

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019 Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

<h2 style="color: #4f81bd; margin: 0;">Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<h3 style="color: #4f81bd; margin: 0;">Trailers and Recreational Vehicle Parking/Storage</h3>	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bree Belyea encouraged the City Council to stay with the 2019 ordinance draft and objected to any restrictions regarding recreational vehicles parked in front setbacks.</li> <li>2. Wes Herman expressed appreciation to the City for their work on the zoning ordinance and objected to any restrictions regarding recreational vehicles parked in front setbacks (letter on file).</li> <li>3. Dano Pagenkopf expressed opposition to any restriction to parking a recreational vehicle on private property and noted the lack of alternative parking for these vehicles. Mr. Pagenkopf commented that the city has more important problems to address.</li> <li>4. Scott Clark expressed opposition to any restriction of parking a recreational vehicle on private property and noted recreational vehicles should be considered as parked, not stored.</li> <li>5. David Geuffrain urged the City Council to take into account residents who have been parking recreational vehicles in their yards for decades before any decisions are made to change setback and curb cut regulations.</li> <li>6. Dana Trout pointed out that the proposed regulations lump large trailers and vehicles, such as recreational vehicles and boats, with small vehicles, such as golf carts and motorcycle</li> </ol>	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised and proposed to read as follows:</p> <p>A. Trailers and recreational vehicles (RV) may be parked/stored anywhere on a lot, subject to Section 17.38.030, General Provisions, and all of the following provisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. No more than one trailer or RV may be parked/stored on a single lot outside of either a fully enclosed structure or an area on the lot that is fully screened by a fence, freestanding wall, or hedge of at least five feet in height, subject to Section 17.24.090 of this Title.</li> <li>ii. The owner of the trailer or RV must reside on the same lot where it is being parked/stored.</li> <li>iii. The trailer or RV must be capable of operation and if required to be registered, must have a current, unexpired registration with the</li> </ol>

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019 Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

Response to Planning Commission Comments	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>trailers. Mr. Trout commented that many residents have a six foot fence in the front yard setback for the purpose of privacy or screening.</p> <p>7. Nathan Harmony noted the lack of available parking for recreational vehicles and trailers. Mr. Harmony commented on the storage prices of recreational vehicle and trailer storage that have risen due to the proposed regulations, and encouraged the City do perform a study on the effect of the proposed regulations and how they will affect the prices of recreational vehicle and trailer storage.</p> <p>8. Rob Paul spoke in support of recreational vehicle parking on personal property, and commented on pickup trucks that are larger than boats parked on the street. Mr. Paul questioned what brought the proposed setback restriction to the City Council and Planning Commission.</p> <p>9. Dean Young urged the City Council and Planning Commission to allow temporary street parking for recreation vehicles and trailers and questioned why the City would regulate private property rights for aesthetics.</p>	<p>California Department of Motor Vehicles.</p> <p>iv. The trailer or RV must not be occupied for living purposes on a site longer than 14 days in a six-month period, except as authorized in Section 17.01.040(B)(6) of this Title.</p> <p>v. The trailer or RV must not project into the public right-of-way, impede vision clearance, or cause any other public safety hazards while parked and stored.</p> <p>B. The use of trailers and RVs within the City shall also be subject to Goleta Municipal Code, Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic and Title 12, Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places.</p> <p>Additionally, a new General Provision for parking and loadings areas was added that reads as follows:  <b>Materials.</b> All areas on which parking or loading occurs, including both required and additional parking, must be paved with a minimum of two inches of</p>

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019 Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

