

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

From: Brian <boisky7@cox.net>

Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 8:52 AM

To: Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>

Subject: Camper storage

Hi Anne, I watched the city Council meeting online last night. Rodger's concerns about allowing campers or trailers to be stored on a front lawn are valid. They should not be allowed. Storing campers on the side yard setbacks are appropriate. But, to allow campers or trailers to be plopped in a front yard is not acceptable. I live in Old Town and already there are multiple households that store cars in driveways for years helping our neighborhood look like a junk yard. Allowing front yard storage will look even worse than driveway storage.

Does the new ordinances restrict people from storing multiple cars in a driveway for years even if they run or not ?

Thanks for all you dedication and hard work.

Brian Boisky

Sent from my iPad

From: Calo, Ben B (San Luis Obispo) USA <Ben.Calo@LehighHanson.com>

Sent: Friday, January 03, 2020 4:24 PM

To: Paula Perotte <pperotte@cityofgoleta.org>; Kyle Richards <krichards@cityofgoleta.org>; Roger Aceves <races@cityofgoleta.org>; Stuart Kasdin <skasdin@cityofgoleta.org>; James Kyriaco <jkyriaco@cityofgoleta.org>; Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>; Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>; Andy Newkirk <anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org>

Cc: Moore, Kenneth (San Luis Obispo) USA <Kenneth.Moore@LehighHanson.com>; Jones, Trevor M (San Luis Obispo) USA <Trevor.Jones@LehighHanson.com>; Guerra, Erika (San Ramon) USA <Erika.Guerra@LehighHanson.com>; Damonte, Ana (San Ramon) USA <Ana.Damonte@LehighHanson.com>; Hungerford, Sean (HTHJ) <shungerford@hthjlaw.com>; Anderson, Ginger (Stantec) <Ginger.Andersen@stantec.com>

Subject: City of Goleta, Proposed Zoning Ordinance Comment Letter, Hanson Aggregates

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

On behalf of Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific Inc., please find attached a comment letter regarding the proposed zoning ordinance. We deeply appreciate the City's time and attention to this matter. We look forward to any questions and to coordinating with City staff as needed to make the appropriate revisions. I can be reached at 805.305.9971 or Ben.Calo@LehighHanson.com.

Thank you,

Ben Calo

Environmental & Land Management Specialist

Lehigh Hanson – Central Coast
P.O. Box 71
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Mobile: 805.305.9971

Fax: 805.543.1806

Email: Ben.Calo@lehighhanson.com

This e-mail may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error) please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the material in this e-mail is strictly forbidden.



Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific Inc.

PO Box 71

San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Office: 805.543.2223

Fax: 805.543.1806

January 3, 2020

Attention: Mayor Paula Perotte and Councilmembers

City of Goleta

130 Cremona Drive

Goleta CA 9311

**Subject: Goleta New Zoning Ordinance
General Industrial Regulations Comments**

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

On behalf of Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific, Inc. ("Hanson"), thank you for the opportunity to request revisions to the November 2019 draft of the new zoning ordinance. We are making this request in order to allow our longstanding business to modernize in a way that is necessary for us to continue operating normally, and which otherwise would be prohibited under the new ordinance.

By way of background, for the past 60 years, Hanson and its predecessors have operated a ready-mix concrete plant at 50 South Kellogg Avenue (the "Facility"). The Facility is one of two concrete suppliers in Goleta's city limits, and the only one with union staff. The Facility is the only one in the City capable of producing over 1,500 cubic yards of concrete per day, with a permitted limit of up to 4,320 cubic yards of concrete per day, making it ideally suited to high-volume public works projects, and the only plant capable of producing high volumes of concrete in response to an emergency situation. The Facility has become an integral part of the local construction industry and has supplied countless public and private construction projects – primarily due to the exceptional quality and volume of its concrete products.

The Facility's concrete manufacturing equipment is aging, however, and needs to be modernized for the Facility to continue serving the City's needs. Currently, the Facility is a dry batch double-concrete batch plant, consisting of two concrete plants merged into a single concrete plant. Hanson intends to replace the existing plant equipment with modern equipment in a single-plant format.

