

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Response to Planning Commission Comments	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
Parking and Loading	
<i>Workshop #5</i>	
Q: Are regulations of RVs in the Front Setback sufficient?	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller commented: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Suggested possible consideration whether an RV parked in a front setback could it be perpendicular to the front street, so an RV would not take up a large portion of the frontage of the property. B. Consider whether to possibly limit the number of vehicles depending on the type per lot. C. Consider whether the vehicles should only be owned by the owners of the lot. D. Pedestrian safety would be an issue; for example, if one of the large vehicles was backing out from being stored directly on the sidewalk onto the sidewalk, and was not giving a pedestrian chance to get out of the way, this would be an argument against having no setbacks. E. Supports adding vehicles storage in the Business Park (BP) zones. 2. Commissioner Maynard pointed out that there may be an enforcement issue in terms of the number of the units because the property would need to have the number of onsite parking spaces required for the single-family home plus room for the RV in onsite spaces that are not on-the-street parking. 3. Commissioner Maynard supports the concept that was brought up about potentially expanding the spaces where RV storage lots might be allowed and considering the Business Park districts as a potential area to have additional storage lots. She would not support RV parking lots in Commercial zones because she would want Commercial zones to be kept as more vibrant areas with people coming in and out. 4. Commissioner Maynard believes there should be more guidance to the City regarding flexibility to allow additional curb cuts where appropriate to the design of the space and where there is an attempt to park an RV, instead of being resistant to curb cuts. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. Staff does not recommend attempting to regulate the direction vehicles are parked in front of a house. 1b. Staff will explore options of limiting the number of trailers or RVs on a lot. 1c. Staff will explore options to require owner of the RV to reside on the lot. 1d. Public safety within the right-of-way would be maintained in the NZO. 1e. Comment noted. 2. Required parking for SFDs is typically provided onsite within an attached or detached garage. 3. The Outdoor Storage use classification would be permitted in CG, IS, IG, consistent with the City's General Plan. 4. Comment noted; however, curb cuts are within the authority of the Public Works Department and not zoning.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>5. Commissioner Maynard requested consideration regarding whether there should be a preference to store an RV on the side setback vs. the front setback because concerns have been expressed regarding RVs parked in side setbacks.</p> <p>6. Commissioner Maynard suggested considering whether there should be an adjustment in the ordinance for the reality that car park in the front setback.</p> <p>7. Commissioner Maynard commented that she has seen a strong response from members of the community for more leniency with regard to storage of RVs and other recreational vehicles.</p> <p>8. Vice Chair Miller commented at this time he is partial to the idea of prohibiting parking in the front setback. He noted his concerns include how it affects people in the neighborhood aesthetically. He requested staff look into finding locations that would be appropriate for RV parking but noted that commercial locations are not appropriate. He also recommended taking a stronger look at screening requirements and size requirements of the RV, particularly if they will be allowed in the front setback. He understands there are issues in connection with parking on the side setbacks.</p> <p>9. Chair Smith commented she has some concerns regarding enforcement of proposed RV requirements and believes enforcement is largely complaint driven. She noted it appears there have not been a lot of complaints previously although there may be more with the proposed requirements. She expressed concern about individuals living in RVs. She commented there would need to be additional requirements if RV parking in the front setback is allowed. She would be open to staff looking for other places to store RVs in the community, and stated she is not entirely convinced allowing RVs in the front setback is the way to go.</p> <p>10. Commissioner Shelor commented in support of continuing to use the standards in the previous draft ordinance. He believes the new proposed standards somewhat negate the General Plan priorities of maintaining aesthetics and neighborhood compatibility. He recognized that this creates issues for individuals that live in the city, and stated it is incumbent upon staff and the City Council to facilitate storing these large vehicles in some appropriate nonresidential zones.</p>	<p>5. Comment noted. However, the standards within the NZO will be requirements and not preferences or recommendations.</p> <p>6. Clarification for this allowance will be made in the NZO.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p> <p>8. Comments noted. Staff will work with the interested parties on this topic further to attempt to develop standards for RVs and trailers that address the overall concerns mentioned.</p> <p>9. Correct, enforcement is currently complaint-driven within the City. RVs are not permitted to be used as permanent habitation on a lot. Staff will continue to research this topic and return to the Commission at a future Workshop with more info.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. However, after public release of the last version, there was significant public input that went into the revisions presented in the 2019 draft NZO.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>11. Vice Chair Miller commented that he would need more information about what seems to be a lack of complaints from neighbors of RV owners before factoring that in to the decision-making.</p> <p>12. Commissioner Maynard commented that she cannot support the additional size limitations and additional screening requirements, and noted that she has heard from many people. She believes notices should be sent to persons who have commented regarding RVs to notify them that there have been changes to the draft ordinance that has been provided and to make sure they have seen the changes. She recommended that persons on both sides of the issue should be contacted.</p> <p>13. Vice Chair Miller questioned whether it is appropriate to notice prior persons who commented on this issue.</p> <p>14. Commissioner Fuller stated that recommendations from the Planning Commission regarding the New Zoning Ordinance will be submitted to the City Council who will be the final decision-makers; and he encouraged interested persons to contact the City Council at the appropriate time.</p> <p>15. Vice Chair Miller clarified that he does not want anyone’s opinions not to be included and he supports ample noticing.</p> <p>16. Chair Smith commented that the intent of the process is that the public has an opportunity to comment on all issues.</p>	<p>11. Comment noted.</p> <p>12. Comment noted. Staff does not believe size limitations will be introduced, as they are not easily enforceable. However, some screening requirements may be added. Staff will also be emailing all RV commenters from the prior 2016 Workshops.</p> <p>13. Noticing is appropriate and will be done.</p> <p>14. Comment noted.</p> <p>15. Comment noted.</p> <p>16. Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> Q: Are Parking reductions appropriate?</p> <p>1. Chair Smith commented that generally she supports the reduction for low-income units most strongly.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Fuller commented he does not believe low-income people do not have cars and he believes elderly people have a car even if they do not drive it. He noted vehicles sales are at an almost record high. He would support a reduction in parking for mixed-use developments because it has the opportunity to provide for shared parking. He noted that the current trend is 5 to 6 office workers in 1,000 square feet, and most offices consider 4 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet a</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>minimum. Also, retail considers 5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet a minimum. Commissioner Fuller commented that not providing adequate parking is creating a property that is working against itself.</p> <p>3. Commissioner Shelor commented that he is concerned about the parking standards being reduced but he does not want to create any more vehicle travel than necessary and wants to support Transportation Demand Management and alternatives. He suggested taking a step back with regard to the parking reductions to get a better understanding because of the uncertainty of other factors that affect parking. He also commented regarding possible effects on parking spaces and parking standards when there is a change of use and substantial conformity.</p> <p>4. Vice Chair Miller generally supports the comments by Commissioner Fuller and Commissioner Shelor with one caveat with regard to mixed-use developments because weekends would be questionable because both residents and retail could be there on the weekend.</p> <p>5. Commissioner Maynard suggested increasing the required parking requirements in many areas across the board but then allow for parking reductions for Transportation Demand Management with incentives including bike parking and transit passes. She noted many areas are under-parked.</p> <p>6. Commissioner Fuller recommended creative solutions that will be useful, for example, businesses providing bus passes to employees, and considering standards noted in the International Zoning Code.