared parking. He noted that the current trend is 5 to 6 office workers in 1,000 square feet, and most offices consider 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. Also, retail considers 5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet a minimum. Commissioner Fuller commented that not providing adequate parking is creating a property that is working against itself.



Commissioner Shelor commented that he is concerned about the parking standards being reduced but he does not want to create any more vehicle travel than necessary and wants to support Transportation Demand Management and alternatives. He suggested taking a step back with regard to the parking reductions to get a better understanding because of the uncertainty of other factors that affect parking. He also commented regarding possible effects on parking spaces and parking standards when there is a change of use and substantial conformity.

Vice Chair Miller generally supports the comments by Commissioner Fuller and Commissioner Shelor with one caveat with regard to mixed-use developments because weekends would be questionable because both residents and retail could be there on the weekend.

Commissioner Maynard suggested increasing the required parking requirements in many areas across the board but then allow for parking reductions for Transportation Demand Management with incentives including bike parking and transit passes. She noted many areas are under-parked.

Commissioner Fuller recommended creative solutions that will be useful, for example, businesses providing bus passes to employees, and considering standards noted in the International Zoning Code.

Chair Smith supports not proceeding with this proposal until more can be known about what is going to happen with Old Town. She is less comfortable with other reductions but commented there are few incentives to offer in terms of low-income units.

Commissioner Maynard commented that UCSB has been very successful with Transportation Demand Management programs. She recommended allowing these incentives where employers are looking for these opportunities. In terms of low-income and senior housing, she noted that local cities have found a way to limit car ownership for low-income and senior housing.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering increasing the parking requirement around cannabis businesses, based on data from other cities showing increased traffic and parking needs.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering strengthening the language for parking available for loading and unloading near day care facilities. She noted from her observations working by a day care center that parking is a major issue with parents parking wherever they can.

Commissioner Maynard recommended reconsidering the system to make sure there is enough adequate parking for employees.

Commissioner Maynard suggested reconsidering whether the necessity for covered vs. uncovered parking is as critical, in Section 17.38.040.A.2.

Commissioner Maynard recommended leaning toward “Full-time Equivalent Employee” rather than “Full-time Employee”.

Commissioner Maynard commented with regard to consideration of parking reductions and incentives:

- A. The incentives need to be significantly above and beyond the city requirements, for example, parking reductions for increased bicycle facilities.
- B. The language with regard to bus passes should be changed to transit pass to count towards other types of commuter passes.
- C. Suggested as an incentive for employers or developers to consider adding additional transit stops, including covered transit stops and bus pull-outs.

Commissioner Maynard suggested that some of the funding the in-lieu fees for parking could go to staffing for parking facilities, shopping for Transportation Demand Management outreach programs, subsidized bikes, additional transit stops, covered benches, and other appropriate uses, with regard to Section 17.38.060.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she would support parking reductions as part of discretionary review as opposed to by right.

Recess held for 5 minutes.

3. Are Bicycle parking requirements sufficient?

Commissioner Maynard commented that overall the bicycle parking requirements are good and questioned whether the Planning Commissioners would consider planning for any type of bike share or a scooter parking plan, noting there will be further discussion on scooters although there is a ban on scooters.

Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller and Commissioner Maynard agreed to recommend increasing the bicycle parking requirements to a minimum of three for short-term. Vice Chair Miller agreed with the staff proposal and would not object to a greater requirement, and believes it is moving in the right direction.

4. Parking Lot requirements (e.g., Landscaping, Color, Covers):  
Retain, Remove, or Modify?

Commissioner Maynard commented:

- A. Recommended considering more detailed requirements on landscaping in parking lots, in particular about separation from buildings, and landscaping in buffers.
- B. Suggested considering landscape requirements as a way for filtration of stormwater by having plants that have the ability to filter some of the toxins from stormwater and pull some stormwater into groundwater systems, and taking advantage of using bioswales.
- C. Recommended stronger permeability requirements for parking lots.
- D. Supports having shade structures being at least solar ready in parking lots, and also suggested incentives that would look at different levels of landscaping requirements.

Chair Smith supports increasing permeability in parking lots. She commented that having shade structures that are solar ready is important. She observed that having more shade structures is somewhat new and anticipates that the community would be interested in the design and the look of those structures.

Vice Chair Miller supports more strengthening on landscape standards rather than allowing structures unless the structures are being used for solar energy. He noted there are lot of shade structures in Phoenix and Las Vegas because the sun is so intense.

Commissioner Shelor appreciates standards that address heat island effects.

Commissioner Maynard commented that shade structures are a new item in the community and suggested more feedback from the Design Review Board regarding the design aesthetics and requiring shade structures.

5. Are there other Parking and Loading issues to be discussed?

Commissioner Maynard supports language in Section 17.38.030 with regard to meeting existing parking standards for the conversion of residential garages into additional living space for the primary unit.

Commissioner Maynard commented that it appears there is a significant reduction in restaurant parking and stated that she would lean towards

the restaurant parking standards being closer to the restaurant parking standards in the International Zoning Code.

Commissioner Maynard commented that her specific concern was regarding restaurant parking; although she believes the minimum requirement for parking is a little low for offices. She noted that Commissioner Fuller made some good points regarding the standards and growth of the industry and parking requirements.

Commission Maynard commented that that she is trying to find a balance with regard to parking because she is supportive of parking reductions for Transportation Demand Management programs, and for additional bike parking, bus passes and commuter passes; however, she hears a lot of concerns regarding limited parking that is available in Old Town and other parts of the City.

Chair Smith commented that she does not support increases from what is currently required and could potentially support some proposed parking reductions but the scope of the proposed reductions is too large. She believes it is a matter of finding that right balance as a community, and also considering the low-income housing issue. She noted there are a lot of unique characteristics of Old Town to consider with regard to parking. She believes the community is still heavily reliant on cars now and things are hopefully starting to change.

Vice Chair Miller commented that while he supports the concept to incentivize walking and taking alternative modes of transportation, he does not believe there is adequate mass transportation infrastructure currently; and although the community is doing a good job trying to provide it, the City is not close to being an urban area where that option is real.

## **TOPIC: SIGNS**

### **Public Speakers:**

Barbara Massey commented: 1) A-frame signs should be prohibited because they are usually cheap, fall over, and obstruct the public right-of-way; 2) Light bulb signs should be prohibited as they are usually just strings of light; 3) Roof signs on top of rooftop structures such as penthouses, walls, and mechanical enclosures should be prohibited; 4) Window signs should be completely prohibited, because it looks trashy; 5) Signs should be prohibited that are within 5 feet of a fire hydrant, city street sign, or traffic signal; 6) Electronic changeable copy signs should be prohibited from scenic corridors, referring to General Plan Policy VH 2.3 regarding

minimizing the use of signage along scenic corridors; 7) There is no discussion of the number of colors that can be used on electronic changeable copy signs; 8) There should be clarification with regard to whether animation is allowed on signs, which can be distracting, and including language in Section 17.40.040 into the section with electronic changeable copy signs; 9) Prohibit A-frame signs from the public right-of-way; 10) A list of submittal requirements for the Overall Sign Plan application has been submitted by Cecilia Brown for consideration to include in a section for required submittals; and 11) Ms. Massey commented in response to Signs Question #1 that she does not mind that there will be nonconforming signs because there is much unwanted signage that because people have taken advantage of an inadequate sign ordinance.

### **Signs questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. NZO will create numerous nonconforming signs in Commercial areas.

No comments provided.

2. Any changes to Exempt or Prohibited Signs?

Commissioner Shelor commented that there are externally sited vending machines located outside of stores that have signage with color and flashing lights, and the machines can be stacked side by side in certain places. In his opinion, these vending machines are as intrusive as similar lighting and signage that would be located inside the business; and would be comparable to window signage and should be considered.

Commissioner Maynard commented:

- A. Supports prohibiting signs on rooftop structures or mechanical elevator overrides.
- B. Regulatory signs should be exempt signs.
- C. Expressed a concern that Open House signs are not directional and seem to sort of clutter the neighborhood without indicating where to go; however, she is not sure whether it can be regulated.
- D. Supports bringing back a restriction against TVs on gas station pumps, noting this was mentioned in a public comment letter.
- E. Agreed with the comment from Commission Shelor regarding vending machines with flashing lights and recommended considering restrictions consistent with other signs.
- F. Supports limiting balloons because they are a huge pollutant going into the ocean.
- G. Supports the idea of having a separation of fire hydrants and recommended checking with the Fire Department about any other concerns they may have about signage in general.

- H. The 100-foot square footage maximum for a freestanding sign seems too high and recommended it be substantially reduced.
- I. Recommended lowering the ten-foot maximum height limit outside of all setbacks in Residential and Mixed-Use Developments because it seems too tall for a residential area (Section 17.40.080.C).
- J. Noted there was previous discussion with regard to standards for allowing an A-frame sign in front of a flag lot to help direct people to a commercial unit that is tucked away in back.

Commissioner Shelor agreed with comments by Commission Maynard.

- 3. Should we keep the Overall Sign Allowance and remove the Sign Types by District?

Commissioner Maynard commented:

- A. Recommended allowing some window signs, closer to 10 percent rather than higher.
- B. Supports keeping sign differentiation between Residential and Commercial Districts because there is such a big difference and it seems like there is something more to protect in Residential Districts. She could support keeping Commercial, Industrial, Business Park, and similar types of signs together.
- C. Suggested some very specific sign regulations for scenic corridors and noted that scenic corridors have been identified in the General Plan and are already mapped. She commented that sign in the sample photo on the upper right corner on Page 29, entitled Electronic Changeable Copy, in the PowerPoint presentation, would seem appropriate for electronic changeable copy, and that changeable copy at a higher height does not make sense in a scenic corridor.
- D. Supports increasing Overall Sign Allowance for Public and Quasi Public zones to the same level as Commercial zones, noting she would not want to disadvantage Public and Quasi-Public areas in terms of the amount of visibility they get and she wants to support public resources in the community.

Chair Smith agreed with the comment regarding a 10 percent allowance for window signs. She supports providing clarity and guidance for applicants regarding what information is required and what would assist the decision-makers. Also, additional guidance with regard to signs in the scenic corridors would be appropriate.

Commissioner Shelor stressed the importance of the pre-application meeting for applicants with staff because it hopefully precludes applicants from overreach on signage at the outset and having to attend multiple reviews with the Design Review Board.

Commissioner Shelor supports the Design Review Board as the approval body for setting up an Overall Sign Plan and also as the approval body for signs that are not part of an Overall Sign Plan. Commissioner Fuller agreed with Commissioner Shelor.

Commissioner Shelor thanked the public for their input and believes it has resulted in an improved process, particularly with signs.

Vice Chair Miller agreed with the comments from Commissioner Maynard and Commissioner Shelor. He commented that he supports the seven statements in the General Plan and believes the objective standards being considered are in line with the General Plan.

4. Staff has already indicated several revisions are being made based on previous feedback. Are there other changes Planning Commission would like to see?

Commissioner Fuller supports having one Zoning Clearance Permit for signs as opposed to separate certificates.

Commissioner Maynard commented that standards regarding drive-through menu signage should be addressed better, and she noted there were a few public comments.

Commissioner Maynard suggested the following with regard to lighting in the Signs Section 17.40.060.L.3:

- A. Add the opportunity for LED lighting.
- B. Include the language that the lighting for signage should be fully cut-off, fully-shielded, and downcast.
- C. Consider turning off additional lighting on signage when the business is closed.
- D. Potentially include standards for lighting levels at the property line, which are included in the Lighting section.
- E. If A-frame signs are restricted, recommended allowing an A-frame sign at the end of a flag lot if it does not restrict accessibility on the sidewalk.

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that Workshop 6 will be held on April 11, 2019, and Workshop 7 is scheduled for April 18, 2019.

**C. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 9:55 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>





**PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, April 18, 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, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard  
Commissioner Shelor  
Absent: Vice Chair Miller

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 Deborah Lopez, City Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

Speakers:  
John Profant expressed opposition to any ordinance that would prevent a citizen from parking an RV on their own property. Mr. Profant noted the City has allowed developers

to repurpose the only available RV parking in the City while the closest alternative for parking would be Bakersfield.

Dean Young agreed with John Profant's comments noting there is no place to park an RV in the City. Mr. Young commented that most citizens have had RVs parked in their neighborhoods the day they moved into their homes and this did not cause an effect on housing prices or health and safety. He asked what is driving the regulations. Mr. Young concluded that without RV parking it reduces RV values if trying to sell in this county.

Cris Wood, a Santa Barbara County resident since 1977, noted that parking for RVs, boats and trailers has always been allowed. She noted that this has been a working-class community and people have trailers for their businesses that include lawn care, landscape maintenance, construction; as well as RVs and boats. Ms. Wood suggested the City not get involved in personal property rights and not prohibit items from being stored on their property if it is legal and not unsafe.

Cecilia Brown, of the Goodland Coalition, announced a forum on April 25, 2019, at 6:30 P.M. regarding the New Zoning Ordinance at the Goleta Library.

Scott Clark, a 20-year Goleta resident, expressed concerns on the City changing topics of tonight's New Zoning Ordinance meeting on short notice. Mr. Clark expressed appreciation to City staff for their work on the public comments and the proposed ordinance. Mr. Clark expressed concern with the last Planning Commission workshop where 4 members of the public seem to sway the Planning Commission against RVs, boats and campers parked in driveways. Mr. Clark urged the Planning Commission to research the amount of work that was put into this draft ordinance. Mr. Clark had in his possession a petition from 3 years ago with 371 signatures, and he noted another petition would be coming soon. Mr. Clark pointed out residents do not want to be the subject of Home Owners Association type laws. Mr. Clark mentioned the City of Buellton's RV friendly ordinance, and urged the Planning Commission to recommend a similar ordinance.

Andy Eggendorfer, a 57-year Goleta resident, spoke on a survey he had taken and found many homes had motorhomes, boats, RVs, and trailers in the driveways. Mr. Eddendorfer noted a high number of people would be forced to find parking, most of which would be very expensive. Mr. Eggendorfer urged the Planning Commission to think about how the proposed ordinance would affect residents. He and his wife use the RV to visit their grandchildren and having a place to stay. Mr. Eggendorfer noted parking RVs and trailers would not harm housing prices. He questioned the reason for restrictions and noted there may be a large number of complaints from one person.

