



**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 of the in-lieu fees for parking could go to staffing for parking facilities, 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 9:45 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>