</p> <p>7. Chair Smith supports not proceeding with this proposal until more can be known about what is going to happen with Old Town. She is less comfortable with other reductions but commented there are few incentives to offer in terms of low-income units.</p> <p>8. Commissioner Maynard commented that UCSB has been very successful with Transportation Demand Management programs. She recommended allowing these incentives where employers are looking for these opportunities. In terms of low-income and senior housing, she noted that local cities have found a way to limit car ownership for low-income and senior housing.</p>	<p>3. Staff will be revisiting the parking standards and potential reductions offered within the NZO. With regard to changes of use and substantial conformity determinations, required parking is in fact evaluated.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. Staff will review the overlapping use of parking for such uses on weekends and revise if needed.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. Staff will revisit the parking provisions in the NZO.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>9. Commissioner Maynard suggested considering increasing the parking requirement around cannabis businesses, based on data from other cities showing increased traffic and parking needs.</p> <p>10. Commissioner Maynard suggested considering strengthening the language for parking available for loading and unloading near day care facilities. She noted from her observations working by a day care center that parking is a major issue with parents parking wherever they can.</p> <p>11. Commissioner Maynard recommended reconsidering the system to make sure there is enough adequate parking for employees.</p> <p>12. Commissioner Maynard suggested reconsidering whether the necessity for covered vs. uncovered parking is as critical, in Section 17.38.040.A.2.</p> <p>13. Commissioner Maynard recommended leaning toward “Full-time Equivalent Employee” rather than “Full-time Employee”.</p> <p>14. Commissioner Maynard commented with regard to consideration of parking reductions and incentives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The incentives need to be significantly above and beyond the city requirements, for example, parking reductions for increased bicycle facilities. B. The language with regard to bus passes should be changed to transit pass to count towards other types of commuter passes. C. Suggested as an incentive for employers or developers to consider adding additional transit stops, including covered transit stops and bus pull-outs. <p>15. Commissioner Maynard suggested that some of the funding the in-lieu fees for parking could go to staffing for parking facilities, shopping for Transportation Demand Management outreach programs, subsidized bikes, additional transit stops, covered benches, and other appropriate uses, with regard to Section 17.38.060.</p> <p>16. Commissioner Maynard commented that she would support parking reductions as part of discretionary review as opposed to by right.</p>	<p>9. Parking standards for Cannabis uses are the same as other similar types of Retail uses listed in NZO Table 17.38.040(A).</p> <p>10. Comment noted. Revisions made to address loading and parking for Day Cares in Table 17.38.040(A).</p> <p>11. Comment noted. No change made.</p> <p>12. Comment noted. No change made.</p> <p>13. Revision to be made to use “Full-time Equivalent” for calculation.</p> <p>14. Comment noted.</p> <p>15. Comment noted. Parking in-lieu fees are administered by Neighborhood Services.</p> <p>16. Comment noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> Q: Are Bicycle parking requirements sufficient?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard commented that overall the bicycle parking requirements are good and questioned whether the Planning Commissioners would consider planning for any type of bike share or a scooter parking plan, noting there will be further discussion on scooters although there is a ban on scooters. 2. Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller and Commissioner Maynard agreed to recommend increasing the bicycle parking requirements to a minimum of three for short-term. 3. Vice Chair Miller agreed with the staff proposal and would not object to a greater requirement, and believes it is moving in the right direction. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. Other alternative modes of transportation could be considered during any future discretionary view of a project. 2. Revision made to increase from two to three required bike spaces. 3. Comment noted.
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> Q: Parking Lot requirements (e.g., Landscaping, Color, Covers): Retain, Remove, or Modify?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard commented: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Recommended considering more detailed requirements on landscaping in parking lots, in particular about separation from buildings, and landscaping in buffers. B. Suggested considering landscape requirements as a way for filtration of stormwater by having plants that have the ability to filter some of the toxins from stormwater and pull some stormwater into groundwater systems, and taking advantage of using bio-swales. C. Recommended stronger permeability requirements for parking lots. D. Supports having shade structures being at least solar ready in parking lots, and also suggested incentives that would look at different levels of landscaping requirements. 2. Chair Smith supports increasing permeability in parking lots. She commented that having shade structures that are solar ready is important. She observed that having more shade structures is somewhat new and anticipates that the community would be interested in the design and the look of those structures. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1A. Comment noted. No change in NZO as this would be Design Review Board consideration. 1B. Comment noted. No change needed. This is already a storm-water management requirement. 1C. Comment noted. No change made. Again, would be a design matter. 1D. Comment noted. Staff researching options to incentivize different types of parking lot landscaping. 2. Comment noted. Design and materials of parking lots and shade

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Vice Chair Miller supports more strengthening on landscape standards rather than allowing structures unless the structures are being used for solar energy. He noted there are lot of shade structures in Phoenix and Las Vegas because the sun is so intense. 4. Commissioner Shelor appreciates standards that address heat island effects. 5. Commissioner Maynard commented that shade structures are a new item in the community and suggested more feedback from the Design Review Board regarding the design aesthetics and requiring shade structures. 	<p>structures would be subject to Design Review by the DRB.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Comment noted. Staff is researching some possible alternatives. 4. Comment noted. 5. Comment noted. As stated above, the design and materials of parking lots and shade structures would be subject to Design Review by the DRB.
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> Q: Are there other Parking and Loading issues to be discussed?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supports language in Section 17.38.030 with regard to meeting existing parking standards for the conversion of residential garages into additional living space for the primary unit. 2. Commissioner Maynard commented that it appears there is a significant reduction in restaurant parking and stated that she would lean towards the restaurant parking standards being closer to the restaurant parking standards in the International Zoning Code. 3. Commissioner Maynard commented that her specific concern was regarding restaurant parking; although she believes the minimum requirement for parking is a little low for offices. She noted that Commissioner Fuller made some good points regarding the standards and growth of the industry and parking requirements. 4. Commission Maynard commented that that she is trying to find a balance with regard to parking because she is supportive of parking reductions for Transportation Demand Management 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. Note however, that pursuant to State law, this provision would not apply to ADUs. 2. Comment noted. Staff to review possible changes to the parking requirement. 3. Comment noted. 4. Comment noted. Staff continues to research creative parking

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>programs, and for additional bike parking, bus passes and commuter passes; however, she hears a lot of concerns regarding limited parking that is available in Old Town and other parts of the City.</p> <p>5. Chair Smith commented that she does not support increases from what is currently required and could potentially support some proposed parking reductions but the scope of the proposed reductions is too large. She believes it is a matter of finding that right balance as a community, and also considering the low income housing issue. She noted there are a lot of unique characteristics of Old Town to consider with regard to parking. She believes the community is still heavily reliant on cars now and things are hopefully starting to change.</p> <p>6. Vice Chair Miller commented that while he supports the concept to incentivize walking and taking alternative modes of transportation, he does not believe there is adequate mass transportation infrastructure currently; and although the community is doing a good job trying to provide it, the City is not close to being an urban area where that options is real.</p>	<p>programs for such areas as Old Town Goleta.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. As stated above, staff continues to research creative parking programs for such areas as Old Town Goleta as well as other areas with higher-density residential development.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p>
<h3>Signs</h3>	