Craig Buzzell, a Goleta resident since 1973, expressed concerns with the last Planning Commission meeting where he felt resentment towards notifying people about what was going to happen. Mr. Buzzell noted several RVs, campers, and boats parked in his own neighborhood, and the investment value of those vehicles. He observed approximately 7

boats and outdoor recreational vehicles that have been purchased by the owners. He hopes the discussion can continue with information previously gathered.

Ken Lewis, expressed concerns with meetings being moved around, and the lack of public notification making it difficult for the public to come and comment at the correct meeting.

Jimmy Rowe, a Goleta resident since 1968, and home owner, bought a house in Goleta over 6 years ago in order to keep an RV in his driveway. Mr. Rowe noted the proposed setback changes will cause him and others undue financial hardship. He agreed with today's public comments regarding RV storage.

Johnny DiBenedetto, a Goleta resident since 1980, and has had a boat on his property since 1992, noted many residents cannot pay to store a boat. Mr. DiBenedetto asked what is driving the proposed ordinance change that would prohibit boat parking within a driveway.

Angela Tripp echoed the previous speaker and noted she was a volunteer on the Goleta Now Committee which pushed incorporation of the City of Goleta. Ms. Rowe expressed concern over the proposed regulations and urged due thought. Ms. Tripp noted her family keeps a truck camper on their property in order to travel and pointed out that they can visit family and park next to a house as opposed to paying for a hotel.

Rich Eickert, a Goleta resident since 1965, expressed opposition to the proposed regulations and noted there are Homeowners Associations people can move into if they don't like having to see boats, RVs and trailers in the driveways as opposed to driving everybody out that has had boats on their property for decades.

Kathy Elizalde, a Goleta resident for over 50 years, commented that about fifteen years ago, her neighbor bought an RV and her three main windows look out at this RV which she does not like; however, she believes people have the right to keep their vehicles on the property they own. Ms. Elizalde noted the neighbor also has a boat and land terrain vehicles in the front yard.

Kirk Sloan, an RV and jet ski owner spoke in favor of being able to park an RV, boat, or trailer on private property within the front setback noting Goleta the Goodland has historically been welcoming and family-friendly which has many facets this is historically included various types of family-friendly recreation and the equipment that might be involved including vehicles a working people use to earn a living. Mr. Sloan commented to disallow the ability to economically store trailers or motor homes, would constitute a serious taking of financial, convenience, peace of mind, and enjoyment. Mr. Sloan noted he felt like he was the victim of gentrification. Mr. Sloan stated concerns with compliance would be complaint driven, and he mentioned the unpleasant reality that most neighbors would know who the complainants would be, and it encourages complaints against any owner that has unpermitted or non-code improvements on their property.

## **A. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

### **A.1 Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance – Height (recap); Floor Area; Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges; Outdoor Storage; Open Space; and Lighting**

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 7 --Staff Report](#)

[A.1 NZO PC Workshop 7 -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 7 -- COMMENTS 35-39](#)

#### **Staff Speakers:**

Peter Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director

Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager

Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner

Jay Ritterbeck, Senior Planner

Shannon McAlpine, Planning and Environmental Review Intern

The staff report was presented by Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; and J. Ritterbeck; including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "City of Goleta Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance, Planning Commission Workshop 7 of 9, Presentation by: Peter Imhof, Anne Wells, Andy Newkirk, J. Ritterbeck, April 18, 2019".

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that Workshop #8 will be held on April 23, 2019, and Workshop #9 will be held on May 9, 2019. In addition, a Joint Planning Commission/City Council Workshop will be held on May 7, 2019.

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, stated that interested persons may sign up to receive email notices of workshops and other pertinent information regarding the New Zoning Ordinance on the City's website at [www.cityofgoleta.org](http://www.cityofgoleta.org) and also on the New Zoning Ordinance website at [www.goletazoning.com](http://www.goletazoning.com).

After each topic was presented, staff responded to questions from the Planning Commission, then public comment was accepted, followed by Planning Commission discussion and deliberation on the topic.

#### **TOPIC: HEIGHT**

#### **Public Comment: Height**

Lorcan Drew, V.P., Watermark Capitol Partners, LLC, the owner of Ritz Carlton Bacara, noted that a more detailed letter has been submitted. Mr.

Drew spoke regarding concerns that there are several areas in the New Zoning Ordinance which the Bacara would not meet. Specifically, the new measurement in height could result in some buildings exceeding the height limit together with the treatment of the projections, chimneys, elevators, stair housing and architectural features. Also, the new ordinance would potentially require more parking not presently required or needed by the hotel. Mr. Drew expressed concern that the new legal non-conforming section would adversely affect the hotel if there was damage to any building, noting if there was damage the owners would want to rebuild quickly without having to go through an approval process. He pointed out that the legal non-conforming provisions are not clear with regard to how it would apply to property with multiple buildings. Mr. Drew stated they look forward to working together to find solutions to ensure the New Zoning Ordinance does not adversely impact the hotel.

Barbara Massey commented that height modifications should only be allowed to increase up to 10% or 2 feet, whichever is less. Ms. Massey also commented that under no condition should the 50% increase in height be permitted, and stated she believes those who support the increases in height would be those who profit from the development that ruins the quality of life. Ms. Massey commented that the area at Storke and Hollister is already ruined by increases in heights.

Ken Alker commented noted that he wrote a letter to Commissioner Maynard after a meeting in March, 2019, indicating he does not think it is right to restrict the height of houses to 25 feet because he thinks would make for some unattractive two-story houses with some non-gabled, flat, roofs. When it comes to height, he believes people will choose function over form to get the size of home they need which will result in compromises that will not be architecturally appealing. He attached an example of a 2-story home with a 9-foot ceiling to a letter he wrote on May 27, 2016, which is attached to the letter he sent to Commissioner Maynard. Mr Alker stated that his property is located in a DR zone which has a 35-foot height standard and noted his goal is to retain the 35-foot standard at least for the DR zone and eliminating the need to go through the process of height modification. Mr. Alker also made suggestions to consider an overlay allowing the 35-foot standard for DR zones, or to allow anybody with a certain size property to have a higher height which is important in zones such as DR where there is agriculture and the need for barns and utilities.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox agreed with comments by Barbara Massey, public speaker. Dr. Cox believes there should be an opportunity for the public to appeal one step higher for Zoning Administrator decisions, to the City Council.

#### **Height questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Is there consensus on the new height methodology?

Commissioner Fuller: Yes

Commissioner Maynard: Yes

Commissioner Shelor stated he likes the direction but is concerned about the 50% height modification, and noted the measurement appears to be fine.

Chair Smith agreed.

2. Any change to the “up to 50%” height Modification?

Commissioner Fuller commented that there are several examples of 3-story complexes that have been built in the past 15 years that do not conform with the old character of Goleta. He would be comfortable with a 30' height limit in single-family zones that allows for architectural diversity. He would like to recommend 30' throughout Goleta as the height limit.

Commissioner Shelor believes the community is concerned about building heights. He noted the importance of story poles. He questioned how the height of the building pad fits with the height of the buildings to go on the pad. He is concerned about the build-up of the pad for the building and the potential it could be subject to manipulation.

Commissioner Maynard recommended going back to the last version of the zoning ordinance with regard to chimneys and decorative structures, etc., and use the language “20% of base district height” as opposed to “20% of structure” to address her concern about the potential for layering of the exceptions.

Commissioner Maynard supports a 30% maximum on Modifications because it involves a high level of review, and not a 50% maximum. She could consider a 20% maximum height.

Commissioner Maynard supports referring back to the transitional standards.

Chair Smith would be open to considering bringing some of the transitional standards into the ordinance.

Chair Smith does not support a 50% maximum on Modifications. She noted that 20-30% may be acceptable. She commented that over time

as the community builds out and with the continued need to meet RHNA numbers, there may be a need to look at increasing densities in certain areas where some of these Modifications may be appropriate. She does not believe the community would support a 50% height Modification.

Commissioner Fuller supports bringing back transitional standards and noted it created a more enjoyable aesthetic for the community. He supports a maximum 20% height Modification. Also, he has concerns with a 35-maximum height and 3 story buildings in neighborhoods.

Commissioner Maynard clarified that the letter received from Ken Alker has been shared with the Planning Commissioners and is part of the public record.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering a higher maximum percent increase in height for smaller buildings and a lower maximum percentage increase in height for larger buildings.

Chair Smith could support a higher percentage maximum height increase for smaller buildings and looking more closely at the 35-foot standard.

Commissioner Fuller suggested going with the 25-foot height limits and 35-foot height limits to be in conformance with the General Plan but limit the modifications to 30% for single-family and 20% for multi-family.

Commissioner Maynard commented that the 30% height Modification would require an extra review.

Commissioner Shelor expressed concern that the height Modification could result in higher second-story homes than currently exist.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he supports giving some flexibility to single-family homeowners with the maximum up to 30% height Modification and noted that an approval would be dependent on the discretion of the reviewing body.

Commissioner Maynard requested staff restudy the issue regarding how chimneys are measured.

After deliberation, the Planning Commissioners summarized that there is an interest in allowing height modifications, not up to 50% as drafted, and possibly somewhere between 20% and 30%.

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

Commissioner Maynard suggested consideration about the height of trees around a property and some factors to think about if considering higher height modifications.

Commissioner Shelor requested staff consider what additional structures would be placed on rooftop open space.

Commissioner Fuller suggested possibly making a special exception for pre-existing approved Development Plans and exempt them from non-conformance through the ordinance.

## **TOPIC: FLOOR AREA**

### **Public Comment:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox commented that with the new changes, garages can become habitable space.

### **Questions for consideration by Planning Commission:**

#### **Floor Area questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

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

Commissioner wanted to make sure there are no unintended consequences.

Commission Fuller believes the proposed standards are an improvement in measurement and recommended clarification that garage spaces are not habitable space and are separate.

Commissioner Fuller commented that the proposed standards are an improvement in measurement and definitions. Also, measuring stair wells and elevator shafts once is appropriate because they are underneath the roof and is used for habitable space.

Commissioner Maynard commented that the more consistency with the language used in the California Building Code and the architectural industry would be better rather the creating definitions.

Commissioner Fuller stated that his understanding is there are separate codes in other jurisdictions for garages that do not meet standards for habitable space, and garages are not usually considered habitable space in the real estate and architectural industries. He noted that garages may have less protection from the elements and are subject to fumes.



Commissioner Maynard initially encouraged garages as habitable space. She later commented that if garages are not counted as habitable space in industry, she could consider counting a converted garage as habitable space; however, it may be challenging if it is not known during construction whether it will be converted.

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

### **Public Comment:**

Barbara Massey commented that fences, freestanding walls, and hedges should be no higher than 4 feet on the front and side setbacks. She recommended lowering the current 6 feet standard to 4 feet for safety reasons so drivers will have adequate visibility when pulling out of a driveway and at intersections. Ms. Massey noted that today she measured cars to see how high the driver sits off the ground at intersections and measured an average that is between 4 and 4.5 feet. She commented that it would be great if the fences were set away from driveways and intersections, although that would make it more complicated to rule.

Ken Alker stated that he owns a commercial property on Hollister Avenue and has hedges on the front along Hollister which are about 8 feet in height. The hedges serve to screen the building and parking from the street and the neighbors across the street. Also, vandalism has stopped since the hedges have grown taller. Mr. Alker thinks there is an advantage for having the hedges taller, and noted his property is in a commercial district.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox noted that chain link fences are being utilized as a wall by a lot of houses that face open spaces. She expressed concern that a wall with the finished side facing an open space would encourage graffiti and a wall would also impair vision when police are patrolling, noting that police would be able to shine a light through a chain link fence at night and see beyond the fence. Dr. Cox questioned whether people would need to replace chain link fences and requested consideration be given to what the financial burden would be for the residents or whether the City would bear the cost. Dr. Cox noted she visited more than 3 sites and observed chain link fences facing open space at all of these sites.

### **Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. The NZO carries forward the existing standards. Is this the right approach for fences and walls?

Commissioner Maynard supports a height restriction on the front of the property and a limit of 4 feet within a residential area on the street side of the property. She noted that a light can be shined over 4 feet and that 4 feet can be looked over. Also, a 4-foot height is more welcoming.

Chair Smith stated she could support an adjustment to the standards with the understanding that existing fences would be non-conforming.

Commissioner Fuller supports requiring a counter permit for a fence, wall, or hedge over 3 feet for safety purposes and allowing Public Works the opportunity to review.

Commissioner Shelor expressed concern about the potential for 6-foot walls adjoining on adjacent multiple lots in residential areas that would result in the walling off of properties from the public right-of-way. He commented if aesthetics are taken into account, 6 feet may be too tall given the possibility of adjoining lots. He suggested consideration that a tall wall, fence, or hedge might be more appropriate if it is set back from the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he has observed a 6-foot fence along the property line around a front yard and noted it is not a very attractive feature for the neighborhood and would seem to disassociate the property from the community and degrading the aesthetics of the neighborhood. He is not totally in favor of having a lower standard for fencing in the front yard, but he suggested having some communal landscaping in the front yard along with possibly a 3- to 4-foot tall fence at the property line and then also allow a 6-foot fence wall for privacy with a 10-15 foot landscaped setback. He believes the communal landscaping in Goleta adds to the aesthetics in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Maynard suggested allowing 4 feet in height for fencing for the front and street side, and 6 to 8 feet in height on the back and internal area between properties without requiring CUPs or excessive permitting.

Chair Smith could support at least 4 feet in height for fencing in the front yard when considering safety and the purpose of the fencing.

Member Shelor supports at least a 3.5-foot height for fencing in front yards for safety purposes with an additional height in an amount that is appropriate.

2. Should the NZO introduce standards for hedges that effectively treat them as fences/walls?

Commissioner Maynard would encourage including hedges as fences but potentially allowing for much a higher height limit in Commercial and Industrial zoning with a minor permit such as a Zoning Clearance, and keeping the hedges at the height of fences in Residential zones.

Chair Smith supports in general the direction staff is moving with regard to hedges. She noted there could be creative structures or planting that could create issues.

Commissioner Maynard requested clarification with regard to the definition of a hedge and suggested adding cactus.

Chair Smith commented that the definition seems to include cactus.

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

Commissioner Fuller suggested adding a reference to Section 17.03.090 Measuring Height of Fence in this section.

Commissioner Fuller recommended adding language to require that slats are placed on the outside of freestanding fences.

Commissioner Maynard commented that there should be a consistency between the Inland and Coastal zones with regard to the vision triangle.

Recess held from 8:37 to 8:45 p.m.