Response to Planning Commission Comments	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
	asphalt, concrete, interlocking masonry pavers, or other permeable material on a suitable base and may not be on grassy lawn areas unless using a form of grassblock or grasscrete.
ADUs	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Cheryl Rogers, League of Women Voters, questioned whether accessory dwelling unit (ADU) impact fees would be an obstacle to development and questioned height requirements for ADUs.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Impact fees for ADUs and other types of structures is part of a separate discussion and Work Program dealing with "Beneficial Projects." Height requirements for ADUs are discussed within Section 17.41.030(F).</p>
General Comments	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Cecelia Brown expressed appreciation to City staff and the Planning Commission for their work on the zoning ordinance.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
ESHA	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Brian Trautwein, Environmental Analyst and Watershed Program Coordinator, Environmental Defense Center (EDC), and representing the Urban Creeks Council, spoke on the creek protection ordinance to be adopted as part of the City's Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Trautwein noted that a one hundred foot</p>	<p>Comment noted. The NZO includes a 100-foot buffer for streamside protection. Edits will be made by staff to clarify that the stated buffers are "minimums." However,</p>

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019  
Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
setback is the minimum to protect water quality, wildlife that utilize the creek, and act as an important buffer between the creek and human activity.	consistent with the General Plan, reductions in required minimum buffers could be approved as part of a Major Conditional Use Permit.
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Tara Messing, Staff Attorney, Environmental Defense Center (EDC), spoke in support and importance of the one hundred foot creek setback.	Comment noted. See response above.
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Anne Burdette, Secretary for the Urban Creeks Council, urged the City Council to provide a process in the new Zoning Ordinance for when the minimum one hundred foot creek setback may be reduced for a development and urged protection of the natural habitat.	Comment noted. As stated above, reductions in required minimum buffers could be approved by the City as part of a Major Conditional Use Permit.
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Rachel Couch, State Coastal Conservancy, spoke in support of the creeks protection portion of the new Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Couch urged the City Council and Planning Commission to keep the creek buffer as wide as possible.	Comment noted. As state above, the NZO includes a 100-foot buffer for streamside protection. Additionally, all other required buffers for other types of EHSA have also been integrated into the NZO.
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dr. Ingeborg Cox spoke in support of the one hundred foot creek setback, the protecting of sensitive Native American culture and archaeological sites, especially at the Bacara.	Comments noted. Chapter 17.43, Cultural Resources, provides protections for Native American resources.
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Vic Cox expressed concern with the lack of protection of areas associated with Native American culture sites.	Chapter 17.43, Cultural Resources, provides protections for Native American resources. Furthermore, the

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019 Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

Response to Planning Commission Comments	
PUBLIC COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
	City's Historic Resources Ordinance is currently being drafted, which will greatly expand upon the details of additional protections to sensitive Native resources.
Ham Radios	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dennis Franklin expressed worry that amateur radio antennas are being grouped in with architectural features, and are therefore subject to height limit restrictions.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The NZO will be revised to exempt most Ham radios and to comply to recent FCC rulings on the topic.</p>
Nonconforming Uses and Structures	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Mitch Menzek, Paul Hastings Law firm, Counsel to the Bacara resort, noted that the new zoning ordinance would render the Bacara non-conforming, making even minor changes, or repairs to a building being very difficult.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Revisions will be made to address projects with previously-approved Development Plans and will propose to "grandfather" such developments, thereby rendering them "legal."</p>
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Kristen Miller, President and CEO of Goleta Chamber of Commerce, noted that the proposed permit requirements may place some businesses into legal nonconforming status, and requested including limited exception language be included to protect the communities investment in local business, and adding clarifying language to chapter 17.36.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Edits to nonconforming Chapter will be made to address this concern.</p>

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019  
Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

