

From: [Gillian Fennessy](#)
To: [Gillian Fennessy](#)
Subject: FW: Comments for Oct 7 City of Goleta Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Friday, October 04, 2019 2:43:43 PM
Attachments: [On site posted notice.eml.msg](#)
[City of Goleta Sep 23 PC hearing comments revised.doc](#)
[City of Goleta Oct 7th pc hearing.doc](#)

From: Cecilia Brown <brownknight1@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2019 12:25 PM
To: Kim Dominguez <kdominguez@cityofgoleta.org>
Cc: brownknight1@cox.net
Subject: Comments for Oct 7 City of Goleta Planning Commission Meeting

Greetings!

Please accept my attached letters and photos to accompany the revised Sept 23rd letter (dated Oct 4th) for Monday's planning commission meeting.

Thank you for your help.

Have a nice weekend

Cecilia Brown

October 4, 2019

Re: Comments on NZO for Oct 7th City of Goleta Planning Commission Hearing

Dear Madame Chair and Members of the Planning Commission

This letter supersedes my letter of September 23, 2019. Since there are revisions to that letter, I would appreciate your referring to this letter for my comments re: Fences, On-site public noticing, and Telecommunication Facilities. Thank you, Cecilia Brown

1. Chapter 17.24.090 Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges (p. iv-9)

I would like you to reconsider the permit path for fences six feet or less on the street sides of corner lots. Here the issue is one of sight clearance for any fence to be located in the front yard setback of a corner lot. However, if the fence is outside of the front yard setback and there are no sight distance clearance issues for the side yard street or any access taken from the property to rear of the corner lot, then, under these circumstances, this fence meeting these standards should be exempt from any permit. Making a property owner go through a permit process when it is not needed is unwarranted and burdensome.

(Please note that the SB County ordinance which has been used for almost 2 decades by the City of Goleta for zoning purposes uses the language of exempt fences as being **“six feet or less.”** The proposed NZO standard for an exempt fence is to be **“...less than six feet.”** Purchased fence pickets are six feet high and this height seems to be a standard.)

Please change the language in the NZO to recognize that the standard should be of a fence 6 feet or less and that if such a fence is outside of front yard setback and there are not other sight clearance issues, it is exempt from a permit.

2. Chapter 17.52.050 Public Notification, paragraph C3 (p. v-13)

The city has generally good noticing procedures for projects subject to various kinds of permits. However, the city's current standard for on-site posted notice with those yellow plastic signs is insufficient for large scale developments, like the Target Shopping Center improvements, all new hotel developments, large scale industrial and commercial uses, and large housing developments (like Hollister Village and the Winslowe in Old Town).

Please see the attachment for the size of the sign used for on-site noticing for all project sizes. For the scope and scale of the projects mentioned above, the signs are too small to attract the public's attention. They aren't seen by motorists passing by because one can't read the sign from the street and these signs are also subject to weather degradation. (The sign at the attachment is located at the Best Western located at the corner of Calle Real and Kellogg. This notice was for the addition of an outside elevator which, I believe, the current on-site posted notice is appropriate for the scope of the project.) There may be other projects which might benefit from increased on-site notice size. As a minimum, the large projects mentioned above are the ones the public is most interested in. A bigger sign is better for getting attention and providing information.

Therefore I would like to request that the Planning Commission add an additional on-site noticing requirement for a certain class/size of development as discussed above (If there are other projects worthy of a bigger on-site notice sign, perhaps those could be added by staff). The signs should be a maximum of 4ft x 8ft, located at eye level no higher than 6ft, 10 ft from property line, have all the info that the current signs have plus first hearing date. I have seen signs in other jurisdictions with just text information and some jurisdictions also have a photo. Either would be better than what is now used. (For good examples of on-site noticing Google “development on- site noticing” for the cities of Fremont, Novato, Anaheim and Mountain View.)

3. Chapter 17.42.010 Telecommunication Facilities (p. iv-157)

In May 2019, the City adopted a Municipal Code ordinance regarding wireless facilities in the Public Right of Way incident to the recent change in FCC regulations.

<https://goleta.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3926403&GUID=6563CB7A-9A61-4118-959E-E5FA5AAD4FB7>

First of all, I believe it would be helpful for the public, not knowledgeable about the FCC rulings, to understand exactly what cell sites are now regulated in the City’s NZO telecom ordinance. It isn’t clear when reading the NZO that it only regulates cells on private property. The following statement in the first paragraph is government speak at its finest and decoding what it means for the public would be really helpful. “ The requirements of this Chapter apply to all telecomm facilities within the City which aren’t subject to FCC ruling (WT Docket N. 17-79, WC Docket No. 17-84, FCC 18-133....” Request a rewrite of second paragraph in this section to clarify what kind of cell sites the NZO regulates.