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> NZO will create numerous nonconforming signs in Commercial areas. No comments from the Planning Commission provided on this issue.</p>	<p>No response needed.</p>
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> Q: Any changes to Exempt or Prohibited Signs?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Shelor commented that there are externally sited vending machines located outside of stores that have signage with color and flashing lights, and can be stacked side by side in certain places. In his opinion, these vending machines are as intrusive as similar lighting and signage that would be located inside the business; and would be comparable to window signage and should be considered.</p>	<p>1. No example of outdoor vending machines with flashing lights were found. There are approximately ten “Glacier” water and “Red Box” video vending machines found throughout the City. NZO edits being considered to add signage</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>2. Commissioner Maynard commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Supports prohibiting signs on rooftop structures or mechanical elevator overrides. B. Regulatory signs should be exempt signs. C. Expressed a concern that Open House signs are not directional and seem to sort of clutter the neighborhood without indicating where to go; however, she is not sure whether it can be regulated. D. Supports bringing back a restriction against TVs on gas station pumps, noting this was mentioned in a public comment letter. E. Agreed with the comment from Commission Shelor regarding vending machines with flashing lights and recommended considering restrictions consistent with other signs. F. Supports limiting balloons because they are a huge pollutant going into the ocean. G. Supports the idea of having a separation of fire hydrants and recommended checking with the Fire Department about any other concerns they may have about signage in general. H. The 100-foot square footage maximum for a freestanding sign seems too high and recommended it be substantially reduced. I. Recommended lowering the ten-foot maximum height limit outside of all setbacks in Residential and Mixed-Use Developments because it seems too tall for a residential area (Section 17.40.080.C). J. Noted there was previous discussion with regard to standards for allowing an A-frame sign in front of a flag lot to help direct people to a commercial unit that is tucked away in back. <p>3. Commissioner Shelor agreed with comments by Commission Maynard.</p>	<p>for vending machines to Signs Chapter.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. Signs Chapter to be revised to address such matters as open house signs, gas station pumps, vending machines, balloons, and for signs on flag lots. No change made to 100 sq. ft. maximum area for freestanding signs since all signs require DRB review. No change to §17.40.080(C).</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>
<p><i>Workshop #5</i> Q: Should we keep the Overall Sign Allowance and remove the Sign Types by District?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Maynard commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Recommended allowing some window signs, closer to 10 percent rather than higher. 	<p>1. A. Comment noted. New subsection (G) to be added to Signs Chapter to discuss window signs.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

Additionally, these City Responses are also **draft** at this point and reflect direction City staff is considering. Once the PC Minutes are adopted, staff will move these responses to the Response to PC Comments table. A **final** Response to Planning Commission 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>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>B. Supports keeping sign differentiation between Residential and Commercial Districts because there is such a big difference and it seems like there is something more to protect in Residential Districts. She could support keeping Commercial, Industrial, Business Park, and similar types of signs together.</p> <p>C. Suggested some very specific sign regulations for scenic corridors and noted that scenic corridors have been identified in the General Plan and are already mapped. She commented that sign in the sample photo on the upper right corner on Page 29, entitled Electronic Changeable Copy in the PowerPoint presentation, would seem appropriate for electronic changeable copy, and that changeable copy at a higher height does not make sense in a scenic corridor.</p> <p>D. Supports increasing Overall Sign Allowance for Public and Quasi Public zones to the same level as Commercial zones, noting she would not want to disadvantage Public and Quasi-Public areas in terms of the amount of visibility the get and she wants to support public resources in the community.</p> <p>2. Chair Smith agreed with the comment regarding a 10 percent allowance for window signs. She supports providing clarity and guidance for applicants regarding what information is required and what would assist the decision-makers. Also, additional guidance with regard to signs in the scenic corridors would be appropriate.</p> <p>3. Commissioner Shelor stressed the importance of the pre-application meeting for applicants with staff because it hopefully precludes applicants from overreach on signage at the outset and having to attend multiple reviews with the Design Review Board.</p> <p>4. Commissioner Shelor supports the Design Review Board as the approval body for setting up an Overall Sign Plan and also as the approval body for signs that are not part of an Overall Sign Plan.</p> <p>5. Commissioner Fuller agreed with Commissioner Shelor.</p>	<p>B. Comment noted.</p> <p>C. Comment noted. Scenic corridor protections included in revised Chapter for Visual Resource Preservation.</p> <p>D. Comment noted. Change to be made to increase the allowance to match that of Commercial zones.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. See response above in 1(A-D).</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<h2>Response to Planning Commission Comments</h2>	
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT	CITY STAFF RESPONSE
<p>6. Commissioner Shelor thanked the public for their input and believes it has resulted in an improved process, particularly with signs.</p> <p>7. Vice Chair Miller agreed with the comments from Commissioner Maynard and Commissioner Shelor. He commented that he supports the seven statements in the General Plan and believes the objective standards being considered are in line with the General Plan.</p>	<p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>
<p>Workshop #5</p> <p>Q: Staff has already indicated several revisions are being made based on previous feedback. Are there other changes Planning Commission would like to see?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Fuller supports having one Zoning Clearance Permit for signs as opposed to separate certificates.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Maynard commented that standards regarding drive-through menu signage should be addressed better, and noted there were a few public comments.</p> <p>3. Commissioner Maynard suggested the following with regard to lighting in the Signs Section 17.40.060.L.3:</p> <p>A. Add the opportunity for LED lighting.</p> <p>B. Include the language that the lighting for signage should be fully cut-off, fully-shielded, and downcast.</p> <p>C. Consider turning off additional lighting on signage when the business is closed.</p> <p>D. Potentially include standards for lighting levels at the property line, which are included in the Lighting section.</p> <p>E. If A-frame signs are restricted, recommended allowing an A-frame sign at the end of a flag lot if it does not restrict accessibility on the sidewalk.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. New subsection for menu boards to be added to Signs Chapter.</p> <p>3. A. No change needed, as LED lights are not prohibited. B. Edit made to include full cut-off requirement for lighting. C. No change made. DRB matter. D. No change needed, as Light Trespass already addressed at property line. E. No changes needed.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Height	
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Is there consensus on the new height methodology?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller: Yes 2. Commissioner Maynard: Yes 3. Commissioner Shelor stated he likes the direction but is concerned about the 50% height modification, and noted the measurement appears to be fine. 4. Chair Smith agreed. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No changes needed.</p>