## **TOPIC: OUTDOOR STORAGE**

### **Public Speakers**

Barbara Massey spoke in support of a 72-hour time limit for temporary storage of construction materials, the same as for other materials. Ms. Massey commented that the NZO language in Section 17.24.130 states the 72-hour time limit does not apply to temporary storage of construction materials, and she would like the 72-hour limit to be the same for construction materials. Ms. Massey requested that a number be applied for vision clearance and visibility standards with regard to outdoor storage. With regard to question #1, she believes the restrictions are not strict enough and people should not be allowed to turn their front yards into storage facilities.

Ken Alker questioned whether there is a problem that exists that the restrictions are trying to resolve and also whether the restrictions are necessary, particularly in commercial district; however, residential areas may be appropriate. Mr. Alker also commented that there might be some specific situations that are being missed with regard to outdoor storage

regulations, as the language seems general. He suggested language that will not require screening if the storage items are not visible and are not a problem for the neighbors.

**Outdoor Storage questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Are the NZO standards for outdoor storage adequate, too strict, or not strict enough?

Commissioner Maynard requested staff clarify how nurseries and garden centers account for Outdoor Storage and suggested allowing some leniency for nurseries and garden centers.

Commissioner Fuller commented that there is ambiguity in the language in Section 17.24.130 Outdoor Storage with regard to Permissibility of Outdoor Storage and also the application of screening to different uses, and requested the language be clarified.

Chair Smith commented that her observation is that storage in the front that is adequately screened and gated, and is not bothering anybody, in a residential neighborhood is fairly tolerated. She also commented that the nuisance standards level may be a high threshold to reach.

2. Are there other issues within the area of Outdoor Storage that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Maynard recommended considering restricting the amount of outdoor storage during business hours particularly in terms of preventing sidewalk movement.

Commissioner Maynard suggested bringing back some setback standards for outdoor storage, noting there were requirements in Section 17.24.130.B.2 that existed in the previous draft.

Commissioner Maynard commented that a 72-hour temporary permit for outdoor storage of PODS would fully address her concerns. She believes there are great options for backyard sheds that will meet aesthetic guidelines.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she supports allowing for outdoor storage that is not visible in this section, particularly in the residential areas.

Commissioner Maynard commented in support of not limiting storage of construction materials to 72 hours, noting that it can be difficult to store the materials inside a building that is being built. She suggested

addressing visibility concerns with screening and noted the use of construction fencing is used as an option at construction sites.

Commissioner Maynard suggested language similar to the fence guidelines and deferring to Public Works with regard to visual clearance for items being stored outside.

Commissioner Fuller supported not allowing storage in the front yard. He noted people will tend to accumulate items in the backyard and since two-story houses can have a view of backyards, there may be a reason for a complaint from neighbors. He considers this issue as being parallel with the Municipal Code regulations.

Chair Smith commented she could support creating some standards in the direction of allowing some flexibility with certain residential space where there is adequate screening and the outdoor storage is not visible and not bothering anyone else; and noted that clarity is important. She noted there is difficulty in addressing nuisances and believes it is important to have other tools as well to address community concerns.

Commissioner Maynard suggested for consideration allowing for storage of items such as a sculpture garden, art studio or art gallery that might have sculptural pieces located in the back of an art studio, as storage or commercial storage if selling the art pieces.

Commissioner Shelor recommended considering anything that can be done to make sure that the screening is acceptable and appropriate. He expressed his concern that some chain link fencing with mesh screening has become dilapidated over time, and particularly unattractive when it is located close to a public right-of-way.

Commissioner Maynard supported allowing chain link fencing with a mesh cover for construction sites.

## **TOPIC: OPEN SPACE**

### **Public Speakers:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox suggested the open space should be named “amenity space” or “private open space” for clarification. She noted for consideration that she has observed in recent developments that there are green areas that have been landscaped with regard to flooding and people cannot use these areas as open space.

Ken Alker questioned whether his project, Kenwood Village Project, would be subject to the new proposed open space requirements. He also questioned whether the requirements have been reviewed by an architect, which he believes would be useful. Mr. Alker commented that he believes it

is critical to count the detention basins as open space if the new standards are approved.

**Open Space questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Should area requirements be adjusted?

Chair Smith supported the direction the requirements are moving. Commissioner Maynard supported the direction the requirements are moving.

2. Should staff revise the NZO to clarify "Open Space" to distinguish between the following three types?

- A. Public Open Space
- B. {Private} Restricted Open Space
- C. {Private} Common Open Space

Chair Smith supported the staff proposal regarding clarification of the language and stated she shares Commissioner Maynard's concerns regarding how common open space is defined.

Commissioner Maynard supported the direction the requirements are moving with regard to usable space.

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

Commissioner Maynard commented that it is important for employees and visitors to have an area for breaks and lunch, and for visitors, and noted lot coverage requirements were removed from commercial sections, and landscaping was removed or reduced, from the previous requirements. She noted that lot coverage requirements were removed from commercial sections and minimum landscaping requirements were eliminated or substantially reduced in most of the commercial sections from the previous ordinance, and she would like to go back to consider the first requirements in the previous zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Fuller suggested the language "private area amenity" and "common area amenity" for clarification, noting these terms are used by homeowners associations. He recommended increasing the amount of private area open space for units and not reducing it. He supported the idea of the open space being usable with minimum widths and horizontal standards.

Commissioner Maynard stated she does not support the following: including rooftop decks in the required open space, including buildings

in open space, and using the language “amenity”. Commissioner Maynard supported the language presented in the staff report and requiring open space to be contiguous with the project.

Commissioner Shelor supported requiring private open space for both condominiums and apartments. He commented that open space is a benefit to residents and guests more than just usable space, and landscaping provides a sense of openness. Also, he noted that more open space equals less footprint for buildable space which would be potentially fewer units unless there is an increase in building heights. Commissioner Shelor questioned whether there are calculations that show it is achievable to fit increased usable space requirements, parking setbacks, and maximum height requirements on a project site with 20 units per acre.

Commissioner Fuller supported the approach for minimum standards for private area and common open space amenities and stated he does not believe the current requirements should be lowered. He supported flexibility as long as the standards are met and noted that the developer is working with conditions that are related to and depends on the specific site.

Additional discussion was requested by the Planning Commission regarding substantial changes to maximum lot coverage, minimum common open space, and landscaping requirements for commercial districts. Commissioner Maynard requested further discussion of commercial open space.

## **TOPIC: LIGHTING CHAPTER 17.35**

### **Public Speakers**

Cecilia Brown commented that she appreciates efforts to update the zoning code; however she believes lighting standards have changed considerably and are very much different from what is being proposed and the standards are much different today. She noted that she and Gretchen Zee, as members of the Design Review Board, wrote the first lighting guidelines that the City used for several years. Ms. Brown recommended that the language for lighting standards language be updated and include standards that are more current and. She noted that the California Building Code is a good reference for lighting code language and there are technical standards she recommended incorporating into the zoning code that support Dark Sky standards. She suggested staff borrow standards and language from the Model Lighting Ordinance.

Ken Alker commented that that from his experience with regard to fluorescent light bulbs, the size of the LED bulbs are getting more specific, and recommended not going below 3000 kelvin, because the bulbs may be difficult to find. He also noted in his opinion, there is not much difference in illumination from 2500 to 3000 kelvin.

**Lighting questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Any comments or input on string-lights?

Commissioner Maynard supported the prohibition of unshielded string-lights outside of the holidays in Section 17.35.030.

Commissioner Fuller recommended string-lights should meet the same standards of any other lighting that includes complete shielding and no light trespass. He suggestion making an exception for lighting with very low wattage.

Chair Smith commented that a narrow exemption on string-lights could be appropriate.

2. Staff has already indicated several revisions are being made based on previous feedback, but are there other changes Planning Commission would like to see?

Commissioner Shelor suggested staff consider language that would allow for an exception for flexibility for up-lighting if the applicant can prove that the lighting will be appropriate and acceptable.

Commissioner Maynard recommended additional consideration regarding whether the City should have exemptions and thinking about where the City needs to have exceptions rather than creating a broad exemption for all City facilities. She recommended City street lights should be fully shielded and cut-off, and approximately 3000 kelvin.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering bringing back the following sections that were eliminated from the previous zoning code: 1) Section 17.35.030 that prohibited landscape lighting other than low-voltage accent lighting (because there could be more landscape lighting); and 2) Section 17.35.040 which was a height limitation off of the roof which was also eliminated.

Commissioner Maynard recommended that it is important to include language where possible for lighting that is fully shielded, fully cut-off, and at the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.



Commissioner Maynard recommended referring to the International Dark- Sky Association for guidance for recreation field lighting standards, noting there may be a need for more specific guidelines for unique situation of recreational fields in addition to the lighting trespass guidelines.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering guidelines regarding the amount of illumination on car lots at night when closed, and noted her concerns including the extreme brightness late at night, the amount of usage of electricity, and the effect on the night sky.

Commissioner Fuller commented that hopefully car lots will not require as much lighting when closed. He agreed with Commissioner Maynard's comment regarding the amount of illumination on car lots.

Commissioner Maynard supported considering the language in the model ordinance provided by Commissioner Shelor, or refer back to the previous draft with regard to gas stations.

Commissioner Maynard recommended limiting the number of consecutive renewals of temporary lighting in Section 17.35.020.

Commissioner Shelor requested consideration of adding flexibility to the language with regard to the light temperatures and other lighting standards to keep up with the new technology involved.

Commissioner Fuller stated that his preference for the lighting temperature standards is 3500 to 4000 kelvin as an appropriate level.

Chair Smith generally supported Planning Commissioners' comments to consider the model language with regard to lighting.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that Workshop #8 will be held on April 23, 2019, and Workshop #9 will be held on May 9, 2019. In addition, a Joint Planning Commission/City Council Workshop will be held on May 7, 2019.

## **C. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 10:07 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>**





**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, April 22, 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, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard,  
Commissioner Shelor  
Absent: Vice Chair Miller

Staff Present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager; Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner; Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner, Marti Milan, Principal Civil Engineer; Christine Lazzaretto, Consultant, Historic Resources Group; John M. Foster, Consultant, Greenwood and Associates; Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney; and David Cutaia, Deputy City Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

None.

## AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

### **A. PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **A.1 Conditional Use Permit for a Crown Castle Small Cell Node on an existing utility pole located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road; APN: N/A (within Public Right of Way); Case No. 18-084-CUP**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission:

1. Adopt Resolution 19-\_\_ entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Approving the Conditional Use Permit for the Small Cell Node Site on an existing utility pole (#ATTSBW02) located within the Street Right of Way on the northwest corner of the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road, Case No. 18-084-CUP; APN: N/A." (Attachment 1)

[Crown Castle Small Cell Node -- staff report](#)

[A.1 Crown Castle Small Cell Node -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.1 Crown Castle Small Cell Node HANDOUT -- REVISED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL](#)

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Commissioner Shelor reported a site visit and stated that he reviewed this project when he was a member of the Design Review Board. Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, and Commissioner Shelor reported no ex-parte conversations.

Staff Speakers:

Joe Pearson, Associate Planner

The Staff Report was presented by Joe Pearson, Associate Planner, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Public Hearing Item A.1, Crown Castle Small Cell Node Utility Pole Site, Planning Commission, April 22, 2019", Mr. Pearson reported that the following minor revisions were made to amend the Conditions of Approval that were submitted today and are recommended by staff: 1) Replaced the language from "encroachment permit" to "conditional use permit" in Condition 1; 2) Added language to clarify that an encroachment permit will be needed for the work outlined in

Conditions 24 and 27; and 2) Clarified the language for lighting regulations and described down lighting in Condition 10.

Tricia Knight, representing applicant Crown Castle, responded to questions from the Planning Commission.

Chair Smith opened the public hearing for public comment at 6:15 p.m.

No speakers.

Chair Smith closed the public hearing for public comment at 6:16 p.m.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners. The Planning Commissioners deliberated on the information presented during the public hearing and provided input which is recorded in the video of the meeting.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Maynard/Commissioner Fuller to adopt Resolution 19-03, entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Approving the Conditional Use Permit for the Small Cell Node Site on an existing utility pole (#ATTSBW02) located within the Street Right of Way on the northwest corner of the intersection of Calle Real and Ellwood Station Road, Case No. 18-084-CUP; APN: N/A.", as amended with Conditions of Approval as amended (Attachment 1).

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

**A.2 Proposed 27-unit Hollister Village Apartments (14 studio and 13 one-bedroom units) with associated General Plan land use and zoning designation changes, lot line adjustment, development plan revisions and setback modifications located on a 1.84-acre site located at 7000 Hollister Avenue; APN: 073-030-026, -027, -028, & -033; Case No. 18-152-GPA-RZ-LLA-DPRV**

**It is recommended that the Planning Commission consider:**

- 1) Opening a public hearing to take verbal and written testimony; and**
- 2) After considering the evidence presented during the public hearing, adopt Resolution No. 19- \_\_ entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, recommending that the City Council 1) Adopt an Addendum to**

**the Westar Mixed-Use Village Final Environmental Impact Report and General Plan Addendum; 2) Approve a General Plan Amendment from Community Commercial (C-C) to Residential Medium Density (R-MD); 3) Approve a Rezone from Shopping Center (SC) to Design Residential (DR-20); 4) Approve a Lot Line Adjustment between three (3) existing lots; and 5) Approve a Development Plan Revision with associated setback modifications for the 27-unit Hollister Village Apartment Project with five affordable units on a 1.84-acre site located at 7000 Hollister Avenue, Case No. 18-152-GPA-RZ-LLA-DPRV; APNs 073-030-026, -027, -028, & -033" (Attachment 1).**

[Hollister Village -- staff report](#)

[Hollister Village PLANS -- Att. 1 Ex. 9](#)

[A.2 Hollister Village -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.2 Hollister Village -- PUBLIC COMMENTS 1-2](#)

[A.2 Hollister Village HANDOUT -- REVISED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL](#)

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Site visits reported by Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, and Commissioner Shelor. Chair Smith reported she regularly drives by the site on a daily basis. Commissioner Shelor reported he reviewed the project when he was a member of the Design Review Board. Chair Smith reported a phone call with the applicant last Friday and she did not learn more than what is in the packet presented to the public; and reported a phone call today with staff for some clarifying points but no new information resulted. Commissioner Maynard reported a phone call with the applicant Connor Best and she did not learn anything that was not a part of the public record.

