

From: masseybarb@aol.com
To: [Bill Shelor](#); [Ed Fuller](#); [Jennifer Smith](#); [Katie Maynard](#); rmiller@ciyofgoleta.org
Cc: [Deborah Lopez](#); [Andy Newkirk](#); masseybarb@aol.com
Subject: Comments on NZO
Date: Sunday, September 08, 2019 8:43:59 AM
Attachments: [NZO comments Sept. 2019.docx](#)

Good morning,

I have attached my comments on the August 2019 version of the NZO for your consideration. Sorry for not getting it to you sooner but 428 pages is a lot to read and consider. I have only hit the serious points and have left a lot without written comments.

See you Monday, Barbara

Commissioners,

The new Zoning Ordinance has a lot of good changes but it has a number of problems also.

I have placed the page number for each of my comments to make it easier to see what I am referring to.

I-18 17.03.130 A. The word Restricted has replaced Private for Open Space. Please change it back to Private. Restricted isn't as specific and isn't commonly used. Instead it should be the commonly used Private Open Space.

II-5 17.07.020 Animal keeping should require a Minor CUP in RS and RP districts. The potential noise, odors, and traffic need to be considered in relation to the adjacent residences.

II-9 17.07.050 C.3. Why was Parking Required removed?

II-31 17.10.030 B.1. This Transitional Standard is a good addition.

III-4 17.16.040 B.3. The ALUP Table 4-1 is mentioned a number of times but is not included in the NZO. The Table should be included; it is only 3 pages and could easily be reduced to fit on one page.

III-417.16.040 D. The word "uses" should be kept and not changed to "features". Features is the wrong word, it isn't as specific. The appropriate word is "uses".

IV-4 17.24.020 B.2. Why was d. "requires a Coastal Development Permit" removed?

IV-12 17.24.130 There should be a time limit on temporary storage of construction materials. Too many developments run into problems and take years to restart or finish a project and the public shouldn't have to look at the piles of construction materials. Some of it looks like junk piles.

17.24.130 B. If a chain link fence is used for screening it must have a covering to block the view.

IV-48 17.30.080 The Streamside Protection Area buffer should be a 50 foot minimum buffer like other ESHAs. Just because the General Plan says 25 feet doesn't mean it can't be 50 feet. There is nothing preventing the City from having stronger ESHA buffers in the NZO. If necessary, place the 50 foot buffer in the NZO and then amend the General Plan later to a 50 foot minimum buffer.

17.30.070 and 17.30.080 I strongly support EDC's comments on the draft NZO. Please incorporate EDC's draft language setting forth a process, required findings, and evidentiary requirements for decisions on allowing reductions to creek setbacks.

IV-79 17.37.030 C.4.e. Setbacks should never be allowed to be reduced to less than 25 feet. C.4.e. should be deleted. Less than 25 feet is no real buffer at all.

IV-85 Table 17.38.040 (A) An addition should be made to Single dwelling units over 3,000 sq. ft. to have the addition of a covered parking space. Also “All required spaces shall be provided within a garage” should be added. These current provisions are City Ordinance 03-05 passed in 2003 and they should be kept.

IV-86 Table 17.38.040 (A) Day Care Facility, Hospital, and Skilled Nursing Facility should have one space per employee as these are facilities that usually have a lack of sufficient parking.

IV-87 Table 17.38.040 (A) Hotels and Motels should have one space per two employees.

IV-91 17.38.070 1.b. The Additional Parking provision is totally inappropriate in Single-Unit Dwellings in Residential Zones. This is turning neighborhoods into vehicle storage lots. This is a terrible addition to the Zoning Ordinance.

IV-91 17.38.080 A.1. No trailer or RV should be permitted outside an enclosed structure or fully screened area in residentially zoned lots. This degrades the appearance of the neighborhood and decreases the value of homes.

IV-115 17.40.030 Window signs should not be exempt; they should be prohibited in residential zone districts. They are not appropriate in residential neighborhoods.

The previous three comments relate to issues that will degrade residential neighborhoods. It seems that there is more interest in personal desires with a lack of consideration for neighbors.

IV-116 17.40.040 F. Portable signs should be prohibited in all zones. Return to previous draft wording. Portable signs clutter open areas, sidewalks, walkways, and are an obstruction for the handicapped and pedestrians.

V-37 17.58.060 B. Grading and lighting plans should be included at Preliminary Review.

V-39 17.58.060 The DRB’s Required Findings should have the finding that “The project proposed would be consistent with the General Plan.”. This is an issue that is not always considered when reviewing a project and is sometimes discouraged by staff when it is. The General Plan is something that should always be considered on any project the Board or Commission review.

V-55 17.62.020 A.1.b.ii. Any modifications for side yard setback depth from property line shouldn’t be less than 5 feet. There should be enough room for a person to walk past a AC unit or similar equipment. This is a safety issue.

V-56 17.62.020 B.1. Special modification should be limited to a maximum increase in height above the base Zone District of 20% in all districts. Increased heights in Residential areas blocks views and light and solar access.

Thank you for considering my suggestions, Barbara