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Any change to the “up to 50%” height Modification?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller commented that there are several examples of 3-story complexes that have been built in the past 15 years that do not conform with the old character of Goleta. He would be comfortable with a 30’ height limit in single-family zones that allows for architectural diversity. He would like to recommend 30’ throughout Goleta as the height limit. 2. Commissioner Shelor believes the community is concerned about building heights. He noted the importance of story poles. He questioned how the height of the building pad fits with the height of the buildings to go on the pad. He is concerned about the build-up of the pad for the building and the potential it could be subject to manipulation. 3. Commissioner Maynard recommended going back to the last version of the zoning ordinance with regard to chimneys and decorative structures, etc., and use the language “20% of base district height” as opposed to “20% of structure” to address her concern about the potential for layering of the exceptions. 4. Commissioner Maynard supports a 30% maximum on Modifications because it involves a high level of review, and not a 50% maximum. She could consider a 20% maximum height. 5. Commissioner Maynard supports referring back to the transitional standards. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. No change made to base Zone District height limits in NZO, which are derived from City’s General Plan. 2. Storypoles have always been able to be required by all Review Authorities. New height methodology is taken from existing grade, not finished grade. 3. No change to “20% of structure” standard. Change made to clarify that no additional projections may be located on a tower feature. 4. Change made to allow up to 20%-30% in residential zones and up to 20% in non-residential zones. 5. Comment noted.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Chair Smith would be open to considering bringing some of the transitional standards into the ordinance. 7. Chair Smith does not support a 50% maximum on Modifications. She noted that 20-30% may be acceptable. She commented that over time as the community builds out and with the continued need to meet RHNA numbers, there may be a need to look at increasing densities in certain areas where some of these Modifications may be appropriate. She does not believe the community would support a 50% height Modification. 8. Commissioner Fuller supports bringing back transitional standards and noted it created a more enjoyable aesthetic for the community. He supports a maximum 20% height Modification. Also, he has concerns with a 35-maximum height and 3 story buildings in neighborhoods. 9. Commissioner Maynard clarified that the letter received from Ken Alker has been shared with the Planning Commissioners and is part of the public record. 10. Commissioner Maynard suggested considering a higher maximum percent increase in height for smaller buildings and a lower maximum percentage increase in height for larger buildings. 11. Chair Smith could support a higher percentage maximum height increase for smaller buildings and looking more closely at the 35-foot standard. 12. Commissioner Fuller suggested going with the 25-foot height limits and 35-foot height limits to be in conformance with the General Plan but limit the modifications to 30% for single-family and 20% for multi-family. 13. Commissioner Maynard commented that the 30% height Modification would require an extra review. 14. Commissioner Shelor expressed concern that the height Modification could result in higher second-story homes than currently exist. 15. Commissioner Fuller commented that he supports giving some flexibility to single-family homeowners with the maximum up to 30% height Modification and noted that an approval would be dependent on the discretion of the reviewing body. 16. Commissioner Maynard requested staff restudy the issue regarding how chimneys are measured. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Section 17.07.050 contains transitional standards for RP, RM and RH districts. 7. Change made to reduce the 50% height Modification to allow up to 20%-30% in residential zones and up to 20% in non-residential zones. 8. Staff will review the issue of transitional standards further and report back at a later Workshop to the PC for additional discussion on this topic. 9. Comment noted. 10. Comment noted. No change made as this would be decided case-by-case by the Review Authority. 11. Comment noted. 12. Change made to reduce the 50% height Modification to allow up to 20%-30% in residential zones. 13. All Modifications require at least a public hearing before the Zoning Administrator, but likely would be the Planning Commission. 14. All Modifications would require Design Review for neighborhood compatibility.
---	---

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>17. After deliberation, the Planning Commissioners summarized that there is an interest in allowing height modifications, not up to 50% as drafted, and possibly somewhere between 20% and 30%.</p>	<p>15. Correct, all Modifications would require a noticed public hearing before the Review Authority. 16. Direction noted. Staff will review how they are measured and report back at a future Workshop. 17. Comment noted. Changes made to reflect the direction of the PC.</p>
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Are there other height issues within this area that need to be discussed? 1. Commissioner Maynard suggested consideration about the height of trees around a property and some factors to think about if considering higher height modifications. 2. Commissioner Shelor requested staff consider what additional structures would be placed on rooftop open space. 3. Commissioner Fuller suggested possibly making a special exception for pre-existing approved Development Plans and exempt them from non-conformance through the ordinance.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted; however, this would be more of a Design Review issue and not a topic for Zoning. 2. Comment noted. No changes needed. 3. Staff will be reviewing options around this issue with the City's Attorney Office.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Floor Area	
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Are there issues within this area that need to be discussed?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Shelor wanted to make sure there are no unintended consequences. 2. Commission Fuller believes the proposed standards are an improvement in measurement and recommended clarification that garage spaces are not habitable space and are separate. 3. Commissioner Fuller commented that the proposed standards are an improvement in measurement and definitions. Also, measuring stair wells and elevator shafts once is appropriate because they are underneath the roof and is used for habitable space. 4. Commissioner Maynard commented that the more consistency with the language used in the California Building Code and the architectural industry would be better rather the creating definitions. 5. Commissioner Fuller stated that his understanding is there are separate codes in other jurisdictions for garages that do not meet standards for habitable space, and garages are not usually considered habitable space in the real estate and architectural industries. He noted that garages may have less protection from the elements and are subject to fumes. 6. Commissioner Maynard initially encouraged garages as habitable space. She later commented that if garages are not counted as habitable space in industry, she could consider counting a converted garage as habitable space; however, it may be challenging if it is not known during construction whether it will be converted. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Edits made to clarify that garage areas are not counted as part of floor area or as habitable space. 3. Comment noted. No changes needed. 4. Comment noted. No changes needed. 5. Garages are not counted as habitable space. The NZO has been revised to clarify that they are also not counted in Floor Area. 6. See response above.
Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges	
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: The NZO carries forward the existing standards. Is this the right approach for fences and walls?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supports a height restriction on the front of the property and a limit of 4 feet within a residential area on the street side of the property. She noted that a light can be shined over 4 feet and that 4 feet can be looked over. Also, a 4-foot height is more welcoming. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Edits made to NZO Section on fences and walls to exempt those that are four feet or less in height within the front and street side setback.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Chair Smith stated she could support an adjustment to the standards with the understanding that existing fences would be non-conforming. 3. Commissioner Fuller supports requiring a counter permit for a fence, wall, or hedge over 3 feet for safety purposes and allowing Public Works the opportunity to review. 4. Commissioner Shelor expressed concern about the potential for 6-foot walls adjoining on adjacent multiple lots in residential areas that would result in the walling off of properties from the public right-of-way. He commented if aesthetics are taken into account, 6 feet may be too tall given the possibility of adjoining lots. He suggested consideration that a tall wall, fence, or hedge might be more appropriate if it is set back from the public right-of-way. 5. Commissioner Fuller commented that he has observed a 6-foot fence along the property line around a front yard and noted it is not a very attractive feature for the neighborhood and would seem to disassociate the property from the community and degrading the aesthetics of the neighborhood. He is not totally in favor of having a lower standard for fencing in the front yard, but he suggested having some communal landscaping in the front yard along with possibly a 3- to 4-foot tall fence at the property line and then also allow a 6-foot fence wall for privacy with a 10-15 foot landscaped setback. He believes the communal landscaping in Goleta adds to the aesthetics in the neighborhood. 6. Commissioner Maynard suggested allowing 4 feet in height for fencing for the front and street side, and 6 to 8 feet in height on the back and internal area between properties without requiring CUPs or excessive permitting. 7. Chair Smith could support at least 4 feet in height for fencing in the front yard when considering safety and the purpose of the fencing. 8. Member Shelor supports at least a 3.5-foot height for fencing in front yards for safety purposes with an additional height in an amount that is appropriate. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Comment noted. 3. Permit required for those over 4 feet, but Vision Clearance is always required regardless. 4. Taller fences, walls, and hedges would be allowable if located outside of all of the required setbacks. 5. Comment noted. 6. Edit to NZO to reduce the permit requirement for a fence or wall over six feet in height and located within a setback. Permit reduced from a Minor CUP to a Land Use Permit (Inland) or Coastal Development Permit (Coastal Zone). 7. Comment noted. 8. Comment noted.