The new equipment would be less complex, more efficient, and cleaner with reduced air emissions. It would occupy a smaller footprint, and be slightly lower in height (by approximately three feet). Replacing the plant equipment would not increase production, or introduce new or additional environmental impacts. The new equipment represents a typical upgrade for this type of facility that allows our legal use to continue while meeting all standards for reliability, efficiency, safety and emissions.

The Facility is properly zoned as “industrial” under the current and proposed zoning ordinance. Under the existing and proposed new zoning ordinance, however, the plant equipment exceeds height limits. The existing plant equipment and silos are 65-feet in height (55-feet in height from current grade) with a 30-foot antenna. Existing zoning regulations have a 45-foot height limit for structures; the proposed ordinance has a 35-foot limit. The existing equipment operates legally because it predates the existing height restrictions in the zoning ordinance. In its current form, however, the proposed ordinance does not clearly allow Hanson to replace aging equipment that are nonconforming as to height with modern components as Hanson intends.

The concrete plant itself is a piece of equipment that is manufactured elsewhere and brought on site, assembled and affixed to the ground. Hanson has explored whether it can modernize the plant within the proposed height limit, and found that no manufacturer makes plant equipment within this height limit; the process itself relies on a certain size, shape and height in its design. Thus, as written, the ordinance could require Hanson to maintain the existing plant as-is, using antiquated, unreliable, and less efficient equipment. If the plant equipment were to deteriorate beyond repair, Hanson could be forced to end operations in the City.

The zoning ordinance amendment process presents Hanson and the City with a rare opportunity to allow important facilities like this to use the newest, cleanest and most efficient equipment. We do not believe that it is the City’s intent to prohibit industrial facilities such as Hanson’s from using modern equipment, or to encourage the use of antiquated and unreliable equipment. Hanson therefore asks for relatively minor modifications to the proposed ordinance allowing modernization to occur. Our requests are the following:

1. That the City include language in its new ordinance that allows the replacement of structures and equipment that are nonconforming as to height in the general industrial (“IG”) zone provided there is no increase in height, size or capacity.

As an example, Santa Barbara County exempts “specific structures and equipment,” and specifically concrete ready-mix silos from the height limits of its M-1 zone if “compliance would render operations technically infeasible.” (S.B.C. Code, § 35.30.090, subd. (E)(3)(a).) Santa Barbara County further exempts height limits for structures and equipment associated with facilities in M-2 zones if “compliance would render operations technically infeasible.” (S.B.C. Code, § 35.30.090, subd. (E)(3)(b).) We welcome you to review and consider the language as highlighted in Attachment 1.

Adding a similar exemption to the City’s proposed ordinance would allow Hanson to modernize and preserve its longstanding business. Additionally, in other parts of the proposed ordinance, we observe that the City will be allowing for the replacement of non-conforming structures in non-industrial zones if there is no increase in size. (See Draft Ord., § 17.25.020(B)(8)(b).) A similar allowance here is even more appropriate for industrial facilities that are existing, properly zoned and sited.

2. Height limits be restored to previous limits (45’) and allowances made for equipment to extend beyond 45 feet. Although this will not cover our silos, we believe maintaining the 45-foot limit in this industrial zone is appropriate and provides our Facility with the flexibility to make other modifications in the future.

Hanson deeply appreciates the City’s time and attention to this matter. We look forward to any questions and to coordinating with City staff as needed to make the appropriate revisions. I can be reached at 805.305.9971 or Ben.Calo@LehighHanson.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben Calo", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ben Calo
Environmental and Land Management Specialist

Attachments:

1. Santa Barbara Countywide Land Use & Development Code 35.30.090.E.3

cc: Kyle Richards, Mayor Pro Tempore
Roger S. Aceves, Councilmember
Stuart Kasdin, Councilmember
James Kyriaco, Councilmember
Peter Imhoff, Planning Director
Anne Wells, Planning Manager
Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner
Ken Moore, Trevor Jones, Erika Guerra, Ana Demonte (Hanson Aggregates)
Sean Hungerford (HTHJ Law)
Ginger Anderson (Stantec)

Attachment 1

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY CODE - CHAPTER 35 - COUNTY LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT CODE

Standards for All Development and Land Uses

35.30.090

higher ceiling heights for habitable space shall be deemed a use intended for human activity. No such structure shall be employed for any commercial or advertising use unless specifically allowed by the applicable zone, except that antennas and associated equipment may be located within such structures.