<b>Day Care Facilities</b>	
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Cheri Diaz, Director of Hope for Kids Early Learning Center, urged the City Council to promote the opening of childcare centers by removing fees to open a childcare center, eliminate zoning issues, eliminate permit processes and fees, provide housing assistance to early childhood education teachers who meet certain criteria, and promote respect for early childhood educators.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Day Care facility fees will be a part of the discussion of “Beneficial Projects,” which is a separate Work Program apart from the NZO. The NZO will be revised to propose allowing these facilities within more Zone Districts and widely with a ministerial zoning permit (e.g., LUP/CDP) or “by-right.”</p>
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Sharol Viker, Early Care and Education Officer, First 5 of Santa Barbara County, spoke on the need for additional child care spaces and the barriers that exist to opening or expanding child care centers. Ms. Viker commented on state and local programs designed to mitigate the costs of opening an early childcare center.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Eileen Monahan, Child Care Consultant, commented that early childcare is good for children and working parents. Ms. Monahan noted the State and Santa Barbara County heavily regulates childcare. Ms. Monahan urged the City Council and Planning Commission to make large family childcare “by-right,” keep childcare as part of the beneficial projects category, allow childcare centers in as many zones as feasible, require the least onerous permitting process, and plan for childcare.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The NZO will be revised to propose allowing these facilities within more Zone Districts and widely with a ministerial zoning permit (e.g., LUP/CDP) or “by-right.”</p>
<p><i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Jacqui Banta, CFO, Children's Resource for All in Santa Barbara County, spoke on supporting working families, low income families and children with disabilities. Ms. Banta commented on the lack of childcare centers in Goleta, and the obstacles of opening a childcare facility in Goleta.</p>	<p>Comments noted. See responses above.</p>

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019 Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

<b>Mobile Vendors</b>	
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dean Young noted mobile vendors should not be limited to food vendors, but include other mobile vendors such as t-shirt, bicycle, and kayak vendors.	Comment noted. No revisions needed, as Mobile Vending would include all forms, not just food.
<b>Review Authorities</b>	
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dr. Ingeborg Cox questioned whether the Director and Zoning Administrator reviewing authorities are the same person.	As stated in earlier Workshops, the Zoning Administrator is appointed by the City Manager and is currently Peter Imhof, the Director of Planning and Environmental Review.
<b>Rules of Measurement</b>	
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dr. Ingeborg Cox commented that floor area calculation taken as gross and net won't provide clarity.	Comment noted.
<b>Design Review</b>	
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dr. Ingeborg Cox questioned why the Design Review Board cannot address the landscape walls in the front yard setback.	The Design Review Board would have the authority to review walls in the front setback over six feet in height.
<b>Appeals</b>	
<i>Joint CC/PC Workshop</i> Dr. Ingeborg Cox questioned why there is no appeals for the issues regarding substantial conformity determination (SCD) and zoning clearance.	Development that would qualify for a SCD would conform to a previously approved project, therefore, the appeal opportunity would have expired with the original project. Similarly, the Zoning Clearance mainly serves to clear conditions associated with a previously-approved Discretionary Action, which

**NOTE: The public comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes of the May 7, 2019 Joint CC/PC Workshop of that have not yet been approved by the City Council or Planning Commission**

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the Final Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to Public Comments table. A **final** Response to Public Comment Table will be included with the release of the Public Hearing Draft of the NZO.

	again, would have its owner appeal timing and opportunity. Otherwise, any stand-alone Zoning Clearance is limited to only very small projects with no possible significant impacts, therefore, no appeal.
<b>Open Space</b>	
Vic Cox spoke to certain goals that have not been meant including a requirement to ensure parks and recreation are provided to public concurrent with any new development, manage and operate and maintain park recreation open space facilities and balancing community needs with available funding, and manage open space areas in a manner that provides for public access.	Comment noted.

**DRAFT** Joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshop Minutes included within **THIS** table: (Unapproved Minutes)

- Joint CC/PC Workshop (5/7)

**DRAFT** Planning Commission Workshop Minutes to be included within other **DRAFT** table: (Unapproved Minutes)

- Workshop #5 (4/8)
- Workshop #7 (4/18)
- Workshop #8 (4/23)
- Workshop #9 (5/9)

**Planning Commission Workshop approved Minutes already added to the Response to PC Comments table:**

- Workshop #1 (2/23)
- Workshop #2 (3/06)
- Workshop #3 (3/12)
- Workshop #4 (3/21)
- Workshop #6 (4/11)