--	--

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Should the NZO introduce standards for hedges that effectively treat them as fences/walls?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard would encourage including hedges as fences but potentially allowing for much a higher height limit in Commercial and Industrial zoning with a minor permit such as a Zoning Clearance, and keeping the hedges at the height of fences in Residential zones. 2. Chair Smith supports in general the direction staff is moving with regard to hedges. She noted there could be creative structures or planting that could create issues. 3. Commissioner Maynard requested clarification with regard to the definition of a hedge and suggested adding cactus. 4. Chair Smith commented that the definition seems to include cactus. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revisions to NZO made to allow hedges to exceed the fence/wall height standards by two feet. 2. Comment noted. 3. Comment noted. No changes made as a cactus could fall within the current definition of “hedge” if planted to form a vegetative wall. 4. Correct. No edits needed.
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller suggested adding a reference to Section 17.03.090 Measuring Height of Fence in this section. 2. Commissioner Fuller recommended adding language to require that slats are placed on the outside of freestanding fences. 3. Commissioner Maynard commented that there should be a consistency between the Inland and Coastal zones with regard to the vision triangle. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. Cross reference added to subsection (A) of this Section. 2. Comment noted. Subsection (C)(4) of this Section clarified to address this comment. 3. Comment noted. No difference exists between Inland and Coastal for this Section of the NZO.
<p>Outdoor Storage</p>	
<p><i>Workshop #7</i> Q: Are the NZO standards for outdoor storage adequate, too strict, or not strict enough?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard requested staff clarify how nurseries and garden centers account for Outdoor Storage and suggested allowing some leniency for nurseries and garden centers. 2. Commissioner Fuller commented that there is ambiguity in the language in Section 17.24.130 Outdoor Storage with regard to Permissibility of Outdoor Storage and also the application of screening to different uses, and requested the language be clarified. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change needed. Nurseries and garden centers would fall into the Use Classification of Outdoor Sales. 2. Edit made to clarify the cited ambiguity that is within the table.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>3. Chair Smith commented that her observation that storage in the front that is adequately screened and gated, and is not bothering anybody, in a residential neighborhood is fairly tolerated. She also commented that the nuisance standards level may be a high threshold to reach.</p>	<p>3. Comment noted.</p>
<p>Workshop #7 Q: Are there other issues within the area of Outdoor Storage that need to be discussed?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard recommended considering restricting the amount of outdoor storage during business hours particularly in terms of preventing sidewalk movement. 2. Commissioner Maynard suggested bringing back some setback standards for outdoor storage, noting there were requirements in Section 17.24.130.B.2 that existed in the previous draft. 3. Commissioner Maynard commented that a 72-hour temporary permit for outdoor storage of PODS would fully address her concerns. She believes there are great options for backyard sheds that will meet aesthetic guidelines. 4. Commissioner Maynard commented that she supports allowing for outdoor storage that is not visible in this section, particularly in the residential areas. 5. Commissioner Maynard commented in support of not limiting storage of construction materials to 72 hours, noting that it can be difficult to store the materials inside a building that is being built. She suggested addressing visibility concerns with screening and noted the use of construction fencing is used as an option at construction sites. 6. Commissioner Maynard suggested language similar to the fence guidelines and deferring to Public Works with regard to visual clearance for items being stored outside. 7. Commissioner Fuller supported not allowing storage in the front yard. He noted people will tend to accumulate items in the backyard and since two-story houses can have a view of backyards, there may be a reason for a complaint from neighbors. He considers this issue as being parallel with the Municipal Code regulations. 8. Chair Smith commented she could support creating some standards in the direction of allowing some flexibility with certain residential space where there is adequate screening and the outdoor storage is not visible and not bothering anyone else; and noted that clarity is important. She noted there is difficulty in addressing nuisances and believes it is important to have other tools as well to address community concerns. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change needed. This type of activity is “Outdoor Sales” and not “Outdoor Storage.” 2. Comment noted. No changes made to reinstate (B)(2) setbacks. 3. Comment noted. No changes needed to 72 hour standard for all outdoor storage, including PODs. 4. Edit made to address the allowable location of outdoor storage. 5. Comment noted. No changes required as construction materials for ongoing projects would not fall into this category. 6. Comment noted. Edit made to address the allowable location of outdoor storage 7. Comment noted. As stated above, edit made to address the allowable location of outdoor storage. 8. No edits made to restriction on what zone districts would allow outdoor storage. Edit made to view

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>9. Commissioner Maynard suggested for consideration allowing for storage of items such as a sculpture garden, art studio or art gallery that might have sculptural pieces located in the back of an art studio, as storage or commercial storage if selling the art pieces.</p> <p>10. Commissioner Shelor recommended considering anything that can be done to make sure that the screening is acceptable and appropriate. He expressed his concern that some chain link fencing with mesh screening has become dilapidated over time, and particularly unattractive when it is located close to a public right-of-way.</p> <p>11. Commissioner Maynard supported allowing chain link fencing with a mesh cover for construction sites.</p>	<p>permanent shipping containers / PODs as accessory structures.</p> <p>9. No edits required. Cited situation would be handled as part of a Home Occupation permit.</p> <p>10. No changes needed. Use of chain-link prohibited in all "R" zones and in non-residential if visible from a public street.</p> <p>11. No change needed. This type of temporary fencing is allow.</p>
<p>Workshop #9</p> <p>1. Commissioner Fuller suggested that the size of PODS would require a permit depending on the size. He stated also that PODS would be more substantial and sturdy than the typical types of storage sheds that can be purchased.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Maynard supports allowing the PODS as temporary storage containment for 72 hours or less.</p> <p>3. Chair Smith supports allowing the PODS as temporary storage for 72 hours or less. She recommended that other types of structures should be allowed, or required, and permitted for permanent storage.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>1. NZO revisions made to propose that large storage containers be permitted as structures.</p> <p>2. No change needed.</p> <p>3. No change needed.</p>
<p>Open Space</p>	
<p>Workshop #7</p> <p>Q: Should area requirements be adjusted?</p> <p>Chair Smith supported the direction the requirements are moving.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No changes needed.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>Workshop #7 Q: Should staff revise the NZO to clarify “Open Space” to distinguish between the following three types? A. Public Open Space, B. {Private} Restricted Open Space, C. {Private} Common Open Space</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chair Smith supported the staff proposal regarding clarification of the language and stated she shares Commissioner Maynard’s concerns regarding how common open space is defined. Commissioner Maynard supported the direction the requirements are moving with regard to usable space. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Comment noted.