2. Portions of a structure may exceed the applicable height limit by no more than three feet where the roof exhibits a pitch of four in 12 (rise to run) or greater.
 3. In order to provide for architectural character, architectural elements, whose aggregate area is less than or equal to 10 percent of the total roof area of the structure or 400 square feet, whichever is less, may exceed the height limit by no more than eight feet when approved by the Board of Architectural Review.
 4. Allowances for exceeding the applicable height limit in compliance with Subsections D.2 through D.3 above, are not cumulative.
- E. Exemptions for specific structures and equipment. The following structures and equipment may exceed the applicable height limit as provided below where the excess height is not prohibited by [Section 35.28.060](#) (Airport Approach Overlay).
1. Coastal Zone only.
 - a. Temporary drilling rigs necessary to explore for and develop oil and gas reservoirs, allowed in compliance with Article 35.5 (Oil and Gas, [Wind Energy and Cogeneration Facilities](#)), or to operate the La Goleta gas storage reservoir (located on Assessor's Parcel Number 071-210-001, as of June 30, 2006), may exceed the applicable height limit for a period of four years or less, provided the temporary use is completed in a diligent manner.
 - (1) Upon written request by the operator, the Director may grant up to two one-year extensions, provided that the operator is diligent in completing an established drilling program.
 2. Coastal Zone and Inland area.
 - a. Amine columns, distillation columns, stripper columns, and flare stacks associated with gas processing, oil and gas production, or oil and gas transportation allowed in compliance with [Article 35.5 \(Oil and Gas, Wind Energy and Cogeneration Facilities\)](#) may exceed the applicable height limit where compliance would render such facilities technically infeasible.
 - b. Workover/pulling rigs necessary to service oil, gas and injection wells may exceed the applicable height limit, provided that the use of these rigs is completed in a diligent manner.
 - (1) Within the Coastal Zone, this includes workover/pulling rigs necessary to operate the La Goleta gas storage reservoir (located on Assessor's Parcel Number 071-210-001, as of June 30, 2006).
 - c. Small Wind Energy Facilities. See Chapter 35.57 (Wind Energy Conversion Systems) height limits for Small Wind Energy Facilities.
 - (1) Subsection 35.30.090.E.2.c of this Development Code shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2017, and is repealed as of that date, unless Article 2.11 (Wind Energy) of Chapter 4 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code (Section 65893 *et seq.*) is extended by statute enacted by the State of California prior to January 1, 2017.
 3. Inland area only.
 - a. Silos used to store and load concrete ready-mix in the M-1 zone may exceed applicable height limits where compliance would render operations technically infeasible.
 - b. Structures and equipment associated with facilities in the M-2 zone may exceed applicable height limits where compliance would render operations technically infeasible.
 - c. Temporary drilling rigs necessary to explore for and develop oil and gas reservoirs, or to

From: [Connie Cornwell](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Subject: Hedge Height Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 10:08:18 AM

City Council Members:

I am writing to strongly encourage you to include a hedge amortization period of three months to ensure that nonconforming hedges must be brought into compliance with the NZO. I feel that time period is fair and reasonable. Without an amortization period for compliance, enforcing the hedge height ordinance would be impossible. The City needs the authority to require a homeowner whose hedges are a safety and view obstruction issue to act in a timely matter.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Connie Cornwell
820 Serenidad Place
Goleta, CA

From: [Kathy Wolfe](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Subject: Re: Hedge Height Ordinance --NZO Meeting on January 21, 2020
Date: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 2:13:11 PM
Importance: High

Dear City of Goleta Council:

I apologize for the impersonal nature of this email – unfortunately because of an upcoming surgery I will be unable to attend the January 21st meeting, however, I felt it important to voice my concerns over your proposed “hedge height ordinance.”

I am also confident that the fact that we are long-time residents of Serenidad Place makes you very much aware of the 40'+ hedges surrounding 830 Serenidad Place (please see attached), and thus our concern that the hedge height ordinance be adopted. My concern is that, once these ordinances are adopted, how will they be enforced? Do we, as neighboring property owners have to initiate a call to Zoning to have them cited? Is there any time limit for compliance or penalties for non-compliance? I feel that these issues are paramount to the successful application of this NZO.

Thank you very much for your time and I am hopeful that these concerns can be addressed either in writing or at the meeting, as several of the concerned neighbors will be in attendance.