Staff Speakers:

Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner  
Peter Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director  
Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney  
Marti Milan, Principal Civil Engineer

The Staff Report was presented by Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Public Hearing Item A.2, Hollister Village, 27 Apartment Project, Planning Commission, April 22, 2019". Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney, provided clarification with regard

to the recommended revised Conditions of Approval related to affordable housing on big Pages 409 and 410 of the resolution.

The applicant presentation was made by Connor Best, Westar Associates.

Chair Smith opened the public hearing for public comment at 7:01 p.m.

Public Speaker:

Barbara Massey (Ms. Massey noted that written comments were submitted previously).

Chair Smith closed the public hearing for public comment at 7:07 p.m.

Staff and the applicant responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners. The Planning Commissioners deliberated on the information presented during the public hearing and provided input which is recorded in the video of the meeting.

Commissioner Maynard recommended adding language to Section 7.B of the resolution to indicate that the adjacent streets, S. Glen Annie and Hollister Avenue, are adequate and properly designed to accommodate the traffic anticipated from the proposed change from the approved project.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Maynard/Commissioner Fuller to adopt Resolution No. 19-04 entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, recommending that the City Council 1) Adopt an Addendum to the Westar Mixed-Use Village Final Environmental Impact Report and General Plan Addendum; 2) Approve a General Plan Amendment from Community Commercial (C-C) to Residential Medium Density (R-MD); 3) Approve a Rezone from Shopping Center (SC) to Design Residential (DR-20); 4) Approve a Lot Line Adjustment between three (3) existing lots; and 5) Approve a Development Plan Revision with associated setback modifications for the 27-unit Hollister Village Apartment Project with five affordable units on a 1.84-acre site located at 7000 Hollister Avenue, Case No. 18-152-GPA-RZ-LLA-DPRV; APNs 073-030-026, -027, -028 & -033" with amended Conditions of Approval and the addition of the recommended language in Section 7.B of the resolution (Attachment 1).

**VOTE:** Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard,

Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Vice Chair Miller.

MOTION: Commissioner Maynard/Commissioner Fuller to recommend that the City Council adopt an Addendum to the Westar Mixed-Use Village Final Environmental Impact Report and General Plan Addendum.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Vice Chair Miller.

MOTION: Commissioner Fuller/Commissioner Maynard to recommend that the City Council approve a General Plan Amendment from Community Commercial (C-C) to Residential Medium Density (R-MD).

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Vice Chair Miller.

MOTION: Commissioner Shelor/Commissioner Maynard to recommend that the City Council approve a Rezone from Shopping Center (SC) to Design Residential (DR-20).

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Vice Chair Miller.

MOTION: Commissioner Fuller/Chair Smith to recommend that the City Council adopt a Lot Line Adjustment between three (3) existing lots.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Vice Chair Miller.

MOTION: Commissioner Fuller/Commissioner Shelor to recommend that the City Council adopt as amended a Development Plan Revision with associated setback modifications for the 27-unit Hollister Village Apartment Project with five affordable units on a 1.84-acre site located at 7000 Hollister Avenue, Case No. 18-152-GPA-RZ-LLA-DPRV; APNs 073-030-026, -027, -028, & -033", with amended Conditions of



Approval and the addition of the recommended language in Section 7.B of the resolution (Attachment 1).

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Absent: Vice Chair Miller.

## **B. DISCUSSION/ACTION**

### **B.1 Historic Preservation Ordinance Discussion**

**Receive a presentation introducing the development of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.**

[B.1 Historic Preservation Workshop 1 -- staff report](#)

[B.1 Historic Preservation Ord -- PRESENTATION](#)

Staff Speaker:

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager

Christine Lazaretto, HHG

John Foster, Greenwood Associates

The Staff Report was presented by Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager, and Christine Lazaretto, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Historic Preservation Ordinance, Planning Commission, April 22, 2019, Presentation by: Christine Lazaretto, HHG".

Chair Smith opened the item for public comment at 8:05 p.m.

Public Speakers:

Dr. Ingeborg Cox

Ron Nye, local historian

Chair Smith closed the item for public comment at 8:11 p.m.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners.

The Planning Commissioner deliberated on the information presented and provided input which is recorded in the video of the meeting.

**C. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review, reported on updates, future agenda items, and upcoming public meetings and events. Mr. Imhof noted that a Special Joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshop will be held on May 7, 2019, concerning the New Zoning Ordinance (NZO).

**D. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

None.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 8:24 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>



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, April 23, 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, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard  
Absent: Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Shelor

Staff present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner; Shannon McAlpine, Intern, Advance Planning; Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney; and Deborah Lopez, City Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No speakers.

## AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None

### **A. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

#### **A.1 Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance - Trailers and Recreational Vehicle Parking/Storage and Planning Commission-Requested Follow-up Items**

##### **Recommendation:**

- A. Receive a presentation, allow public comments, and provide feedback on the Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) regulation of Trailers and Recreational Vehicle Parking/Storage in Section 17.38.070(A)(3) of the Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance (page IV-86). This issue is highlighted on page 59 of the Key Issues Guide.**
- B. Time permitting, receive a presentation, allow public comments, and provide feedback on Planning Commission-requested follow-up items.**

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 8 -- staff report.pdf](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 8 -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 8 -- COMMENTS 40-48](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 8 -- COMMENTS 49-56](#)

##### **Staff Speakers:**

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager

Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner

J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner

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 8 of 9, Presentation By: Peter Imhof, Anne Wells, Andy Newkirk, J. Ritterbeck, April 23, 2019".

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners and public speakers during the workshop. The Planning Commissioners provided feedback at the close of the discussion of each topic.

## **TOPIC: TRAILERS AND RV PARKING/STORAGE**

### **Public Speakers:**

Barbara Remick, 40-year resident, spoke in support of the direction of the proposed RV Parking/Storage Guidelines with one change that she could keep her 18-foot travel trailer on her driveway because the side yards are too narrow. Ms. Remick suggested that people who have room elsewhere on their property should provide space for their vehicles in side or back yards, but it should not be required because it would create financial challenges to make adjustments such as creating a passage or destruction of current landscaping and features. She requested removing Section 17.38.070.f. Ms. Remick requested the City continue to work with the public to allow RV owners to store RVs at their home. She noted that if the RV parking is not allowed, and because of the shortage of existing RV storage in the area, many RVs may need to be sold. She commented that instead of decreasing property values, allowing RV storage at homes may create the interest of persons who own RVs and instead increase their value.

Wes Herman, retired Fire Captain, County of Santa Barbara, stated that he does not see that there are any overriding problems that are being addressed. He discussed two principles called “traditional and historical usage” and “past practices and procedures” as they relate to how property owners have used their lots. He believes the policies should not be changed radically and the revisions should follow the reasonable changes discussed in the past and agreed upon. Upon running out of time, Andrew Vineyard relinquished his time to Wes Herman to continue. He then noted that the owners are put in a difficult situation because several storage sites have gone out of business due to zoning. Mr. Herman commented if the City takes more action forcing trailer storage off of the owners’ property, which has been done for many years, it would be considered the taking of value of private property. If the City were to pursue more restrictions, he expects that legal action may need to be taken to defend their property rights.

Craig Buzzell, resident since 1973, expressed concern that the proposed ordinance is restrictive and would preclude almost anything stored on his property. Mr. Buzzell commented that he believes it is important to consider the concerns of the residents in attendance at tonight’s meeting who have acquired and maintained RVs, boats, and trailers over the years, as well as the age demographics. Noted that there were millions of dollars worth of investment throughout the community in RVs, boats, and trailers.

John Profant commented that when he bought his home over 30 years ago, one of the reasons he purchased his home was that it had a 30-foot RV pad which he has used for various boats and RVs. He stated that his RV has been parked perpendicular and there has not been a problem even though he hops a curb because he has built ramps instead of having a curb cut. Mr. Profant requested that his comments be taken into consideration so he will still be able to use the RV pad, and not have this value taken away.

David Geoffrion commented that he has stored RVs on his property for 30 years. He used to park the RV in the street, but a changed rule prohibits that, so now he uses ramps rather than curb cuts to get to the paved parking area, which has not been problematic for the neighbors or at the curb. He noted that the County of Santa Barbara gave him a choice of using a ramp or curb cut and he believes it is a significant hardship to change the rules for people who have equity for 20 to 30 years. He noted the sidewalk in front of his home is usable and the ramp is only used for a few minutes with no damage to the curb and then placed in storage. If changes are made to require curb cuts, it should apply to new RV storage after adoption of the NZO only and those properties with existing RV storage should be grandfathered.

Eric Sharp spoke in support for no new legislation and for allowing parking in all setbacks unless it interferes with the sidewalk. He commented that he uses board ramps for his boat rather than a curb cut. He prefers parking his boat on grass rather than a paved surface that is permanent and unattractive, and requested consideration. He indicated that one of the reasons he moved here from Santa Barbara was due to over-burdensome rules there compared to Goleta.

Tera Yamasaki, resident since 1994, commented on the value for her family of camping vacations with an RV and boat over the years. She indicated that to take away the ability to park RVs and trailers on your property would be taking away family time. She also noted that trips such as to Hawaii are cost prohibitive because they bought a house in Goleta.

Jim Richards commented that he is opposed to the increased restrictions, noting that he does not know of any proposals for new storage sites. He expressed concern that some of the over-size vehicles might be moved out of the City's boundary and parked within the County jurisdiction in front of other people's homes instead. He believes trailers should be allowed to stay on the owner's property and suggested an unintended consequence would be trailers being parked on City streets and just towed every 72 hours to another location on a street just to avoid a ticket. Mr. Richards noted that his RV is parked in Oxnard and he is on a 2-year waiting list for storage.

Tammy Hughes commented that she appreciates the opportunity to store her boat in her backyard and be able to take it out often to the islands. Ms. Hughes noted that today she observed that 11 out of 27 houses on one street had some kind of RV, boat, or trailer being stored. Ms. Hughes noted that having access to a RV is valuable when wanting to visit scenic recreation sites in the State and not just stay indoors. She believes that RVs and recreational vehicles create more of a sense of community and indicates an active lifestyle.

Bree Belyea spoke in opposition to the proposed restrictions she considers infringements on property rights for what she believes to be no more than an aesthetic issue. Ms. Belyea commented that she is working to become part of the next generation of homeowners in Goleta and that she pays attention to City actions.

Dana Trout commented that he appreciates the public process of the NZO. He also indicated that he purposely purchased his home in the Ellwood area rather than in an HOA because he did not want the added restrictions. He also noticed at the time that there were a lot of physically active people who enjoyed boating and camping with a trailer. Mr. Trout noted that he walked around the area this afternoon and counted about 280 addresses of which he saw being stored 57 boats, trailers, and various conversions as well as about 12 medium-size trailers about the size of a passenger car that fit in the driveway.

Mark Rogers stated that he agreed with all of the previous public speakers today. Mr. Rogers requested that parking be allowed on the grass, gravel or driveway.

Scott Clark, 20-year resident, commented that he has never heard a complaint regarding RVs on his property from a neighbor or City official. Mr. Clark noted that most driveways in Goleta are not big enough to park a car without it being in the front setback, so the RV is parked in the front setback. He noted that RVs are used for many important things including recreation and as an emergency preparedness vehicle. Mr. Clark appreciates the Planning Commissions' direction to staff, but expressed concern that the two Planning Commissioners (Shelor and Miller) who spoke out against RVs at a previous workshop are not present at today's meeting would not grasp the sentiment of today's public speakers and therefore should recuse themselves on this topic in the future.

Francis Arnoult, 40-year resident, commented that although there may be some poor aesthetic examples of the use of setbacks in the City by homeowners or renters, he wants to continue to be able to park his RV,

which he keeps in good condition, in his driveway. He noted that his RV occupies one of three paved spaces on the paved driveway and uses it at least once a month. Mr. Arnoult suggested not solving the problems associated with some residents by banning all recreational vehicles from being parked on the property.

John Feeley, 30-year resident, spoke in support of not making any changes, and noted he has not seen a statement of the problem and has not heard of any problems over the years.

Virginia Pagenkopf, new homeowner, stated that she has a small RV that was ticketed a few times because it was parked in the grass. She noted that they had to build a driveway to comply with the City which cost thousands of dollars and she is now concerned with the proposed changes and requested reconsideration. Ms. Pagenkopf requested the Planning Commission focus on the graffiti and garbage on the street.

Miles Wallace requested that the ability to store RVs not be taken away. He commented that he believes all setbacks are necessary, given the various types of property. He noted that he brought his RV to his rental home in Goleta and placed it in the side yard. When his neighbor complained, he moved the RV to a more desirable place for the neighbor, along the front setback, and the neighbor complained that she can see the RV no matter where it is located. He also noted that a prior speaker at an earlier workshop spoke out against RVs and cited his trailer as an example, but that she did not mention that he responded to her by moving it.

Roland Takayama commented that he bought his house in 1983 and has interviewed his neighbors to see if his RV is a problem and they have assured him it is not. He noted that he stores a few boats and trailers on his property and he works very hard to keep everything in the back, and actually expanded the garage to keep most of the items inside and out of sight.

Sandy Andrews commented that she is a newcomer and appreciates the active character of the community with the boats and trailers, and noticed most of the properties are neat and tidy. Ms. Andrews expressed concern that she may not be able to store her toy hauler on her property and questioned why there would be rules if there was not a problem. She hopes the active character of the City can be maintained.

Robert Paul, resident since 1965, stated he has never had a problem with anyone's boat or RV. Mr. Paul lives on a cul de sac and expressed concern that it would not be economical for him to have to pay over \$200 monthly fees for off-site storage for his boat.



Kirk Sloan stated that he is commenting to try and protect the ability for himself and other Goleta residents to store their vehicles on their property. He noted that there are young, decent, tax-paying families who participate in recreation and sports who need to store boats and vehicles, as well as older people. He stressed that this is not just an issue about an older demographic with RVs, but many ages and ethnicities of families with many different types of recreational vehicles.

Jason Dave, 30-year Goleta resident commented that he believes the regulations are being considered to regulate a problem that does not exist or is perhaps an attempt to address urban blight and aesthetics. He commented that he would rather see trailers and RVs rather than houses that have been boarded up as a drug house.