Secondly, the design and development standards in the City’s Municipal Code for small cells in the public ROW are quite robust and comprehensive. Some jurisdictions use the same standards for both cells in the ROW ordinance and for those on private property regulated by their zoning ordinance. Without a side-by-side comparison of the City’s Muni Code and the NZO regarding cell small sites standards, it is difficult to know if they are the same or different than what is in the NZO.

However, I do note that there are few, if any development standards in the NZO. Missing is the Muni Code ordinance requirement for 3rd party review by a licensed professional engineer affirming that radio frequency emissions are compliant with FCC’s standards, etc. The Muni Code also requires photosims/visual analysis, absent from the NZO. These two issues are the ones where the public has the most interest and both these development standards should have been in the NZO Telecomm Facilities section.

Small cell sites, wherever they are located--whether in the ROW or on private property, should have the same design and development standards since project impacts could have the same impacts. And, there should also be consistency between the city’s regulatory documents regulating the same kind of telecom facility. Request that the City’s Muni Code regulations for small cells in the ROW apply to small cells on private property regulated by the NZO Telecommunication Facilities ordinance.

October 5, 2019

Re: Comments on NZO for Oct 7, 2019 City of Goleta Planning Commission Meeting

Dear Madame Chair and Members of the Planning Commission,

At the conclusion of your last hearing, Commissioner Maynard requested several topics for discussion at your Oct 7th pc meeting. One was about story poles.

This is a really important topic for those us concerned about "the look, fit, and feel" of development in the City and how it affects community character. Story poles are a necessary and useful "tool" to help decision makers, staff and the public in assessing project size, bulk and scale, neighborhood compatibility, and impacts to public views. They are a must to be incorporated into a city regulatory document for use by all of the above. I hope you will take action to do that at your Oct 7 hearing. On the next page are links I recommend for story pole documentation from the named jurisdictions to consider using for the City of Goleta.

There is some urgency about the City having a requirement with standards for story poles (not in some future document yet to be considered) because there is a project on the near horizon that will need story poles. This is the proposed Calle Real Hotel, a three story building of unusual size bulk scale for the neighborhood of mostly one story buildings, not compatible with any structure in the area at its proposed size. It may also block views. Story pole standards are must to ensure that they convey the proper information about the project.

I urge you to require rather broad language in the NZO about requirements, procedures and certification for story poles. There should also be a requirement for photos of the story pole installation, too. This is a must for those who don't see the story poles while they are in place and are documentation for the record. If the detail must wait for some future document like a handout or resolution like the commercial development design guidelines, there needs to be some language in the NZO about the city's standards, expectations and outcomes in using story poles for a particular project.

What kind of projects should require story poles? I have seen story poles for very large projects, like the Marriott Resident Inn on Hollister in the City of Goleta, Comstock's housing project at the west end of Hollister, and for a SB County project at 80 N. Patterson which was a 7000 sq.ft "one story" office building with an unusually high volumetric ceiling (31ft tall) with viewshed impacts. As one architect said: "Story poles tell no lies." Story poles are needed to accurately depict a proposed project so it is known the extent of the proposed development and its impacts. Photosims don't always do it. The real deal is to use story poles. Request story pole standards be added in the NZO at your Oct 7, 2019 hearing.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.
Cecilia Brown

County of Santa Barbara

https://www.countyofsb.org/uploadedFiles/plnDev/Content/Hearing_Bodies/Story%20Pole%20Guidelines%20Final%201-09-09.pdf

Agoura Hills

<http://www.ci.agoura-hills.ca.us/home/showdocument?id=19915>

The City of Malibu

https://www.malibucity.org/DocumentCenter/View/4578/LCP_MMC-Story-Pole-Policy?bidId=

The Town of Los Gatos

<https://www.losgatosca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/179/Height--Story-Pole-and-Netting-Information?bidId=>

5620

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

_____ Case No. _____

For more information, please contact
(Para información sobre esta propuesta de desarrollo, favor de llamar)

Staff Planner: _____ Phone: _____
Email: _____ @cityofgoleta.org

NOTICE OF FINAL APPROVAL
Submitted to Goleta City Council
Planning and Environmental Services
1000 E. Highway 101, Suite 100, Goleta, CA 93141
Phone: (805) 965-1000 Fax: (805) 965-1001
www.cityofgoleta.org

Project Information:
Project Name: _____
Project Location: _____
Project Description: _____
Project Number: _____
Project Date: _____

Staff:
Staff Planner: _____
Staff Engineer: _____

Approval:
City Council: _____
City Manager: _____