<p>Workshop #7 Q: Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner Maynard commented that it is important for employees and visitors to have an area for breaks and lunch, and for visitors, and noted lot coverage requirements were removed from commercial sections, and landscaping was removed or reduced, from the previous requirements. She noted that lot coverage requirements were removed from commercial sections and minimum landscaping requirements were eliminated or substantially reduced in most of the commercial sections from the previous ordinance, and would like to go back to consider the first requirements in the previous zoning ordinance. Commissioner Fuller suggested the language “private area amenity” and “common area amenity” for clarification, noting these terms are used by homeowners associations. He recommended increasing the amount of private area open space for units and not reducing it. He supported the idea of the open space being usable with minimum widths and horizontal standards. Commissioner Maynard stated she does not support the following: including rooftop decks in the required open space, including buildings in open space, and using the language “amenity.” Commissioner Maynard supported the language presented in the staff report and requiring open space to be contiguous with the project. Commissioner Shelor supported requiring private open space for both condominiums and apartments. He commented that open space is a benefit to residents and guests more than just usable space, and landscaping provides a sense of openness. Also, he noted that more open space equals less footprint for buildable space which would be potentially fewer units unless there is an 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. No change made. Lot coverage and landscaping standards in commercial zones is located in Table 17.08.030. Edits to NZO to distinguish between public and private open space, but without using term “amenity,” which was not generally supported. With regard to the amount of private open space per dwelling unit, staff is exploring options on the appropriate edits. Rooftop decks and buildings are not included as “open space” areas. The term “amenity” is also not used in the NZO. Comments noted. Staff will continue to look for examples of open space options to present to the Commission at a future Workshop discussing Open Space.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>increase in building heights. Commissioner Shelor questioned whether there are calculations that show it is achievable to fit increased usable space requirements, parking setbacks, and maximum height requirements on a project site with 20 units per acre.</p> <p>5. Commissioner Fuller supported the approach for minimum standards for private area and common open space amenities and stated he does not believe the current requirements should be lowered. He supported flexibility as long as the standards are met and noted that the developer is working with conditions that are related to and depends on the specific site.</p> <p>6. Additional discussion was requested by the Planning Commission regarding substantial changes to maximum lot coverage, minimum common open space, and landscaping requirements for commercial districts. Commissioner Maynard requested further discussion of commercial open space.</p>	<p>5. Comments noted. As noted above, staff will continue to look for examples of open space options to present to the Commission at a future Workshop discussion on Open Space area.</p> <p>6. Request noted. Staff will research these issue areas further and will report back to the Commission at a future Workshop.</p>
<p>Lighting</p>	
<p>Workshop #7 Q: Any comments or input on string-lights?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Maynard supported the prohibition of unshielded string-lights outside of the holidays in Section 17.35.030.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Fuller recommended string-lights should meet the same standards of any other lighting that includes complete shielding and no light trespass. He suggestion making an exception for lighting with very low wattage.</p> <p>3. Chair Smith commented that a narrow exemption on string-lights could be appropriate.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Section on temporary Seasonal Lights added to NZO to allow them to be installed and operated for the time period commencing 30 days prior to the festivity or holiday and extending no later than 30 days afterwards, provided that no individual light or lamp exceeds ten watts and 70 lumens.</p>
<p>Workshop #7 Q: Staff has already indicated several revisions are being made based on previous feedback, but are there other changes Planning Commission would like to see?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Shelor suggested staff consider language that would allow for an exception for flexibility for up-lighting if the applicant can prove that the lighting will be appropriate and acceptable.</p>	<p>1. No changes made. Uplighting prohibited by General Plan policy VH 4.12.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. No changes made to NZO, which does not exempt</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Commissioner Maynard recommended additional consideration regarding whether the City should have exemptions and thinking about where the City needs to have exceptions rather than creating a broad exemption for all City facilities. She recommended City street lights should be fully shielded and cut-off, and approximately 3,000 kelvin. 3. Commissioner Maynard suggested considering bringing back the following sections that were eliminated from the previous zoning code: 1) Section 17.35.030 that prohibited landscape lighting other than low-voltage accent lighting (because there could be more landscape lighting); and 2) Section 17.35.040 which was a height limitation off of the roof which was also eliminated. 4. Commissioner Maynard recommended that it is important to include language where possible for lighting that is fully shielded, fully cut-off, and at the minimum intensity needed for the purpose. 5. Commissioner Maynard recommended referring to the International Dark-Sky Association for guidance for recreation field lighting standards, noting there may be a need for more specific guidelines for unique situation of recreational fields in addition to the lighting trespass guidelines. 6. Commissioner Maynard suggested considering guidelines regarding the amount of illumination on car lots at night when closed, and noted her concerns including the extreme brightness late at night, the amount of usage of electricity, and the effect on the night sky. 7. Commissioner Fuller commented that hopefully car lots will not require as much lighting when closed. He agreed with Commissioner Maynard’s comment regarding the amount of illumination on car lots. 8. Commissioner Maynard supported considering the language in the model ordinance provided by Commissioner Shelor, or refer back to the previous draft with regard to gas stations. 9. Commissioner Maynard recommended limiting the number of consecutive renewals of temporary lighting in Section 17.35.020. 10. Commissioner Shelor requested consideration of adding flexibility to the language with regard to the light temperatures and other lighting standards to keep up with the new technology involved. 11. Commissioner Fuller stated that his preference for the lighting temperature standards is 3500 to 4000 kelvin as an appropriate level. 12. Chair Smith generally supported Planning Commissioners’ comments to consider the model language with regard to lighting. 	<p>ALL lighting for City facilities, just those required by ordinance or law. Staff will also recommend deleting the 3,000 Kelvin standard and allowing Design Review to determine the appropriate color.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Comment noted. These sections were not added back in to the NZO. 4. Comment noted. Edit made to include these measures. 5. Comment noted. No edits necessary beyond those made to include “full cutoff” lighting. 6. Auto sales lots would be subject to subsection 17.35.050(D), Exterior Display/Sales Areas, which regulates the night lighting. 7. Comment noted. See response above. 8. Edit made to require gas stations to comply with all general lighting standards in Section 17.35.040. 9. Comment noted. No change made as this would be at the discretion of the Director. 10. Comment noted. 11. Comment noted. 12. Comment noted.
---	--

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Trailers and RV Parking/Storage	
<p><i>Workshop #8</i></p> <p>Q: Allow parking <u>all</u> setbacks? (Note: Goleta Municipal Code consistency).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard stated she believes it is important to allow RV parking in the front setback as long as it is not blocking the sidewalk or the ability to walk up and down the sidewalk or bike paths. She noted that the front setback is where vehicles park throughout the Goleta region. And, no need to single out RVs and not any other vehicles. 2. Commissioner Fuller commented that the current proposal is to allow for parking of trailers and RVs in the setbacks with some provisions. 3. Chair Smith commented that all of the information presented this evening has provided a better understanding of the history of regulations and the current status quo; and also helps to understand the community expectations and the difficulty the residents have in terms of finding other places to store RVs. She stated that comments have been received by email expressing concerns and noted that the concerns included parking impacts to accommodate a RV due to the garage being used for storage and not to park cars. 4. Chair Smith stated that she is open to reconsider allowance for parking trailers and RVs in the front setback and noted she believes access to the sidewalks is important. With regard to allowance for parking in side setbacks, Chair Smith commented that issues could be raised with regard to having a sense of privacy and views that may be somewhat difficult to address as there are different sizes of RVs, as well as different lots sizes and structures. She noted with regard to privacy issues a concern may be if someone was living in the RV and can see into a neighbor's house, and that a vehicle that is just being stored may not trigger the privacy issues. 5. Commissioner Maynard spoke in support for parking in both side and back setbacks. She noted there is a lot more ability to provide screening in back yards which addresses some of the concerns. 6. Commissioner Fuller spoke in support for parking in all setbacks with certain common sense regulations. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised to allow parking within all setbacks, but require that no impediment to pedestrian access or the road right-of-way may occur.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>Workshop #8</p> <p>Q: Require current registration with DMV?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair Smith spoke in support for requiring current registration with the DMV and requested that staff clarify the different types of storage and situations that do not require DMV registration. 2. Commissioner Maynard agreed with requiring current registration with the DMV and also requested staff to research DMV regulations and provide clarifying language with regard to vehicle registration regulations that apply including operable and being capable of operation. 3. Commissioner Fuller agreed with comments from Chair Smith and Commissioner Maynard. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised to require those types of RVs/trailers that are licensed by the State DMV to have a current registration, including “Non-Op” registration.</p>
