

**From:** [Gillian Fennessy](mailto:Gillian.Fennessy)  
**To:** [Gillian Fennessy](mailto:Gillian.Fennessy)  
**Subject:** FW: Corrected Errata comments 34  
**Date:** Monday, September 23, 2019 9:04:32 AM

---

**From:** [masseybarb@aol.com](mailto:masseybarb@aol.com) <[masseybarb@aol.com](mailto:masseybarb@aol.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2019 8:38 AM

**To:** Bill Shelor <[bshelor@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:bshelor@cityofgoleta.org)>; Ed Fuller <[efuller@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:efuller@cityofgoleta.org)>; Jennifer Smith <[jsmith@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:jsmith@cityofgoleta.org)>; Katie Maynard <[kmaynard@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:kmaynard@cityofgoleta.org)>; Robert Miller <[rmiller@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:rmiller@cityofgoleta.org)>

**Cc:** Deborah Lopez <[dlopez@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:dlopez@cityofgoleta.org)>; Andy Newkirk <[anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org)>; [Masseybarb@aol.com](mailto:Masseybarb@aol.com)

**Subject:** Corrected Errata comments

I accidentally sent the uncorrected comments yesterday. Below are the corrected ones. The only change is in the third paragraph but I wanted you to have the correct comments.

Deborah and Andy would you please delete the previous comments and only use these.

Thank you, Barbara

Chair and Commissioners,

I will keep these comments brief and by page and Chapter numbers.

Pg. 2 Table 17.38.040 A. Parking for Large Family Day Care should not be changed. Residential districts already have parking problems and the residential parking requirement is inadequate. There needs to be parking for employees and drop offs.

Attachment 1, Chapter 17.30 The August 2019 draft is an improvement over the January 2019 draft. There are still some problems including the failure to address EDC's continuing concern over CE 2.2. Everyone was shocked and disappointed by the Errata's awful deletion of 17.30 subsections, which we received only when we arrived for the September 9<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission hearing. These errata removed the good work staff did to respond to the Planning Commission's and public's requested changes. Residents are very unhappy and have asked me who got to the Planning Department.

It needs to be pointed out that a policy recommended by EDC for having a process, required findings, and evidence requirements for feasibility for any reduction of creek setbacks still has not been included. This has been requested numerous times by EDC and others.

Pg. IV-46, 17.30.050 A. should be retained. Any reduction of a required buffer must have a Conditional Use Permit.

Pg. IV-48, 17.30.070 should not be removed. This provides the process for making requested buffer changes and findings to justify them.

Pg. IV-49, ~~17.30.080~~ 17.30.070 I ask that you adopt the ordinance supplied by EDC and used by the County of Santa Barbara to protect our creeks and riparian habitat.

Pg. IV-51, 17.30.100 The buffer should remain 100 feet.

Pg. IV-51, 17.30.120 Lagoons should have a 100 foot buffer.

Pg. IV-52, 17.30.140 B. Protection of Coastal Bluff Scrub, Coastal Sage Scrub, and Chaparral should

be kept at 50 foot with all the wording of the August 2019 draft.

Pg. IV-52, 17.30.150 Protection of Native Oak Woodlands and Savannas should go back to the August 2019 drafts 50 foot buffer.

Pg. IV-53 17.30.160 C. Protection of Native Grasslands should retain the 20 foot buffer.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment, Barbara