Denise Tisdale, 30-year resident and 18-year homeowner, commented that the previous public speakers have voiced her concerns. Ms. Tisdale suggested that consideration be given to the fishermen as well as recreational boaters, noting that there is not enough offsite storage available. She requested that she can continue to store her boat on her property and noted she cannot afford to pay for storage. She stated that she would have to get rid of her boat and stop enjoying the recreation opportunities if forced to find and pay for off-site boat storage. She commented that Goleta residents who appreciate their property rights have chosen not to live in HOAs, which dictate all forms of rules.

Cris Wood, resident since 1977, requested consideration that RVs are important for disabled people and others who are not all active energetic people, and noted the importance of accessibility for the disabled. Ms. Wood noted she was able to use her RV to move her dad around to enjoy recreation opportunities. She was able to park her RV on the street until 2015 due to regulations imposed by the City and now parks it on her property for her and her disabled husband to use. But, if these regulations are passed she would have to get rid of it.

Brad Penkala stated that he owns a cab-over camper that he takes off when he uses his pickup truck. Mr. Penkala noted that the DMV does not register these cabs and he requested consideration regarding this situation and making an exception.

Neil Therrien, homeowner since 1988, suggested consideration be given to all of the ordinance and ADU regulations, and maintain the status quo. Mr. Therrien noted that a neighbor parked a RV that blocked his mountain view for about four or five year, but he did not file a complaint. He also noted that he thought the City should get its priorities straight as it relates to housing.

Valerie Sweat, 8<sup>th</sup> generation Santa Barbara, expressed concern that proposed regulations will cost money for the owners, and commented that she does not want to be told what she can do and what she cannot do with her property as long as it is safe and not a hazard of any sort.

Justin Wood, property owner, expressed concern about requirements that would force him to not be able to keep his boat. He also indicated that he believes that a majority of complaints about RVs, boats, and trailers were from people trying to flip homes and not people actually living in the neighborhood.

Brigitta Eggleston, 40-year resident, agreed with all of today's public comments and expressed the importance for her son to have his boat for recreational use in the local areas. Ms. Eggleston also noted that her family worked very hard to find and buy back the last boat that her father built.

Russell Granger noted that the large part of the reason he came to the community was the type of homes and a place for RVs and boats, because camping is important for his family. Mr. Granger noted that he owns a trailer small enough to fit in the driveway, not hang over the sidewalk, and not impact his neighbors.

Dale Elevatorski supported allowing RVs and trailers to be parked in the driveway off of the sidewalk, and just dealing with registrations and expirations. Mr. Elevatorski expressed concern that there is no offsite parking available and noted that the largest local site for RV parking was recently closed in order to use the land to build a retirement home.

Kevin Duffy, Goleta resident, commented on how precious the lifestyle is including the ability to enjoy recreation on the ocean and the lakes, and he does not think it is right to even discuss taking that away. Mr. Duffy noted he believes it is important for property owners to pay attention to these issues and follow through to see that residents are in harmony with the decision-makers and if not, vote in ones that will.

Conrad Metzenberg, Vice president, Santa Barbara Freedivers Club, stated that many of the members live in Goleta and own boats, and they like to keep their boats in their driveway and he is requesting that this not be taken from them. Mr. Metzenberg noted that Goleta's maritime tradition dates back to the Chumash. He also noted that some of the best fiberglass boats in the world are built locally by Anderson and Radon. He noted that many of the club's members dive and harvest fish and lobster locally and often give it out to their neighbors to share the local resource to those in the community.

Nathan Harmony, homeowner and teacher at Dos Pueblos, encouraged researching how much the effect of having to move and store RVs and boats will have on the residents, considering the lack of storage sites and the price of storage. Mr. Harmony requested the City consider that his family enjoys the use of their RV and boats, and he noted that his family chose a home based on the ability to store these items on their property and did not want to belong to a homeowners association. He also noted that forcing everyone to move their RVs and boats off-site to a facility will increase the storage costs due to a sudden imbalance in supply and demand.

Theresa Gritt commented on the importance of emergency preparedness with regard to disasters and requested that resources such as RVs and boats that are needed for evacuations are available to help ourselves and others, and are not taken away. She also commented that they also provide access to areas to the south, like Ventura, when the high is closed.

Sharon Nye commented that she has lived in Goleta most of her life, except for 15 years in San Diego while living in an HOA. She agreed with comments presented tonight by the public speakers and stated she is very interested in preserving her rights.

#### **Trailer and RV Parking/Storage Issues for Consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Allow parking all setbacks? (Note: Goleta Municipal Code consistency).

Commissioner Maynard stated she believes it is important to allow RV parking in the front setback as long as it is not blocking the sidewalk or the ability to walk up and down the sidewalk or bike paths. She noted that the front setback is where vehicles park throughout the Goleta region. And, no need to single out RVs and not any other vehicles.

Commissioner Fuller commented that the current proposal is to allow for parking of trailers and RVs in the setbacks with some provisions.

Chair Smith commented that all of the information presented this evening has provided a better understanding of the history of regulations and the current status quo; and also helps to understand the community expectations and the difficulty the residents have in terms of finding other places to store RVs. She stated that comments have been received by email expressing concerns and noted that the concerns included parking impacts to accommodate a RV due to the garage being used for storage and not to park cars.

Chair Smith stated that she is open to reconsider allowance for parking trailers and RVs in the front setback and noted she believes access to the sidewalks is important. With regard to allowance for parking in side setbacks, Chair Smith commented that issues could be raised with regard to having a sense of privacy and views that may be somewhat difficult to address as there are different sizes of RVs, as well as different lots sizes and structures. She noted with regard to privacy issues a concern may be if someone was living in the RV and can see into a neighbor's house, and that a vehicle that is just being stored may not trigger the privacy issues.

Commissioner Maynard spoke in support for parking in both side and back setbacks. She noted there is a lot more ability to provide screening in back yards which addresses some of the concerns.

Commissioner Fuller spoke in support for parking in all setbacks with certain common sense regulations.

2. Require current registration with DMV?

Chair Smith spoke in support for requiring current registration with the DMV and requested that staff clarify the different types of storage and situations that do not require DMV registration.

Commissioner Maynard agreed with requiring current registration with the DMV and also requested staff to research DMV regulations and provide clarifying language with regard to vehicle registration regulations that apply including operable and being capable of operation.

Commissioner Fuller agreed with comments from Chair Smith and Commissioner Maynard.

3. Allowance for RV on-site use for 14 days or less? (Note: Goleta Municipal Code consistency).

Commissioner Fuller spoke in support for allowance for RV on-site use for 14 days or less, and noted the Goleta Municipal Code should be followed regarding this item, in his opinion.

Commissioner Maynard supported the allowance for RV on site use for 14 days or less and recommended retaining the language for not allowing RVs to be occupied as a living residence. Commissioner Maynard commented that she would be interested to learn about possible new housing laws being considered by other cities, or the State of California, with regard to allowing RVs as small homes in response to

the affordable housing situation, and requested staff follow the status of current State legislation.

Chair Smith commented she believes the allowance for RV on-site use for 14 days or less is reasonable and should stay consistent with the Goleta Municipal Code. She commented that this would prevent a potential nuisance situation when there is a permanent living situation and other disruptions that are not appropriate under the City's current regulations, and noted that parking a RV in the side yard may present the potential for a problem. Chair Smith noted she is hearing from the audience that members of the community have been working well with their neighbors and also there is a nuisance code if there is a problem.

4. Require parking on paved surface? (Note: Goleta Municipal Code consistency).

Commissioner Maynard recommended requiring parking on a paved surface in the front setback but not necessarily requiring parking on a paved surface in the side and back. Commissioner Maynard recommended staff explore and encourage the City Council to consider turf block, pavers, gravel and other alternatives that may be appropriate as a base for parking.

Chair Smith supported the recommendations by Commissioner Maynard with regard to requiring parking on paved surface.

Commissioner Maynard supported a suggestion by J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner, to explore for further discussion the option to address the gravel distinction in the glossary.

Commissioner Fuller encouraged the public to continue participation in the New Zoning Ordinance process and suggested they may want to express their points with the City Council as well as express support for Planning Commission recommendations.

5. Require owners to live on site?

Commissioner Maynard supported requiring owners of the trailer or RV to live on site and requested staff to clarify that it is the owner of the trailer or RV that must live on site.

Commissioner Fuller agreed that the owner of the trailer or RV must live on site.

Chair Smith supported requiring owners of the trailer or RV to live on site. She commented that if there is an occasional issue or concern that may arise there should be an owner on site for the City to contact.

6. Require parking to be perpendicular to road?

Commissioner Maynard stated that she would not support adding this requirement. If the proposed requirement is added, she recommended it would not apply to vehicles that are lower in height and with height below a fence or hedge line but to taller RVs. Also, Commissioner Maynard suggested considering the size equity between different types of vehicle, for example a SUV and RV.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he had proposed requiring parking of RVs to be perpendicular to address the impact of views of the house; however, he would not necessarily need to support this requirement.

Chair Smith commented that it would not make sense for smaller vehicles and trailers, and it would depend on the size of the property and the particular driveway. She noted she has not heard that perpendicular parking is a particular concern or problem and suggested, if considered, it would need to be narrowly applied.

7. Any other issues?

Commissioner Fuller commented that he does not see why curb cuts would be a requirement and suggested it be deferred to Public Works if there are safety concerns.

Commissioner Maynard suggested that that Section 17.38.070.e be removed because it is restrictive and she believes if this section is not removed, additional curb cuts would need to be allowed by the City for more access so people can achieve that development standard. Commissioner Maynard expressed concern that there may need to be more leniency by Public Works with allowing curb cuts and noted the feedback from tonight's indicates there has not been a problem in the past for those that "jump" the curb.

Chair Smith agreed with the above comments from Commissioner Maynard regarding curb cuts.

**TOPIC: DAY CARE FACILITIES:**

**Public Speaker:**

Eileen Monahan made the following comments with regard to the idea of permitting Large Family Child Care by-right and not requiring a Land Use Permit:

- A) Noted that the care provider is typically an individual person and for them, the Land Use process is daunting, and she has seen that people may likely not go through with the process;
- B) There is a need for neighbors to understand what is going on in the community, and she does not believe neighbors complain often about day care facilities;
- C) It is difficult to make these types of facilities pencil out, so anything that can be done to make the permit process easier for child care facilities outside of the home will increase the number of child care programs;
- D) Requested additional consideration of all the policies that affect child care;
- E) Think of ways to incentivize child care with developers; and
- F) Recommended using the local child care planning council, such as being done by other cities and counties, to figure out the development and properties that are going on in the market that can be useful for child care.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners and public speaker.

**Day Care Uses questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Allow Day Care Facilities without a CUP in certain Commercial Zones?

Commissioner Fuller supports these facilities being allowed in tertian Commercial Zones without a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Commissioner Maynard recommended that Goleta Old Town (OT) is an appropriate place for day care centers, noting it is family centric and there is a need for day care facilities. She commented she is open to including the Community Commercial (CC) and General Commercial (CG) uses as well, and expressed concern regarding the Intersection or Highway Commercial (CI) use because lots of children around major intersections seems problematic.

Commissioner Maynard supported keeping Regional Commercial (CR) and CI at least requiring a Minor CUP, and possibly a Major CUP; and in the CU zone; and recommended moving CC, OT, and CG to "P" (Permitted).

Commissioner Fuller supported the analysis and recommendation by Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner.

Chair Smith generally supported the recommendations by staff, and questioned whether the Service Industrial (IS) and General Industrial (IG) zones are appropriate even though consistent with the General Plan.

Commissioner Maynard recommended not allowing day care facilities in IG at all, and moving to Major CUP for IS; and stated that at the minimum she would like Major CUP for IS and IG for day care facilities. Commissioner Maynard stated that she appreciates the need to have more day care facilities in the community but noted she believes in the basis of zoning to separate sensitive receptors from potential hazards, not just when in normal facilities but also during emergencies and major disasters.

Commissioner Fuller supported designating Permitted "P" for Business Park (BP) and Office Institutional (OI) zones. He commented that it may be valuable to have day care facilities in areas where people work as it would alleviate people needing to drive further to day care facilities. Also, he believes that specific safety concerns regarding a facility would be addressed.

Chair Smith indicated support for the staff recommendation that IS and IG require a Major CUP.

Commissioner Maynard indicated that she was open to dropping BP and OI to Permitted "P" since it is more of a support service.

Chair Smith reiterated support for staff's recommendation and also that she supported designating Permitted "P" for BP and commented that it is worth considering changing the allowance to Permitted "P" for the OI zone.

## 2. Reduce Major CUPs for Day Care to Minor CUPs?

Commissioner Maynard supported the staff recommendation not to allow Large Family Day Care Facilities or Day Care Facilities, but to allow Small Family Day Care in Agricultural (AG) zones. (Commissioner Maynard stated she commented regarding Major and Minor CUPs under Question 1).



Commissioner Fuller agreed with Commissioner Maynard's support of the staff recommendation.

Chair Smith agreed with Commissioner Maynard's support of the staff recommendation. (Chair Smith had no additional comments other than those made with regard to the BP and OI zones in Question 1).

3. Remove Land Use Permit requirement for Large Family Day Care?

Commissioner Fuller supported, with the understanding that the Large Family Day Care is regulated by the State of California, removing the requirement for a permit in Residential zones.

Commissioner Maynard stated that she would support the potential revisions 1, 2, and 3 in NZO Section 17.41.130 with regard to parking regulations, and would like to see additional parking requirements in consideration of the off-loading.

Commissioner Maynard spoke in support of moving towards a Zoning Clearance with some additional parking requirements.

Chair Smith noted the distinction would be if there is no permit, the parking would be a code enforcement matter.

Commissioner Fuller commented although concern with parking is valid, adding an additional parking space on a small property may negate the ability for some applicants to conduct day at the home.

Chair Smith stated that she generally supports the Zoning Clearance, and noted she has heard from the community that there is a real need for child care in the community and the City needs to look at ways to promote them.

Commissioner Fuller supported the Zoning Clearance and the standards for dropping off and access to the property.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she could support the Zoning Clearance with staff making recommendations on how to add some flexibility, possibly as a type of transportation demand management program or guidelines for parents to follow.

After staff provided information regarding how parking requirements are reviewed by the Business License permit process along with the Planning Department, Commissioner Maynard spoke in support of the staff recommendation, along with reference to the Business License permit process rather than requiring the Zoning Clearance. She also recommended that staff address the loading and unloading requirements for the Day Care Facilities and possibly align these closer to the Large Family Day Care standards.

After further discussion, Chair Smith spoke in support of the staff proposal, along with reference to the Business License permit process rather than the Zoning Clearance.