Respectfully,

*Kathleen C. Wolfe
810 Serenidad Place
Goleta, CA 93117*



From: [Rittershaus, Olga](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Cc: [Peter Imhof](#); [Anne Wells](#); [Michael Jenkins](#); [Amerikaner, Steven](#)
Subject: New Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Amendment
Date: Friday, January 17, 2020 10:29:12 AM
Attachments: [BHFS Letter to Mayor Paula Perotte & Members of the City Council, City of Goleta re New Zoning Ordinance Proposed Amendment \(Sywest\).pdf](#)
Importance: High

Dear Sir/Madam:

Attached please find a letter from Steven A. Amerikaner, on behalf of Sywest Development, regarding the above-referenced matter. Would you kindly distribute a copy to the Mayor and City Councilmembers at your earliest convenience.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Olga Rittershaus
Assistant to Steven A. Amerikaner

Olga Rittershaus

Legal Secretary
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP
1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
805.882.1467 tel
ORittershaus@bhfs.com

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY & DISCLAIMER: The information contained in this email message is attorney privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by calling (303) 223-1300 and delete the message. Thank you.

January 17, 2020

Steven A. Amerikaner
Attorney at Law
805.882.1407 tel
805.965.4333 fax
samerikaner@bhfs.com

EMAIL (CITYCLERKGROUP@CITYOFGOLETA.ORG)

Mayor Paula Perotte and Members of the City Council
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

RE: New Zoning Ordinance -- Proposed Amendment

Dear Mayor Perotte and Members of the City Council:

This letter is presented on behalf of SyWest Development, the owner of the former drive-in property at 907 S. Kellogg Avenue ("Property"). SyWest has appeared at a number of recent public hearings to express its concerns with the New Zoning Ordinance (NZO). The purpose of this letter is to propose a solution to the problems we have been describing to you.

As we have previously pointed out, SyWest has a pending application before the City for an industrial project on the Property. The application was prepared at great expense, and was determined to be complete by the City in March 2018. At SyWest's request, preparation of an EIR was placed on temporary hold to allow SyWest time to determine whether its discussions with the Santa Barbara County Foodbank would make it possible for Foodbank to consolidate all of its operations to the SyWest site.

The community and SyWest were surprised in September 2019 when the Planning Commission added to the NZO a provision planning a "sunset date" on the period of time available to an applicant, like SyWest, to secure its permits. The draft of the NZO currently before the Council includes a sunset date of December 31, 2021, which is approximately 23 months away. This 23 month period is simply too short for any applicant in SyWest's position to complete all of the procedures – including preparation of an EIR – to secure project approvals.

More to the point, the timing for those city approval procedures are outside of SyWest's control. A land use applicant does not control how quickly an EIR consultant is engaged, how long the necessary studies require to be completed, when the draft EIR will be presented and released for public comment, how long the consultant needs to prepare responses to public comments, and when the project is presented to the Planning Commission for review and approval. Moreover, an applicant cannot control whether a project approval is appealed or when an appeal hearing will be scheduled.

While SyWest cannot control the time it takes to process its permit application, it will certainly bear the burdens if the NZO deadlines are not met. The NZO imposes significant new restrictions on SyWest's ability to build the project it has designed, including new height limits and creek setback requirements.

1021 Anacapa Street, 2nd Floor
Santa Barbara, CA 93101-2711
main 805.963.7000

Based on these considerations, SyWest respectfully requests that the City Council consider an amendment to the NZO that will extend the sunset date. Our specific proposed language is attached to this letter for your staff's review and your consideration.

Thank you for considering these views.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven A. Amerikaner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "S" and "A".

Steven A. Amerikaner

Enclosure: Proposed revision to NZO, Sec. 17.01.040, E, 4

cc Peter Imhoff, City Planning Director (pimhoff@cityofgoleta.org)
Anne Wells (awells@cityofgoleta.org)
Michael Jenkins, City Attorney (mjenkins@cityofgoleta.org)

20196718

NZO, Section 17.01.040, E, 4

Current Text

4. Project Applications Deemed Complete. At the Applicant's election, a project application that is determined to be complete prior to September 1, 2019, shall either:

- a. Be processed under the zoning regulations at the time of the determination; or
- b. Be processed under this Title.