<p>Workshop #8</p> <p>Q: Allowance for RV on-site use for 14 days or less? (Note: Goleta Municipal Code consistency).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller spoke in support for allowance for RV on-site use for 14 days or less, and noted the Goleta Municipal Code should be followed regarding this item, in his opinion. 2. Commissioner Maynard supported the allowance for RV on site use for 14 days or less and recommended retaining the language for not allowing RVs to be occupied as a living residence. Commissioner Maynard commented that she would be interested to learn about possible new housing laws being considered by other cities, or the State of California, with regard to allowing RVs as small homes in response to the affordable housing situation, and requested staff follow the status of current State legislation. 3. Chair Smith commented she believes the allowance for RV on-site use for 14 days or less is reasonable and should stay consistent with the Goleta Municipal Code. She commented that this would prevent a potential nuisance situation when there is a permanent living situation and other disruptions that are not appropriate under the City’s current regulations, and noted that parking a RV in the side yard may present the potential for a problem. Chair Smith noted she is hearing from the audience that members of the community have been working well with their neighbors and also there is a nuisance code if there is a problem. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised to require that the trailer or RV not be occupied for living purposes on a site longer than 14 days in a six-month period, except as authorized in declared emergencies.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>Workshop #8 Q: Require parking on paved surface? (Note: Goleta Municipal Code consistency).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard recommended requiring parking on a paved surface in the front setback but not necessarily requiring parking on a paved surface in the side and back. Commissioner Maynard recommended staff explore and encourage the City Council to consider turf block, pavers, gravel and other alternatives that may be appropriate as a base for parking. 2. Chair Smith supported the recommendations by Commissioner Maynard with regard to requiring parking on paved surface. 3. Commissioner Maynard supported a suggestion by J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner, to explore for further discussion the option to address the gravel distinction in the glossary. 4. Commissioner Fuller encouraged the public to continue participation in the New Zoning Ordinance process and suggested they may want to express their points with the City Council as well as express support for Planning Commission recommendations. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised to require that all areas on which parking or loading occurs, including both required and additional parking, must be paved with a minimum of two inches of 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.</p>
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Require owners to live on site?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supported requiring owners of the trailer or RV to live on site and requested staff to clarify that it is the owner of the trailer or RV that must live on site. 2. Commissioner Fuller agreed that the owner of the trailer or RV must live on site. 3. Chair Smith supported requiring owners of the trailer or RV to live on site. She commented that if there is an occasional issue or concern that may arise there should be an owner on site for the City to contact. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised to require that the owner of the RV or trailer reside on the same lot where it is being parked/stored.</p>
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Require parking to be perpendicular to road?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard stated that she would not support adding this requirement. If the proposed requirement is added, she recommended it would not apply to vehicles that are lower in height and with height below a fence or hedge line but to taller RVs. Also, Commissioner Maynard suggested considering the size equity between different types of vehicle, for example a SUV and RV. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will not be proposing revisions that require parking or RVs</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Commissioner Fuller commented that he had proposed requiring parking of RVs to be perpendicular to address the impact of views of the house; however, he would not necessarily need to support this requirement. 3. Chair Smith commented that it would not make sense for smaller vehicles and trailers, and it would depend on the size of the property and the particular driveway. She noted she has not heard that perpendicular parking is a particular concern or problem and suggested, if considered, it would need to be narrowly applied. 	<p>and trailers to be perpendicular to the road.</p>
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Any other issues?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller commented that he does not see why curb cuts would be a requirement and suggested it be deferred to Public Works if there are safety concerns. 2. Commissioner Maynard suggested that that Section 17.38.070 (E) be removed because it is restrictive and she believes if this section is not removed, additional curb cuts would need to be allowed by the City for more access so people can achieve that development standard. Commissioner Maynard expressed concern that there may need to be more leniency by Public Works with allowing curb cuts and noted the feedback from tonight's indicates there has not been a problem in the past for those that "jump" the curb. 3. Chair Smith agreed with the above comments from Commissioner Maynard regarding curb cuts. 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>All provisions around curb cuts will be removed from the NZO as the curb facilities are within the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department and not a zoning issue.</p>
<p>Day Care Facilities</p>	
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Allow Day Care Facilities without a CUP in certain Commercial Zones?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller supports these facilities being allowed in certain Commercial Zones without a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). 2. Commissioner Maynard recommended that Goleta Old Town (OT) is an appropriate place for day care centers, noting it is family centric and there is a need for day care facilities. She commented she is open to including the Community Commercial (CC) and General Commercial (CG) uses as 	<p>All comments noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>well, and expressed concern regarding the Intersection or Highway Commercial (CI) use because lots of children around major intersections seems problematic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Commissioner Maynard supported keeping Regional Commercial (CR) and CI at least requiring a Minor CUP, and possibly a Major CUP; and in the CU zone; and recommended moving CC, OT, and CG to “P” (Permitted). 4. Commissioner Fuller supported the analysis and recommendation by Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner. 5. Chair Smith generally supported the recommendations by staff, and questioned whether the Service Industrial (IS) and General Industrial (IG) zones are appropriate even though consistent with the General Plan. 6. Commissioner Maynard recommended not allowing day care facilities in IG at all, and moving to Major CUP for IS; and stated that at the minimum she would like Major CUP for IS and IG for day care facilities. Commissioner Maynard stated that she appreciates the need to have more day care facilities in the community but noted she believes in the basis of zoning to separate sensitive receptors from potential hazards, not just when in normal facilities but also during emergencies and major disasters. 7. Commissioner Fuller supported designating Permitted “P” for Business Park (BP) and Office Institutional (OI) zones. He commented that it may be valuable to have day care facilities in areas where people work as it would alleviate people needing to drive further to day care facilities. Also, he believes that specific safety concerns regarding a facility would be addressed. 8. Chair Smith indicated support for the staff recommendation that IS and IG require a Major CUP. 9. Commissioner Maynard indicated that she was open to dropping BP and OI to Permitted “P” since it is more of a support service. 10. Chair Smith reiterated support for staff’s recommendation and also that she supported designating Permitted “P” for BP and commented that it is worth considering changing the allowance to Permitted “P” for the OI zone. 	<p>Revisions to the NZO will be made to allow these facilities with a LUP/CDP within the CG, OT, and CC zones instead of a CUP.</p> <p>Additionally, they would be allowed in the CR, VS, and CI with a Minor CUP.</p> <p>Within the IS and IG, a Major CUP would still be needed.</p>
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Reduce Major CUPs for Day Care to Minor CUPs?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supported the staff recommendation not to allow Large Family Day Care Facilities or Day Care Facilities, but to allow Small Family Day Care in Agricultural (AG) zones. 	<p>Comments noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Commissioner Fuller agreed with Commissioner Maynard’s support of the staff recommendation. 3. Chair Smith agreed with Commissioner Maynard’s support of the staff recommendation. 	<p>Revision made to allow Small Family Day Care in the AG Zone District.</p>