Chair Smith also commented that she would be open to addressing loading and unloading and parking requirements for the Day Care Facilities as part of the Business License process.

Commissioner Maynard indicated that loading and unloading standards for Day Care Facility should be aligned with those for Large Family day Care.

Commissioner Fuller commented that the current proposed language in the New Zoning Ordinance presumes that the curbside is adequate for loading and unloading.

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

Commissioner Maynard questioned the rationale for Large Family Day Care only being allowed in Residential zones, and noted there was discussion about bringing more day care closer to where parents are working.

Chair Smith stated that comments received in this section have raised some interesting questions about how all of the policies might impact child care issues. She noted that issues such as incentives are more of a discussion worthy for the City Council to consider.

**TOPIC: RESIDENTIAL SETBACKS**

**Residential Setbacks Questions for the Planning Commission to Consider:**

1. Add back 20' front setback in RP?

Commissioner Fuller commented in regard to Planned Residential (RP), when a planned unit development comes up to a public street, especially a frontage, the development should be 20 feet off of the public street, but if there are internal private streets in a development, no setback standards. He noted if the development has a side that is on a public street, the side setback should be applied.

Chair Smith questioned whether the entire elimination would be supported by the community and suggested looking for a more flexible standard.

Commissioner Maynard noted she would advocate for a 20-foot setback for RP from the front of the overall development and allowing more flexibility within the development.

Commissioner Maynard requested further discussion when appropriate at a future workshop with regard to commercial setbacks with regard to Section 17.08.030 Commercial Districts and Section 17.24.120 Mixed-Use Development. She noted her concerns in 17.24.120 included the minimum setback requirement seemed low, and there is no language about setbacks.

Commissioner Fuller recommended discussing commercial setbacks when discussion commercial issues.

Chair Smith commented the intent of this zone is to allow flexibility, but she is not certain that a '0' setback is appropriate.

After hearing from staff, Chair Smith commented that she could be comfortable with setbacks being adjusted through the Development Plan process as a way to address her concern about allowing flexibility for projects in the RP zone.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he would support a 20-foot setback off a public road for buildings in a planned unit development.

Commissioner Fuller also spoke in support of keeping the backyard setbacks the same whether or not the backyard backs up to open space.

Commissioner Maynard supported Commissioner Fuller's comment to keep the rear yard setbacks the same whether or not the rear yard backs up to open space.

Chair Smith commented that she is not certain to support Commission Fuller's comment in support of keeping the rear yard setbacks the same whether or not the backyard backs up to open space, but the point is taken.

2. Are there any other issues within this top that need to be discussed?

None.

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that the next meeting will be a Joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshop on May 7, 2019. Also, Workshop #9 will be held on May 9, 2019, for final topics for discussion. Staff is also planning two more Open Houses for the public to review the NZO materials.

Commissioner Maynard requested confirmation that the following items will be discussed at the upcoming Workshop: 1) minimum Open Space and landscaping for Commercial districts; and 2) staff response to the discussion regarding infeasibility and how to assess infeasibility.

Chair Smith commented that the community might appreciate at least one Open House held at another location besides City Hall.

Commissioner Maynard supported Chair Smith's comment in support of holding a public Open House at a mixture of other locations, and at least one at the Goleta Valley Community Center.

## **B. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 9:32 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>



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, May 09, 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**

Chair Smith called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Present: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller,  
Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor  
Absent: Vice Chair Miller

Staff Present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner; Megan Garibaldi, Counsel, Best Best & Krieger; and David Cutaia, Deputy City Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox questioned who will be handling Temporary Use Permits and Coastal Development Permits now that the Administrative Hearing Officer position has been removed. She believes that Variance requests should remain at the Planning Commission level of review. With regard to Chapter 17.36 Nonconforming Uses and Structures, Dr.

Cox questioned what would happen with the Ellwood Onshore Facility that is nonconforming. Also, in her opinion oil drilling and production plans should be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council rather than by discretionary review. Dr. Cox commented that lot line adjustments, parcel maps, and reclamation and surface mining permits should have at least a one-line statement informing the public where to go for a decision rather than just removing them. She recommended that the language with regard to reclamation and surface mining permits should state that any such activity is not permitted within the city, but just not remove the permit. She noted that she did not see in a notice that the cultural resources section will be discussed at tonight's workshop. Dr. Cox agrees that previously disturbed spaces could still have a lot of artifacts. With regarding to the Bacara site, she requested consideration that there are at least five to seven archaeological sites associated with the original application in the late 1980s.

Ken Alker commented that a paragraph in Section 17.01.040.E Effect on Projects in the Entitlement Process in the draft zoning ordinance dated November 2015 was not included in the New Zoning Ordinance and requested that it be reinstated. He noted that the language stated that projects accepted for processing prior to the adoption of this ordinance may continue to be processed with the previously adopted Title 17 or may utilize the provisions herein. Mr. Alker stated that he received notice of application completeness for the Kenwood Village Project in 2010 and has paid for architectural plans, two EIRs and various studies under the guidelines of the current zoning ordinance. Mr. Alker commented that the permit process has been long and expensive and he implored that the paragraph be reinstated as it critical to the processing of his project, and requested this matter be addressed at the workshop today.

## **AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA**

None

### **A. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

#### **A.1 Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance -Planning Commission- Requested Follow-up Items**

**Receive a presentation, allow public comments, and provide feedback on Planning Commission-requested follow-up items and provide feedback on other items in the Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance.**

[A.1 NZO Workshop 9 -- Staff Report](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 9 -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 9 -- COMMENTS 57-79](#)

**Staff Speakers:**

Peter Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager

Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner

J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner

Megan Garibaldi, Counsel, Best Best & Krieger

The staff report was presented by Anne Wells, Advance Planner; 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 9 of 9, Presentation By: Peter Imhof, Anne Wells, Andy Newkirk, J. Ritterbeck; May 9, 2019".

After each topic was presented, staff responded to questions from the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission then accepted public comment including comments regarding all topics, followed by Planning Commission discussion and deliberation.

**TOPIC: SETBACKS IN NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONES**

**Public Speakers:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox requested and the Planners and speakers not use so much lingo to make it easier for the public to understand. She requested clarification regarding the measurements for the front, rear and side setbacks for Open Space and Residential districts.

Holly Garcin, with Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, extended gratitude for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the New Zoning Ordinance and questioned when the public comment will be closed.

Kirk Sloan, Goleta resident since the early 1990s, commented that he wants a zoning ordinance that is consistent and fair and suggested an NZO that is responsive to the needs of the community, sympathetic to the historical precedent, and respectful of the wishes of Goleta residents. He questioned how it would be known if other Goleta residents were upset but do not comment. He stated that trailer owners request that the ability to parking their vehicles on private property not be restricted. He noted from his observation in the Santa Barbara Shores area that all parcels are not equal and some favor trailer and RV parking, and some are not designed or intended for trailer and motor home parking, which he believes is a natural check on the proliferation. Mr. Sloan commented that registration of trailers is a state function and noted motor homes and house trailers are required

to be registered; however, other trailers can legally be placed on a Planned Non-Operation status. He suggested

William Master commented regarding recreation vehicle storage lots and supported allowing storage in general commercial zones, although general commercial has a limited number of parcels. He recommended the terminology be changed to Vehicle Storage for operable vehicles from Outdoor Storage which suggests non-operable vehicles. He noted that there are very few industrial zones in the city. He suggested that the permit requirement for vehicle storage in a commercial zone be changed from Major CUP to up to minor CUP. Mr. Master also suggested considering adding RV storage as an allowed accessory use for a business in business parks.

Jeff Wayco requested the City Council or others find a way to help take the pressure off the need for parking for recreational vehicles, but not eliminate what can be stored on private property, noting there are people who live in apartments and condos. Mr. Wayco stated there were about 400 or 450 people that were counted who had some sort of RV or trailer in their yard and noted there are many young families who would like to enjoy recreational opportunities. He noted that a facility in Santa Paula is closing soon. Mr. Wayco commented that most of the items on the proposed list seem okay but suggested the following: 1) Allow exemptions for occupancy when needed due to damage from fire, flood, earthquake, etc.; 2) Do not make the requirements for materials for the pad surface so restrictive because it is not cheap or easy and some boats and vehicles are smaller; and 3) Requested that the language with regard to approved driveway access be removed. Mr. Wayco also commented that he was encouraged with the discussion regarding day care.

### **Planning Commission and Staff Discussion Regarding General Comments from Public Speakers:**

Commissioner Maynard supports designating general commercial districts for RV storage lots and making the necessary adjustments for vehicle storage. She is not quite sure if vehicle storage is appropriate in business park districts. She supports having less restrictions regarding pad surfaces, and more variety for the materials, especially for smaller items being stored.

Chair Smith commented regarding a comment from Dr. Ingeborg Cox by noting that there is a district for common open space that is distinct from the concept of common open space standards that may be provided as part of a multi-unit development.



Commissioner Fuller commented that he highly recommends requiring a rear yard setback on open space.

Commissioner Fuller commented that believes it is fair and equitable to allow projects that are substantially completed or that are submitted and complete under a certain zoning ordinance to continue under that ordinance, considering how long it takes for a project to get approvals.

Commissioner Maynard commented that it seems fair that the Planning Commission or City Council could use the flexibility of the earlier zoning ordinance when reviewing a project for consistency with the General Plan. She supports language that requires that the applicant has submitted a complete application to qualify to use the flexibility of the earlier zoning ordinance and would support vesting with a completed application.

### **Planning Commission Discussion Regarding Setbacks in Non-Residential Zones:**

Commissioner Fuller supports having upper stories stepped back on second stories for residential units where there are zero lot line situations in non-residential zones. He noted it is not comfortable for residents to have their windows exactly above the sidewalk when there are people walking below. He noted a potted plant could fall from a second-story window onto the sidewalk. He would support not stepping back when there is a setback that is, for example, 20 feet.

Commissioner Maynard commented that the minimum setback for mixed-use should be based on the first-floor use of the mixed use. She suggested a minimum setback of 5 feet rather than 3 feet which seems random as everything else is in measurements of 5 feet. Also, she does not see the rationale for having the setback on the second floor.

Commissioner Shelor questioned what was envisioned for a 3-foot setback and suggested a lot more could be done with a 5-foot setback, for example, adding landscaping.

Chair Smith commented in the terms of setbacks, that after having heard more background and information with regard to the philosophical approaches of the two drafts, the 2019 draft makes sense overall.

## **TOPIC: TRANSITIONAL STANDARDS**

### **Public Speakers:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox expressed concern that when looking at the Transitional Standards the residential house will get overpowered by the RH District, noting that the distance of 10 feet is very low and the privacy will be lost because people can look into the adjacent backyards. She commented that residential areas are suffering and disappearing because they are overpowered by these other buildings.

### **Planning Commission Discussion Regarding Transitional Standards:**

Commissioner Shelor commented that he believes when there are transitional zones it is not ideal for residential homes to be overpowered by other buildings and that it was not originally envisioned and may need to be reconsidered. He commented that the idea of setbacks and stepping back in tandem makes sense; however, when considering this along with density issues, the issue of more height will also need to be considered. He believes it is achievable but needs to be done strategically so it is done in the right places where height can be accommodated and it is not destroying views.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she still sees the value of the Transitional Standards because it helps with neighborhood compatibility to have some transition between the areas. If forty feet is too long to require for the setback, she suggested considering a shorter distance

Commissioner Fuller stated in general he supports the 2019 Transitional Standards. He echoed Commissioner Maynard's comments and believes the RM, RP and RH Districts not have a 25-foot height limit and there will not be the probability of three-story buildings.

Commissioner Maynard supports the direction to not require the mobile home parks to be set back a further distance than the setback requirement for single-family residences.

Commercial Maynard supports the inclusion of the requirement for a 50-foot rear setback in the IS and IG Districts if abutting residential districts, given the additional risks that come up with industrial uses. She noted the picture for this item is appreciated.

Chair Smith commented that generally it is helpful to hear the background and an overview of this topic and believes the Transitional Standards are moving in the right directions. Chair Smith could consider adding back in the 50-foot rear setback requirement in the IS and IG Districts, noting protection from the industrial districts would make sense.

## **TOPIC: MOBILE VENDORS**

### **Public Speakers:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox requested that the staff clarify how the mobile vendors will be regulated and whether someone will be hired for this purpose. Dr. Cox commented that currently the response for cars parked over the required time limit is complaint driven.

### **Discussion by Planning Commission Regarding Mobile Vendors:**

Commissioner Maynard supports possibly requiring a business license or Temporary Use Permit in most cases for mobile vendors, and she is leaning towards a business license since that is what is required in the right-of-way; and then only requiring a minor CUP if there are three or more vendors. She is more concerned about how many mobile vendors are in an area, rather than how often they are there, as it can create traffic and parking issues. She is concerned about how late at night the mobile vendors would be operating, and recommended that a minor CUP may be needed, depending on the location. She is more concerned about how late the vendor is operating than the number of hours the vendor is operating. She also requested clarification with regard to the meaning of "hours of operation".

Commissioner Maynard suggested that reasons for exemptions, or for a lower level of approval, could include a birthday party an internal event for employees that would not cause additional traffic or a program for the distribution of free food. She recommended some equity and a balance between the standards for mobile vendors on the right-of-way vs. on private property. She expressed concern that significant requirements for private property may push the mobile vendors onto the right-of-way rather than a large parking lot where there is more space.

Chair Smith commented that she likes the general direction of the draft ordinance. She recommended further staff exploration with regard to the regulations, including to address potential impacts such as fire safety, emergency access and accessibility to parking. She recommended for exemption consideration regarding a one-time use within a certain period of time and suggested maybe some narrow exemptions such as a food truck at a birthday party. Her concerns include the massing of a number of mobile vendors as well as the cumulative impacts when there are multiple single events in a neighborhood at the same time. She thinks that the section regarding event permitting might address some of her concerns. Chair Smith senses that the community enjoys one-time uses on private property. She commented that she has not heard that mobile vendors have been an issue and she does not want it to become a major issue because of

massing. She noted for consideration that there would be state law governing the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Shelor recommended that it would seem appropriate to use caution with regard to mobile vendors.

## **TOPIC: COMMERCIAL OPEN SPACE**

### **Public Speakers:**

None.