The allowances under this provision shall sunset on December 31, 2021, if a project has not received all required land use entitlements, after which, the project shall be subject to all regulations of this title.

Proposed Text

4. Complete Project Applications ~~Deemed-Complete~~. At the Applicant's election, a project application that is determined to be complete prior to September 1, 2019, shall either:

- a. Be processed under the zoning regulations in effect at the time of the determination; or
- b. Be processed under this Title.

The Applicant's option under clause "a" allowances under of this provision shall ~~terminatesunset~~ on the "Sunset Date," defined as the later of (a) the effective date of this Title as to the property for which the Project is proposed, or (b) December 31, 2021, provided, however, that if thea pProject has not-received, prior to the Sunset Date, either (i) all required non-ministerial land use entitlements, or (ii) a water service commitment from the Goleta Water District, after which, the Applicant's option under clause "a" of this provision shall remain in effect for a period of six years. The six year period shall not include any period of time in which any City decision concerning the Project is the subject of litigation project shall be subject to all regulations of this title.

1/9/20

From: Calo, Ben B (San Luis Obispo) USA <Ben.Calo@LehighHanson.com>

Sent: Friday, January 17, 2020 3:43 PM

To: Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>; Mary Chang <mchang@cityofgoleta.org>; Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>; Andy Newkirk <anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org>

Cc: Moore, Kenneth (San Luis Obispo) USA <Kenneth.Moore@LehighHanson.com>; Jones, Trevor M (San Luis Obispo) USA <Trevor.Jones@LehighHanson.com>; Guerra, Erika (San Ramon) USA <Erika.Guerra@LehighHanson.com>; Damonte, Ana (San Ramon) USA <Ana.Damonte@LehighHanson.com>; Hungerford, Sean (HTHJ) <shungerford@hthjlaw.com>; Anderson, Ginger (Stantec) <Ginger.Andersen@stantec.com>

Subject: FW: City of Goleta, Proposed Zoning Ordinance Comment Letter, Hanson Aggregates

Peter, Mary, Anne, and Andy,

I am writing to keep the City's planning staff informed of our efforts to modernize our concrete ready-mix plant at 50 S. Kellogg Avenue, and also to request City staff's support. I and the other members of Hanson's team deeply appreciate staff's time on December 12th, 2019 to consider how to modernize our Facility within the language of the incoming zoning ordinance (based on the November 2019 draft). At this moment, however, I think that we agree that the most efficient approach is simply to revise the draft ordinance to allow for the Facility modernization to proceed. Santa Barbara County, for instance, has included language in its zoning ordinance that exempts concrete silos from height limits in certain situations. This or similar language ensures our ability to continue operating within the City of Goleta. We wrote to the City Council requesting these revisions (attached) and intend to present to the City Council at the January 21st, 2020 meeting. We would very much appreciate if you could express your support (internally within the City) for our proposed zoning ordinance changes. If the ordinance is not revised, Hanson intends to resume discussions with staff, and will of course exhaust all available pathways to continue our vested operations.

Thank you for your consideration. I am happy to discuss this at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Ben Calo

Environmental & Land Management Specialist

Lehigh Hanson – Central Coast
P.O. Box 71

San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Mobile: 805.305.9971

Fax: 805.543.1806

Email: Ben.Calo@lehighhanson.com

This e-mail may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error) please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the material in this e-mail is strictly forbidden.

From: Calo, Ben B (San Luis Obispo) USA

Sent: Friday, January 3, 2020 4:24 PM

To: 'pperotte@cityofgoleta.org' <pperotte@cityofgoleta.org>; 'krichards@cityofgoleta.org' <krichards@cityofgoleta.org>; 'raceves@cityofgoleta.org' <raceves@cityofgoleta.org>; 'skasdin@cityofgoleta.org' <skasdin@cityofgoleta.org>; 'jkyriaco@cityofgoleta.org' <jkyriaco@cityofgoleta.org>; 'pimhof@cityofgoleta.org' <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>; 'awells@cityofgoleta.org' <awells@cityofgoleta.org>; 'anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org' <anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org>

