Per the Planning Commission April 18th workshop regarding maximum building height, Commissioners supported up to 35% allowance for single family and 20% for multi-family. Additionally, there was a suggestion to consider if the property is in a canyon, lot size, etc.

The property where I live in Goleta is in the DR zone district which has a maximum building height of 35'. I purchased my property with the ability to build to this height, and I would like to continue to have the right to build to this height. I am on a large parcel where I need to store tractors and utility equipment. All four of my immediate neighbors have barns. I store my tractors outdoors, but would like to build an accessory structure when I can afford to do so one day. I would like to be able to build to 35'. I am in a canyon and am surrounded by trees that are much taller than 35'. There are no views to preserve, and no one has access to my land even if there were views to preserve. I am NOT the only person in Goleta in this situation.

I understand from a past workshop that it may have been more appropriate to have rezoned properties that are in the DR zone district into the new RP zone district rather than the RS zone district, but the fact is, that was not done, so our properties are now being lumped in with all the smaller lots where some people feel it might not be appropriate to build as high. Requesting a rezone, as was implied, is expensive, requires a general plan change, and takes a long time. This is simply not a practical solution for a home owner who wants to build a 35' accessory structure, ADU, or second home on their property.

I still believe that my suggested approach to height as detailed in my May 27, 2016 letter (please re-read that letter) is the best approach. Based on my letter, I feel that people in the RS district should be able to build to at least 33’ in order to have attractive gabled two story homes (rather than flat roofs) in order to preserve, and even enhance, the character of Goleta. If the strategy outlined in my 2016 letter is not chosen, and a 25' base height is chosen for the RS zone district, I respect and appreciate the Planning Commission's willingness to allow modifications to 30% (if not 35% as one Commissioner suggested, or even just 32% which gets to the 33' described in my letter).

In any case, I request that you add a stipulation that allows building to 35' (or 40% higher than the base district, if using a percentage is more desirable) "by right" on lands that are in the DR zone district. If it is
not practical to single out these parcels by creating an overlay, then I suggest allowing 35’ on any land that is greater than some minimum size, such as 10,000 square feet as most DR parcels are likely greatly than this and most other parcels that will end up in the RS zone are probably 7,000 square feet, or less. This figure could certainly be made bigger; perhaps 15,000 or even 20,000 square feet.

Staff’s response to Planning Commission Comments Version 2 (posted 4/29/19) page 33 speaks to a 20-30% modification of height perhaps with higher height modifications allowed in the RS zone district. This doesn’t consider the 35% suggestion from one Planning Commissioner nor does it address the suggestion of allowing even higher heights based upon land location and/or lot size, etc. Please consider these suggestions from our Commissioners as well as my above suggests for the new zoning ordinance.

Sincerely,

Ken Alker

Ken Alker