### **Discussion:**

Commissioner Fuller commented that there will be setbacks in some of these zones that are going to be landscaped setbacks and will provide an aesthetic contribution to the area as well as provide open space in a context of an unused area. He noted that the open space may not be useable, common or private open space, and suggested there may need to be a fourth definition of open space such as including landscaped areas. He noted that landscaped areas have been included as part of the definition of the old open space types. Commissioner Fuller commented that a retail business is not a typical place where people would congregate or expect useable amenities unless it was wanted by the business. He noted there may be workers who would want useable amenities. Commissioner Fuller commented that he is not sure whether there needs to be a requirement for useable open space or common open space except maybe in the context of how it is ancillary to the tenants and the employees.

Commissioner Maynard believes there is value in providing open space for employees to use and stated it is consistent with a goal of the General Plan to create an open feel to the community where there is a reduced bulk and an opportunity for outdoor spaces for gatherings throughout all the different regions. She is most overall concerned regarding a significant reduction in landscaping, limitations to lot coverage, and not requiring open space in most of the commercial districts because it creates a dense bulky space and does not allow for outdoor gathering spaces throughout the community; and stated she would like to see more standards brought back.

Commissioner Shelor expressed gratitude for Commissioner Maynard's comments linking open space, landscaping, and lot coverage and the impacts of the combined standards.

Chair Smith noted a potential in business parks for some limited requirement for open space. She expressed a desire to know what other communities in the region do.

Commissioner Maynard supported some amount of common open space for business parks.

Commissioner Fuller noted Resolution 03-20 and expressed concern with adding standards that may create nonconforming properties.

## **TOPIC: OUTDOOR STORAGE**

### **Public Speakers:**

None.

### **Discussion by Planning Commission Regarding Outdoor Storage:**

Commissioner Fuller suggested that the size of PODS would require a permit depending on the size. He stated also that PODS would be more substantial and sturdy than the typical types of storage sheds that can be purchased.

Commissioner Maynard supports allowing the PODS as temporary storage containment for 72 hours or less.

Chair Smith supports allowing the PODS as temporary storage for 72 hours or less. She recommended that other types of structures should be allowed, or required, and permitted for permanent storage.

## **TOPIC: LOT COVERAGE & LANDSCAPING**

### **Public Speakers:**

None.

### **Discussion by Planning Commission Regarding Lot Coverage & Landscaping:**

Commissioner Fuller commented that there is no specific maximum lot coverage requirement but there are variable design standards that will determine the project's lot coverage as well as setbacks, height, parking ratios that will impact an applicant's ability to design the site.

.

Commissioner Maynard expressed concern about reduction in lot coverage requirements in commercial districts from the 2015 draft version. She commented that it is unclear to her how the overall lot coverage would be affected when only relying on other standards and without relying on the lot coverage standards proposed in the 2015 draft. She expressed concern about the landscape requirements and common open space considerations overlapping. She also expressed concern regarding the removal of landscaping requirements for commercial districts and the reduction in landscape requirements in commercial districts from the 2015 draft. She mentioned that General Plan Policy VH 4.7.C calls out that office buildings, business parks, institutional public and quasi-public uses should provide plazas, courtyards and landscaped open space to create a campus-like setting and encourage pedestrian access. She commented that not having common open space requirements for office and business parks seems inconsistent. She recommended for clarity that the language, at least for the office and business park districts, indicates there must be open space for consistency with the General Plan.

Commissioner Shelor supports having the Design Review Board, in most cases, start with an existing minimum standard then use their discretion to potentially require more rather than have no minimum requirements and have the Design Review Board make the requirement for more.

Commissioner Fuller commented that it is questionable with no minimum landscaping requirements in some districts whether landscaping can be eliminated. He noted that most properties will have setbacks and they will likely be required to have landscaping or hardscaped as required by the DRB.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she has seen projects with inadequate landscaping in commercial districts and on industrial sites; and she believes a modest amount of a landscaping requirement would help this to be addressed. She commented it is not clear how this would affect overall lot coverage. She noted there are projects on Calle Real and in the Camino Real Marketplace in commercial districts, as well as projects in the industrial districts, that have very little landscaping. She believes this can be addressed by a minimal landscaping requirement for the commercial districts.

Chair Smith appreciates staff's comments with regard to balancing the standards and permitting, and how it fits together. She shares some of the Commissioners' concerns regarding landscaping requirements and suggested staff revisit and consider where there are no minimum requirements. Chair Smith noted while it is helpful to allow the Design

Review Board some artistic flexibility it can be helpful to have some minimum landscaping requirements in the appropriate situation.

Commissioner Fuller suggested if front setbacks are not large enough for commercial districts, maybe there should be larger setbacks, and noted it would result in more landscaping. He believes the landscaping standards for the industrial areas are sufficient and follow the current standards so non-conforming properties are not being created. He commented there is the argument of changing some standards for existing properties and also the argument of creating better standards for the community. He believes that standards need to follow the General Plan. He commented that it is hard to argue against landscaping.

Commissioner Maynard commented that one of her concerns is keeping the landscape minimum requirement only in industrial districts just because this is the way it was done before.

Commissioner Fuller noted the use of existing standards to ensure the same development rights for all property owners, whether they developed previously or not. He also noted the alternative view that we could be creating better standards for the community for the future.

Commissioner Maynard believes it is important to match the vision of Goleta as expressed in the General Plan Policy VH 4.7. She believes requiring a minimum of at least 10 percent landscaping across the board makes sense in most districts, although she suggested skipping it in Old Town because it is so dense. She does not understand requiring the 10 percent minimum for landscaping in industrial districts but not in commercial areas. She supports the 2015 version with 20% landscaping in Visitor Serving. She noted that if landscaping standards came back, she would be less concerned about lot coverage. She supports some modest amount of common open space for office buildings in business parks as well.

Commissioner Shelor commented that he believes the zoning ordinance imposes many standards that supersede discretion and he does not understand why landscaping is different. He would like to ensure that whatever the minimum landscaping requirement is, it is equal to greater than what would be required when adding up all the setbacks, the land, the unused areas, and what is required for stormwater management.

Commissioner Fuller commented that for Open Space and Resolution 03-20, he was looking at commercial as retail use, and not industrial, office park, or business park districts. He noted that because Resolution 03-20 is for non-residential and includes "shall", the analysis is up to the Design Review Board.

Chair Smith shares some of the concerns regarding landscaping and commented that the landscaping consideration is worth a second look. She stated that she may not view the issue as broadly as Commissioner Maynard. She noted it might be helpful to research what is being done in other communities near Goleta. She suggested there could be the potential for some sort of blended requirement in the business park districts and noted her primary concern is the business park districts.

## **TOPIC: EXEMPTIONS**

### **Public Speakers:**

None.

### **Discussion by Planning Commission Regarding Exemptions:**

Chair Smith requested staff consider if the standards for fences change in the NZO, that the language in the Design Review Board section is consistent with the changes.

## **TOPIC: CITY LIGHTING**

### **Public Speakers:**

None.

### **Discussion by Planning Commission Regarding City Lighting:**

Commissioner Fuller supports not having the lighting standard and therefore allowing the approval to be made by the Design Review Board. He noted that there are places and situations where a more daylight or neutral kelvin would be appropriate and believes the Design Review Board, the applicants, and people who will be using the property should have the opportunity to determine what temperature of lighting they want.

Commissioner Shelor believes that the technology seems to be changing and probably will be changing rapidly, and he wants the city to stay with the technology and not fall behind. He does not believe one size should fit all with regard to the standards. He read, in part, a comment letter received a few months ago suggesting a neighborhood desire for 2800K temperature in neighborhoods and a higher temperature at intersections and other appropriate places. He noted he would not want an industrial look in his neighborhood. Commissioner Shelor suggested discussing this issue at an



upcoming Planning Commission meeting with regard to the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) consistency hearing.

Chair Smith commented that good points were made in the comment letter that was received and read in part by Commissioner Shelor.

Commissioner Fuller pointed out the sample color of the low Kelvin temperature and the moderate Kelvin temperature on the staff presentation. He commented that the low Kelvin lighting temperature is approximately 2700K which is a yellow color that would take out the other colors in the neighborhood. He noted that lighting that goes lower than 3000K would result in more amber colors and wash out the colors in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fuller commented that the total amount of light (wattage) in a certain area should be a consideration in addition to the temperature of light.

Commissioner Maynard pointed out that she commented at a previous workshop that she had a concern about the exemption for a city facility from lighting standards and she did not support it.

Chair Smith commented that one alternative would be to include this type of exemption in a set of design standards.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she would be open to staff advising if there is another document appropriate for the requirements. She noted that a lot of projects are small enough not to require Design Review Board review.

Commission Maynard encouraged retaining the maximum LED lighting standard in the zoning ordinance and keeping the maximum at 3000K which would keep it in line with the dark sky guidelines and provides an upper limit.

Chair Smith supports keeping an upper limit for LED lighting temperature in the NZO. She noted that technology may change, but there would be an upper limit for the lighting temperature for now.

Commissioner Fuller and Commissioner Shelor do not support retaining the 3000K maximum standard in the zoning ordinance.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that there is still further research being done by staff with regard to Infeasibility, Grading/Grubbing on Agricultural (AG) Land, and Developer Incentives.

Ms. Wells reported that two additional Open Houses are scheduled for May 29, 2019, at Goleta Valley Community Center.

**Public Comment on Other Items in the NZO:**

Ken Alker stated that he does not have an RV but suggested consideration for allowing RV storage in Community Commercial districts as well as in General Commercial districts. He owns property in a Community Commercial district that abuts a couple of General Commercial districts and has had RV storage for decades which he would like to be continued in Community Commercial districts as there obviously is a need. He noted that most all people who use his storage facility, or who call about storing RVs, live within a mile of the property, and he believes the issue of limiting to local residents is self-limiting. He requested consideration to allow indoor and outdoor personal storage in Community Commercial, noting there is public storage in the surrounding General Commercial districts. Also, he is storing a couple of seagoing containers stored in the back of this property and expressed concern if these types of containers are not allowed, it would be a huge problem and expense to remove, or it may create nonconforming uses. He suggested considering possibly taking the commercial restriction out of Outdoor Storage and move it into the Industrial, Public and Quasi Public districts where it is not permitted in the front or street side setbacks but permitted in interior side and rear setbacks. Mr. Alker also commented: 1) Requested more than one Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) be allowed on a property, and suggested, if needed, possibly restricting the number of units by property size; 2) Requested ADUs not be limited to 800 square feet and suggested basing it on property size, if needed. He noted he would like to provide an ADU on his DR district property for his parents. He believes 1200 square feet is allowed by the County of Santa Barbara for ADUs; 3) He purchased his property where he lives in the DR district with the opportunity to build up to a 35-foot maximum height and he wants to continue to have the right to build to this height. He noted his property is large and located in a canyon surrounded by trees that are much taller than 35 feet. Also, there are no views to preserve and no one has access to his land. He would like to build an accessory structure in the future to store tractors and utility equipment. He noted there are others that have these DR district properties. He expressed concern that the DR district properties will be included in the RS zone with smaller lots where he might not be able to build to a maximum height of 35 feet; and noted there had been a consideration to rezone the DR district to RP rather than RS. He expressed concern that requesting a re-zone is expensive, requires a General Plan Amendment, and takes a long time; and 4) He believes his suggested approach to height as detailed in his letter dated May 27, 2016, is the best approach that suggests allowing people in the RS district to build houses

up to a maximum 33 feet in height in order to have attractive gabled two-story homes, rather than flat roofs, to be able to preserve and enhance the character of Goleta. If this suggestion is not chosen, he requested adding a stipulation that allows building to a maximum 35-foot height or 40 percent higher than base, if using a percentage, by right for lands that are in the DR district. He believes creating an overlay is most appropriate; or allowing a 35-foot maximum height on any land greater than a minimum lot size such as 10,000 square feet, or possibly higher. Mr. Alker requested consideration be given to a suggestion by one Planning Commissioner for a 35 percent maximum height modification and noted that there was another suggestion to allow higher heights based on land location and/or lot size.

### **Planning Commission Comments regarding Public Comments:**

Commissioner Maynard supports allowing RV storage in the Community Commercial district based on the need, and not allowing personal storage. Generally, she would like to see Community Commercial districts more engaging and with more storefronts rather than a lot of storage spaces. She supports allowing RV storage in General Commercial districts.

Commissioner Maynard commented that there has been much discussion with regard to ADUs and she is reticent to make changes at this time. She noted that very good points were made regarding ADUs by the public comment.

Commissioner Fuller supports keeping vehicle such as RVs, motorcycles, and trailers as a separate class for storage and not as a part of Outdoor Storage which should include machinery, engines, equipment, building materials, etc. He supports finding more places for vehicle storage that would not reduce the required parking or encroach into open spaces.

### **Planning Commission Comments on Other Items in the NZO Not Previously Discussed:**

Commissioner Maynard recommended requiring compost containers to be available at Multi-unit Dwellings in Section 17.24.140.B.1.a.ii Recycling and Waste Storage Areas because new state legislation was passed to encourage cities to increase composting percentages to 75 percent. She believes this is the appropriate time help meet the State goals and consider the limits of the local landfill.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he just received a notice that Marborg Industries is creating a very large facility that will separate out compostable items as well as all other forms of recycling that will bring the recycling percent up to 85 percent and he noted it is moving in the direction of

addressing the state legislation requirements. He was not sure whether we needed to add a requirement on site. He commented also that green bins are used for residents to separate yard waste.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she believes the separation of compostable materials at the facility is very good but it does not negate the value of separating the composting materials at the dwelling units because this maintains the quality of the materials being recycled and reduces the overall costs of the recycling system.

Commissioner Maynard recommended making sure that each of the Native American tribes are aware of the Cultural Resources section and has looked over this section; and requested verification by staff.

Commissioner Maynard recommended additional language be added to Chapter 17.34.030 Cultural Resources Application Requirements to require during each stage of the cultural resources review that if any artifact at any level of significance is found there would also be consultation with the Native American community regarding what would be done with that item. She believes this is important and in line with the recent legislation that has been passed about repatriation of Native American artifacts back to the Native American community.

Commissioner Maynard suggested for consideration along with the Historic and Cultural Resources Ordinance ways that could go beyond the CEQA process with regard to Cultural Resources. She suggested considering increased Native American monitoring including previously disturbed spaces.

Chair Smith suggested staff consider the status of the process for ADU applications and check if any adjustments could be made in terms of the NZO based on feedback and objective data that is available.

Chair Smith supports some way to timely address inclusionary housing in the NZO process.

Commissioner Maynard supports Chair Smith's comments regarding housing.