Cc: Moore, Kenneth (San Luis Obispo) USA <Kenneth.Moore@LehighHanson.com>; Jones, Trevor M (San Luis Obispo) USA <Trevor.Jones@LehighHanson.com>; Guerra, Erika (Cupertino) USA <Erika.Guerra@LehighHanson.com>; Damonte, Ana (San Ramon) USA <Ana.Damonte@LehighHanson.com>; Hungerford, Sean (HTHJ) <shungerford@hthjlaw.com>; Anderson, Ginger (Stantec) <Ginger.Andersen@stantec.com>

Subject: City of Goleta, Proposed Zoning Ordinance Comment Letter, Hanson Aggregates

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

On behalf of Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific Inc., please find attached a comment letter regarding the proposed zoning ordinance. We deeply appreciate the City's time and attention to this matter. We look forward to any questions and to coordinating with City staff as needed to make the appropriate revisions. I can be reached at 805.305.9971 or Ben.Calo@LehighHanson.com.

Thank you,

Ben Calo

Environmental & Land Management Specialist

Lehigh Hanson – Central Coast

P.O. Box 71

San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Mobile: 805.305.9971

Fax: 805.543.1806

Email: Ben.Calo@lehighhanson.com

This e-mail may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error) please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the

material in this e-mail is strictly forbidden.



Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific Inc.

PO Box 71

San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Office: 805.543.2223

Fax: 805.543.1806

January 3, 2020

Attention: Mayor Paula Perotte and Councilmembers

City of Goleta

130 Cremona Drive

Goleta CA 9311

**Subject: Goleta New Zoning Ordinance
General Industrial Regulations Comments**

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

On behalf of Hanson Aggregates Mid-Pacific, Inc. ("Hanson"), thank you for the opportunity to request revisions to the November 2019 draft of the new zoning ordinance. We are making this request in order to allow our longstanding business to modernize in a way that is necessary for us to continue operating normally, and which otherwise would be prohibited under the new ordinance.

By way of background, for the past 60 years, Hanson and its predecessors have operated a ready-mix concrete plant at 50 South Kellogg Avenue (the "Facility"). The Facility is one of two concrete suppliers in Goleta's city limits, and the only one with union staff. The Facility is the only one in the City capable of producing over 1,500 cubic yards of concrete per day, with a permitted limit of up to 4,320 cubic yards of concrete per day, making it ideally suited to high-volume public works projects, and the only plant capable of producing high volumes of concrete in response to an emergency situation. The Facility has become an integral part of the local construction industry and has supplied countless public and private construction projects – primarily due to the exceptional quality and volume of its concrete products.

The Facility's concrete manufacturing equipment is aging, however, and needs to be modernized for the Facility to continue serving the City's needs. Currently, the Facility is a dry batch double-concrete batch plant, consisting of two concrete plants merged into a single concrete plant. Hanson intends to replace the existing plant equipment with modern equipment in a single-plant format.

The new equipment would be less complex, more efficient, and cleaner with reduced air emissions. It would occupy a smaller footprint, and be slightly lower in height (by approximately three feet). Replacing the plant equipment would not increase production, or introduce new or additional environmental impacts. The new equipment represents a typical upgrade for this type of facility that allows our legal use to continue while meeting all standards for reliability, efficiency, safety and emissions.

The Facility is properly zoned as “industrial” under the current and proposed zoning ordinance. Under the existing and proposed new zoning ordinance, however, the plant equipment exceeds height limits. The existing plant equipment and silos are 65-feet in height (55-feet in height from current grade) with a 30-foot antenna. Existing zoning regulations have a 45-foot height limit for structures; the proposed ordinance has a 35-foot limit. The existing equipment operates legally because it predates the existing height restrictions in the zoning ordinance. In its current form, however, the proposed ordinance does not clearly allow Hanson to replace aging equipment that are nonconforming as to height with modern components as Hanson intends.

The concrete plant itself is a piece of equipment that is manufactured elsewhere and brought on site, assembled and affixed to the ground. Hanson has explored whether it can modernize the plant within the proposed height limit, and found that no manufacturer makes plant equipment within this height limit; the process itself relies on a certain size, shape and height in its design. Thus, as written, the ordinance could require Hanson to maintain the existing plant as-is, using antiquated, unreliable, and less efficient equipment. If the plant equipment were to deteriorate beyond repair, Hanson could be forced to end operations in the City.

The zoning ordinance amendment process presents Hanson and the City with a rare opportunity to allow important facilities like this to use the newest, cleanest and most efficient equipment. We do not believe that it is the City’s intent to prohibit industrial facilities such as Hanson’s from using modern equipment, or to encourage the use of antiquated and unreliable equipment. Hanson therefore asks for relatively minor modifications to the proposed ordinance allowing modernization to occur. Our requests are the following:

1. That the City include language in its new ordinance that allows the replacement of structures and equipment that are nonconforming as to height in the general industrial (“IG”) zone provided there is no increase in height, size or capacity.

As an example, Santa Barbara County exempts “specific structures and equipment,” and specifically concrete ready-mix silos from the height limits of its M-1 zone if “compliance would render operations technically infeasible.” (S.B.C. Code, § 35.30.090, subd. (E)(3)(a).) Santa Barbara County further exempts height limits for structures and equipment associated with facilities in M-2 zones if “compliance would render operations technically infeasible.” (S.B.C. Code, § 35.30.090, subd. (E)(3)(b).) We welcome you to review and consider the language as highlighted in Attachment 1.

Adding a similar exemption to the City’s proposed ordinance would allow Hanson to modernize and preserve its longstanding business. Additionally, in other parts of the proposed ordinance, we observe that the City will be allowing for the replacement of non-conforming structures in non-industrial zones if there is no increase in size. (See Draft Ord., § 17.25.020(B)(8)(b).) A similar allowance here is even more appropriate for industrial facilities that are existing, properly zoned and sited.

2. Height limits be restored to previous limits (45’) and allowances made for equipment to extend beyond 45 feet. Although this will not cover our silos, we believe maintaining the 45-foot limit in this industrial zone is appropriate and provides our Facility with the flexibility to make other modifications in the future.

Hanson deeply appreciates the City’s time and attention to this matter. We look forward to any questions and to coordinating with City staff as needed to make the appropriate revisions. I can be reached at 805.305.9971 or Ben.Calo@LehighHanson.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben Calo", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ben Calo
Environmental and Land Management Specialist

Attachments:

1. Santa Barbara Countywide Land Use & Development Code 35.30.090.E.3

cc: Kyle Richards, Mayor Pro Tempore
Roger S. Aceves, Councilmember
Stuart Kasdin, Councilmember
James Kyriaco, Councilmember
Peter Imhoff, Planning Director
Anne Wells, Planning Manager
Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner
Ken Moore, Trevor Jones, Erika Guerra, Ana Demonte (Hanson Aggregates)
Sean Hungerford (HTHJ Law)
Ginger Anderson (Stantec)

Attachment 1

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY CODE - CHAPTER 35 - COUNTY LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT CODE

Standards for All Development and Land Uses

35.30.090

higher ceiling heights for habitable space shall be deemed a use intended for human activity. No such structure shall be employed for any commercial or advertising use unless specifically allowed by the applicable zone, except that antennas and associated equipment may be located within such structures.