## **B. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 9:45 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>



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, May 13, 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.

Staff Present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager; James Winslow, Senior Project Engineer; Charlie Ebeling, Public Works Director; Christine Lazzaretto, Consultant, Historic Resources Group; Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

None.

## AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

### **A. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

#### **A.1 General Plan Conformance Findings for the Capital Improvement Program FY 2019-2020**

**Adopt Resolution No. 19-\_\_\_\_, entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Finding the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Capital Improvement Program is in Conformance with the Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan Pursuant to Section 65401 of the Government Code."**

[A.1 65401 CIP -- Staff Report](#)

[A.1 65401 CIP -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.1 65401 CIP -- ERRATA 12and16](#)

[A.1 65401 CIP -- ERRATA 11](#)

Staff Speakers:

James Winslow, Senior Project Engineer

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review

The staff report was presented by James Winslow, Senior Project Engineer, CIP Division, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "General Plan Conformance Findings for the Capital Improvement Program, FY 2019-2020". Mr. Winslow stated an errata sheet was presented for Page 13 to indicate that status is construction rather than design for Project Number 9060; and an errata sheet was presented with a correction of a clerical error on Page 16 with regard to the Goleta Valley Community Center.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners.

Chair Smith opened the public hearing for public comment at 6:51 p.m.

No speakers.

Chair Smith closed the public hearing for public comment at 6:52 p.m.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners. The Planning Commission deliberated on the information presented during the

public hearing and provided input which is recorded in the video of the meeting.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Maynard/Vice Chair Miller to adopt Resolution No. 19-05 entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Finding the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Capital Improvement Program is in Conformance with the Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan Pursuant to Section 65401 of the Government Code".

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

## **A.2 Historic Preservation Ordinance Discussion**

**Conduct a workshop and provide feedback regarding general and built environment provisions associated with Historic Preservation.**

[A.2 Historic Preservation -- Staff Report](#)

[A.2 Historic Preservation -- PRESENTATION](#)

Staff Speakers:

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager

Christina Lazzaretto, Consultant, Historic Resources Group

The staff report was presented by Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager, and Christina Lazzaretto, Consultant, with Historic Resources Group, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "City of Goleta Historic Preservation Ordinance Workshop #2, May 13, 2019, Historic Resources Group".

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners.

Recess was held from 7:17 p.m. to 7:20 p.m. for the public to provide input on posters regarding questions that will aid in shaping the draft Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Chair Smith reconvened the meeting and opened the discussion for public comment and Planning Commission discussion at 7:20 p.m.

Public Speakers:

Ronald Nye, historian  
Fermina Murray, historian

The Planning Commission and public speakers provided feedback regarding general and built environment provisions associated with Historic Preservation, and responded to eight individual questions, which is recorded on the video of the meeting.

Chair Smith closed the discussion for public comment at 8:44 p.m.

Chair Smith encouraged the public to submit comments between now and the next public workshop on June 24, 2019.

## **B. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review, reported on updates, future agenda items, and upcoming public meetings. The Planning Commission meeting for May 27, 2019, is cancelled. The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on June 10, 2019.

## **C. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**

None.

## **D. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 8.54 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>





**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, June 10, 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 6:10 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Present: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller,  
Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor  
Absent: None

Staff Present: Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager; Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner; Laura Bridley, Contract Planner; Vyto Adomaitis, Neighborhood Services & Public Safety Director; Gerald Comati, Interim Deputy Public Works Director; Julie Love, Senior Biologist, Rincon Consultants; Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

None.

## AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

### **A. PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **A.1 General Plan Conformity Determination for 130 Cremona Drive, APN 073-330-014 (eastern portion); Case No. 19-045-GC**

[General Plan Conformity Determination for 130 Cremona Drive, APN 073-330-014 \(eastern portion\); Case No. 19-045-GC](#)

Staff Speakers:

Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager

Vyto Adomaitis, Neighborhood Services & Public Safety Director

The staff report was presented by Joe Pearson, II, Associate Planner, and Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "General Plan conformity Determination for 130 Cremona Drive, Planning Commission, June 10, 2019, Presentation by Joe Pearson II, Associate Planner; Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager".

Chair Smith opened the public hearing for public comment at 6:25 p.m.

No speakers.

Chair Smith closed the public hearing for public comment at 6:26 p.m.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners. The Planning Commissioners deliberated on the information presented during the public hearing and provided input which is recorded in the video of the meeting.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Maynard/Commissioner Fuller to adopt Resolution No. 19-06 entitled A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Reporting that the Acquisition of a 2.04-Acre Portion of Assessor Parcel Number 073-330-014 is in Conformance with the Goleta General Plan / Coastal Land Use Plan Pursuant to Section 65402 of the Government Code" Attachment 1).

**VOTE:** Motion approved by the following unanimous voice vote:  
Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller,

Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes:  
None.

**A.2 Request for Approval of Addendum to Final EIR for Ekwill Street and Fowler Road Extensions Project and Biological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan located at multiple sites in Old Town Goleta and at Ellwood Mesa; Case No. 04-121-DRB, -GRC, -DP and 11-EIR-02; APNs 071-130-062, -051, 071-170-080, -082, -083, 071-130-040, -023, 071-151-011, 071-130-006, 071-140-067, 071-160-006, -011, -012, -013, 071-181-012, 071-190-018, -034, 071-170-079 (portion also for Biological Restoration area), 071-090-078, -037, -036, -007, 071-140-046, 071-330-009, and 071-140-068 (Ekwill Street and Fowler Road Project area); and 071-130-072; 079-210-019 and -069 (Biological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan sites)**

[Request for Approval of Addendum to Final EIR for Ekwill Street and Fowler Road Extensions Project and Biological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan located at multiple sites in Old Town Goleta and at Ellwood Mesa; Case No. 04-121-DRB, -GRC, -DP and 11-EIR-02; APNs 071-130-062, -051, 071-170-080, -082, -083, 071-130-040, -023, 071-151-011, 071-130-006, 071-140-067, 071-160-006, -011, -012, -013, 071-181-012, 071-190-018, -034, 071-170-079 \(portion also for Biological Restoration area\), 071-090-078, -037, -036, -007, 071-140-046, 071-330-009, and 071-140-068 \(Ekwill Street and Fowler Road Project area\); and 071-130-072; 079-210-019 and -069 \(Biological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan sites\)](#)

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Commissioner Shelor reported he was on the Planning Commission when the Ekwill/Fowler Road Extensions project was presented. Commissioner Maynard reported walking through the Goleta Old Town elements of the project. Vice Chair Miller reported walking along the Devereux Creed site yesterday. Chair Smith reported driving around the site. Commissioner Fuller No ex-parte conversations were reported by the Planning Commissioners.

**Staff Speakers:**

Laura Bridley, Contract Planner  
Gerald Comati, Interim Deputy Public Works Director  
Julie Love, Senior Biologist, Rincon Consultants  
Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney

The staff report was presented by Laura Bridley, Contract Planner; and Gerald Comati, Interim Public Works Director, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Ekwill Street and Fowler Road Extensions Project, Planning Commission Hearing, June 10, 2019, Public Works

Department: Laura Bridley, Contract Planner; Gerald Comati, Interim Deputy Public Works Director".

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commission.

Chair Smith opened the public hearing for public comment at 7:20 p.m.

Public Speakers:

Mike Pollard, representing Kellogg Avenue, LLC, property owner where the recycling plant is located

Beth Collins, from Brownstein, representing John Lund, Thornwood Real Estate, owner of APN 071-170-079, -080, -083

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

The Planning Commissioners deliberated on the information presented during the public hearing and provided input which is recorded in the video of the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Miller/Commissioner Fuller to adopt Resolution No. 19-07 entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, to adopt the CEQA Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and Adopting the Updated Mitigation and Monitoring Program for the Ekwill Street and Fowler Road Extensions Project (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2004061072) located along multiple APNs in Old Town Goleta and including a Biological Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (BMMP) on portions of Ellwood Mesa, Case No. 11-EIR-02".

VOTE: Motion approved by the following unanimous voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None.

## **B. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager, reported on updates, future agenda items, and upcoming public meetings. The next Planning Commission meeting will be on June 24, 2019.

Chair Smith commented that she attended the New Zoning Ordinance public open house on May 29, 2019, and extended positive feedback to

staff. She commented that using the Goleta Valley Community Center is a good option for public meetings.

Commissioner Maynard reported that she attended the New Zoning Ordinance workshop on May 29, 2019, and echoed Chair Smith's comments.

## **C. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 7:55 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>





**PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, June 24, 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*

**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

Staff Present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager; Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner; Bret McNulty, Contract Planner; Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner; Christine Lazzaretto, Consultant, Historic Resources Group; John Foster, Consultant, Greenwood Associates; and Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No speakers.

## **AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA**

None.

### **A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

#### **A.1 Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of March 21, 2019.**

**Approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of March 21, 2019.**

[Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of March 21, 2019.](#)

MOTION: Vice Chair Miller/Commissioner Fuller to approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of March 21, 2019, as amended.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following unanimous voice vote:  
Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None.

#### **A.2 Planning Commission Minutes for the Special Meeting of April 11, 2019**

**Approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of April 11, 2019**

[Planning Commission Minutes for the Special Meeting of April 11, 2019](#)

MOTION: Commissioner Maynard/Vice Chair Miller to approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes for the Meeting of April 11, 2019, as submitted.

VOTE: Motion approved by the following unanimous vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. .

### **B. PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **B.1 Request for the Cox Communications Headquarters Upgrade and New Critical Facility Development Plan Revision and development**



**standard modifications located on a 2.43-acre site at 22 South Fairview Avenue; APNs: 071-021-01 and -44; Case No. 18-093-DPRV**

**It is recommended that the Planning Commission consider:**

- 1. Opening a public hearing to take verbal and written testimony; and**
- 2. After considering the evidence presented during the public hearing, adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 19- \_\_\_\_ entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City Of Goleta, California, adopting the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Approving the Development Plan Revision with Modifications for the Cox Communication Headquarters Upgrade and New Critical Facilities Project, located at 22 South Fairview Avenue, Goleta; Case No. 19-093-DPRV; APNs 071-021-01 & -044 (Attachment 1).**

[Request for the Cox Communications Headquarters Upgrade and New Critical Facility Development Plan Revision located at 22 South Fairview Ave - Staff Report](#)

Recused: Commissioner Fuller recused himself because he lives within 500 feet of the project site and he exited the Council Chambers.

Site visits and ex-parte conversations: Site visits reported by Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Maynard, and Commissioner Shelor. Commissioner Shelor reported he reviewed the project when he was a member of the Design Review Board. Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, and Commissioner Maynard reported no ex-parte conversations.

Staff Speakers:

Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner

Bret McNulty, Contract Planner

Mary Chang, Supervising Senior Planner

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review

The staff report was presented by Chris Noddings, Assistant Planner, and Bret McNulty, Contract Planner, including a PowerPoint presentation entitled "Cox Communications Headquarters Site Improvements, City of Goleta, Planning Commission Meeting, June 24, 2019".

Comments on behalf of the applicant were made by agent Alicia Harrison, with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, land use project manager; and Greg Seitz, project architect; both on behalf of Cox Communications; and Adam Puhl with Dudek, consultant.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners.

Chair Smith opened the public hearing for public comment at 7:04 p.m.

Public Speakers:

Barkley Kern

Bill Macfadyen, Noozhawk

Kristen Miller, Goleta Chamber of Commerce

Mark Ingalls, Camino Real Marketplace

Hallie Avolio, Cox Communications

Fermina Murray, local historian

Janet D. Garcia, Chumash Community

Linda Trevino, Barbareno Chumash

Dr. Ingeborg Cox

James Yee, Chairman, Barbareno Band of Chumash Indians

Ernestine Ygnacio- DeSoto, Barbareno Band of Chumash Indians

Chair Smith closed the public hearing for public comment at 7:31 p.m.

The Planning Commissioners deliberated on the information presented and provided input that is recorded on the video of the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Maynard/Vice Chair Miller to adopt Resolution No. 19-08 entitled "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Goleta, California, Adopting the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, Adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Approving the Development Plan Revision with Modifications for the Cox Communication Headquarters Upgrade and New Critical Facilities Project Located at 22 South Fairview Avenue, Goleta, CA; Case No. 19-093-DPRV; APNs 071-021-01 & -044" (Attachment 1), with the following amendments to the Conditions of Approval:

1. Incorporate language into Condition #10 Environmental Mitigations/Conditions to require that should any artifact be discovered, whether it be human remains or not, everyone on the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) list as well as the Barbareno Band of Chumash Indians (BBCI) and the Coastal Band of Chumash would be contacted and consulted for their guidance on whether that item would be reburied or curated, and if curated, where that might be.

2. Add the following language to Condition #2 Construction Noise and to Condition #17 Construction Notice at the end of the first sentence: "in both English and Spanish".

VOTE: Motion approved by the following voice vote: Ayes: Chair Smith, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Maynard, Commissioner Shelor. Noes: None. Recused: Commissioner Fuller.

Recess held from 7:55 to 8:03 p.m.

## **C. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEM**

### **C.1 Historic Preservation Ordinance Discussion - Workshop #3**

**Conduct a workshop and provide feedback related to cultural/Native American and archaeological resources associated with Historic Preservation.**

[Historic Preservation Ordinance Discussion - Workshop No. 3 - Staff Report](#)

Recess from 7:55 to 8:03 p.m.

Staff Speakers:

Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager

Christina Lazzaretto, Consultant, Historic Resources Group

John Foster, Consultant, Greenwood Associates

The staff report was presented by Lisa Prasse, Current Planning Manager; Christina Lazzaretto, Consultant with Historic Resources Group; and John Foster, Consultant, Greenwood Associates.

Staff responded to questions from the Planning Commissioners.

Chair Smith opened the discussion for public comment at 8:29 p.m.

The public speakers commented on four questions for consideration followed by discussion and input from the Planning Commission which is recorded on the video of the meeting.

Public Speakers:

Vic Cox

Dr. Ingeborg Cox

Joyce Gerber, professional archaeologist, Applied EarthWorks, Inc.

Janet Garcia, Chumash Community  
Ernestine DeSoto  
Fermina Murray  
Bruce Morden, South Coast Railroad Museum

Chair Smith closed the discussion for public comment at 9:59 p.m.

**D. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review, reported on updates, future agenda items, and upcoming public meetings and events. The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for July 22, 2019. The July 8, 2019, meeting is cancelled.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 10:01 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>