2. Portions of a structure may exceed the applicable height limit by no more than three feet where the roof exhibits a pitch of four in 12 (rise to run) or greater.
 3. In order to provide for architectural character, architectural elements, whose aggregate area is less than or equal to 10 percent of the total roof area of the structure or 400 square feet, whichever is less, may exceed the height limit by no more than eight feet when approved by the Board of Architectural Review.
 4. Allowances for exceeding the applicable height limit in compliance with Subsections D.2 through D.3 above, are not cumulative.
- E. Exemptions for specific structures and equipment. The following structures and equipment may exceed the applicable height limit as provided below where the excess height is not prohibited by [Section 35.28.060](#) (Airport Approach Overlay).
1. Coastal Zone only.
 - a. Temporary drilling rigs necessary to explore for and develop oil and gas reservoirs, allowed in compliance with Article 35.5 (Oil and Gas, [Wind Energy and Cogeneration Facilities](#)), or to operate the La Goleta gas storage reservoir (located on Assessor's Parcel Number 071-210-001, as of June 30, 2006), may exceed the applicable height limit for a period of four years or less, provided the temporary use is completed in a diligent manner.
 - (1) Upon written request by the operator, the Director may grant up to two one-year extensions, provided that the operator is diligent in completing an established drilling program.
 2. Coastal Zone and Inland area.
 - a. Amine columns, distillation columns, stripper columns, and flare stacks associated with gas processing, oil and gas production, or oil and gas transportation allowed in compliance with [Article 35.5 \(Oil and Gas, Wind Energy and Cogeneration Facilities\)](#) may exceed the applicable height limit where compliance would render such facilities technically infeasible.
 - b. Workover/pulling rigs necessary to service oil, gas and injection wells may exceed the applicable height limit, provided that the use of these rigs is completed in a diligent manner.
 - (1) Within the Coastal Zone, this includes workover/pulling rigs necessary to operate the La Goleta gas storage reservoir (located on Assessor's Parcel Number 071-210-001, as of June 30, 2006).
 - c. Small Wind Energy Facilities. See Chapter 35.57 (Wind Energy Conversion Systems) height limits for Small Wind Energy Facilities.
 - (1) Subsection 35.30.090.E.2.c of this Development Code shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2017, and is repealed as of that date, unless Article 2.11 (Wind Energy) of Chapter 4 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code (Section 65893 *et seq.*) is extended by statute enacted by the State of California prior to January 1, 2017.
 3. Inland area only.
 - a. Silos used to store and load concrete ready-mix in the M-1 zone may exceed applicable height limits where compliance would render operations technically infeasible.
 - b. Structures and equipment associated with facilities in the M-2 zone may exceed applicable height limits where compliance would render operations technically infeasible.
 - c. Temporary drilling rigs necessary to explore for and develop oil and gas reservoirs, or to

From: [Nadir Dagli](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Subject: Perimeter planting/hedge height ordinance
Date: Monday, January 20, 2020 4:56:04 PM

Dear Goleta City Council members,

We are writing to you regarding the zoning ordinance that will be discussed in tomorrow's city council meeting. We strongly ask for the inclusion and enforcement of a perimeter planting/hedge height ordinance as part of this zoning. We live at 840 Serenidad Pl. Our neighbor at 830 Serenidad Pl. has been a problem for us and our neighbors over many years. He has planted bushes/trees etc. all around the periphery of his property and let them grow over a very long time. These perimeter plantings are over 40 feet tall and come with major problems for us and neighbors. First of all they are out of character with the neighborhood and Goleta in general. The appearance of these very tall perimeter planting/hedges create a very unfavorable vision and affect the property values in the neighborhood adversely. In addition they block the sun on the south side of our property which leads to rot and molding. That side of the house becomes very difficult to keep warm since sun is blocked all day long. Moreover their roots are all over the place and go under the slab of our house. These lead to expensive foundation repairs. They are also full of dirt, small insects and even the mildest breezes blow them to our property. It is impossible to maintain a lawn in front of our house and fruit trees we had on that side all died. We need help in rectifying this situation. Anybody should be able to have perimeter planting/hedges as long as their height is reasonable and they are maintained. Such rules exist in all the cities around us and are characteristics of well managed cities. I hope you will be responsive to our request. So in summary we would like to see an ordinance that includes height restrictions for perimeter plantings/hedges and enforceable. We would like to see a provision that requires compliance with the ordinance within a reasonable length of time such as 90 days.

Respectfully

Nadir Dagli and Gulcin Dagli
840 Serenidad Pl. Goleta, CA 93117.

From: [Anne Wells](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Cc: [Andy Newkirk](#); [Jay Ritterbeck](#)
Subject: FW: New Goleta Zoning Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 11:22:12 AM

NZO public comment.

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

From: Keith Douglas <keithaarondouglas@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 10:50 AM
To: Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: New Goleta Zoning Ordinance

Hello Ms. Wells,

I'm a third generation Goleta/Santa Barbara resident. I have lived & worked in the area for my entire life & I feel truly blessed to call it home. Lately I've had to consider leaving this incredible place though. I just can longer afford to stay here. I drive for a private car service (which is now in the process of relocating to Goleta) & I love my job but the very nature of it demands that I live in the community that I serve. I can't commute from Santa Maria or Oxnard on short notice when I am on standby to pickup guests at the Bacara or elsewhere.

I only became aware of the new ordinance to make affordable rental properties available in Goleta yesterday. I wish that I could attend the City Council meeting tonight but I will be working. I'm curious to know what steps I can take to acquire information on applying for a place & what all I can do to get involved & stay on top of information as it comes to light.

Best wishes,

Keith Douglas
(805) 453-1113