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Remove Land Use Permit requirement for Large Family Day Care?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller supported, with the understanding that the Large Family Day Care is regulated by the State of California, removing the requirement for a permit in Residential zones. 2. Commissioner Maynard stated that she would support the potential revisions 1, 2, and 3 in NZO Section 17.41.130 with regard to parking regulations, and would like to see additional parking requirements in consideration of the off-loading. 3. Commissioner Maynard spoke in support of moving towards a Zoning Clearance with some additional parking requirements. 4. Chair Smith noted the distinction would be if there is no permit, the parking would be a code enforcement matter. 5. Commissioner Fuller commented although concern with parking is valid, adding an additional parking space on a small property may negate the ability for some applicants to conduct day at the home. 6. Chair Smith stated that she generally supports the Zoning Clearance, and noted she has heard from the community that there is a real need for child care in the community and the City needs to look at ways to promote them. 7. Commissioner Fuller supported the Zoning Clearance and the standards for dropping off and access to the property. 8. Commissioner Maynard commented that she could support the Zoning Clearance with staff making recommendations on how to add some flexibility, possibly as a type of transportation demand management program or guidelines for parents to follow. 9. After staff provided information regarding how parking requirements are reviewed by the Business License permit process along with the Planning Department, Commissioner Maynard spoke in support of the staff recommendation, along with reference to the Business License permit process rather than requiring the Zoning Clearance. She also recommended that staff address the loading 	<p>All comments noted.</p> <p>The NZO will be revised to defer to the State for the licensing and permitting on Large Family Day Care facilities without the need for a local zoning permit within Residential Zone Districts.</p> <p>However, Chapter 17.41, Standards for Specific Uses and Activities, will maintain a Section for these types of facilities to ensure that such standards like Parking and Loading, On-site residency, Licensing, etc. are maintained.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>and unloading requirements for the Day Care Facilities and possibly align these closer to the Large Family Day Care standards.</p> <p>10. After further discussion, Chair Smith spoke in support of the staff proposal, along with reference to the Business License permit process rather than the Zoning Clearance.</p> <p>11. Chair Smith also commented that she would be open to addressing loading and unloading and parking requirements for the Day Care Facilities as part of the Business License process.</p> <p>12. Commissioner Maynard indicated that loading and unloading standards for Day Care Facility should be aligned with those for Large Family day Care.</p> <p>13. Commissioner Fuller commented that the current proposed language in the New Zoning Ordinance presumes that the curbside is adequate for loading and unloading.</p>	
<p>Workshop #8</p> <p>Q: Are there any other issues within this topic that need to be discussed?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Maynard questioned the rationale for Large Family Day Care only being allowed in Residential zones, and noted there was discussion about bringing more day care closer to where parents are working.</p> <p>2. Chair Smith stated that comments received in this section have raised some interesting questions about how all of the policies might impact child care issues. She noted that issues such as incentives are more of a discussion worthy for the City Council to consider.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Note: Large family day care by definition is accessory to a residential use.</p>
<p>Residential Setbacks</p>	
<p>Workshop #8</p> <p>Q: Add back 20' front setback in RP?</p> <p>1. Commissioner Fuller commented in regard to Planned Residential (RP), when a planned unit development comes up to a public street, especially a frontage, the development should be 20 feet off of the public street, but if there are internal private streets in a development, no setback standards. He noted if the development has a side that is on a public street, the side setback should be applied.</p>	<p>All comments noted.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Chair Smith questioned whether the entire elimination would be supported by the community and suggested looking for a more flexible standard. 3. Commissioner Maynard noted she would advocate for a 20-foot setback for RP from the front of the overall development and allowing more flexibility within the development. 4. Commissioner Maynard requested further discussion when appropriate at a future workshop with regard to commercial setbacks with regard to Section 17.08.030, Commercial Districts, and Section 17.24.120, Mixed-Use Development. She noted her concerns in 17.24.120 included the minimum setback requirement seemed low, and there is no language about setbacks. 5. Commissioner Fuller recommended discussing commercial setbacks when discussion commercial issues. 6. Chair Smith commented the intent of this zone is to allow flexibility, but she is not certain that a '0' setback is appropriate. 7. After hearing from staff, Chair Smith commented that she could be comfortable with setbacks being adjusted through the Development Plan process as a way to address her concern about allowing flexibility for projects in the RP zone. 8. Commissioner Fuller commented that he would support a 20-foot setback off a public road for buildings in a planned unit development. 9. Commissioner Fuller also spoke in support of keeping the backyard setbacks the same whether or not the backyard backs up to open space. 10. Commissioner Maynard supported Commissioner Fuller's comment to keep the rear yard setbacks the same whether or not the rear yard backs up to open space. 11. Chair Smith commented that she is not certain to support Commission Fuller's comment in support of keeping the rear yard setbacks the same whether or not the backyard backs up to open space, but the point is taken. 	<p>The 20-foot setback for the "RP" zone district will be reinstated within the revised Draft NZO.</p> <p>No change made to subsection 17.07.030(D), which allows a rear setback (of more than 15 feet) to be reduced to 15 feet if the rear setback abuts a permanently dedicated public open space or a street to which access has been denied as part of an approved subdivision or other approved permit.</p>
<p>Workshop #8 Q: Are there any other issues within this topic that need to be discussed? None.</p>	<p>No response needed.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

General Response to Public Comments	
<p><i>Workshop #9</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supports designating general commercial districts for RV storage lots and making the necessary adjustments for vehicle storage. She is not quite sure if vehicle storage is appropriate in business park districts. She supports having less restrictions regarding pad surfaces, and more variety for the materials, especially for smaller items being stored. 2. Chair Smith commented regarding a comment from Dr. Ingeborg Cox by noting that there is a district for common open space that is distinct from the concept of common open space standards that may be provided as part of a multi-unit development. 3. Commissioner Fuller commented that he highly recommends requiring a rear yard setback on open space. 4. Commissioner Fuller commented that he believes it is fair and equitable to allow projects that are substantially completed or that are submitted and complete under a certain zoning ordinance to continue under that ordinance, considering how long it takes for a project to get approvals. 5. Commissioner Maynard commented that it seems fair that the Planning Commission or City Council could use the flexibility of the earlier zoning ordinance when reviewing a project for consistency with the General Plan. She supports language that requires that the applicant has submitted a complete application to quality to use the flexibility of the earlier zoning ordinance and would support vesting with a completed application. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. No response needed. 2. No response needed. 3. Comment noted. No change made. 4. Comment noted. The Vesting section of the NZO has been expanded and clarified to address the matters around projects within the permit path already. (See §17.01.040(E)). 5. Comment noted. As stated above, the Vesting section of the NZO has been expanded and clarified to address the matters around projects within the permit path already.
<p><i>Workshop #9</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supports allowing RV storage in the Community Commercial district based on the need, and not allowing personal storage. 2. Generally, she would like to see Community Commercial districts more engaging and with more storefronts rather than a lot of storage spaces. She supports allowing RV storage in General Commercial districts. 3. Commissioner Maynard commented that there has been much discussion with regard to ADUs and she is reticent to make changes at this time. She noted that very good points were made regarding ADUs by the public comment. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No changes made. 2. Comments noted. No changes made. 3. Comment noted. No substantive changes to ADU standards will be made in the Revised draft NZO.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>4. Commissioner Fuller supports keeping vehicle such as RVs, motorcycles, and trailers as a separate class for storage and not as a part of Outdoor Storage which should include machinery, engines, equipment, building materials, etc. He supports finding more places for vehicle storage that would not reduce the required parking or encroach into open spaces.</p>	<p>4. Comment noted. No changes made to create a new type of storage class for different types of machines and equipment.</p>
<p><i>Workshop #9</i></p> <p>1. Commissioner Maynard recommended requiring compost containers to be available at Multi-unit Dwellings in Section 17.24.140.B.1.a.ii Recycling and Waste Storage Areas because new state legislation was passed to encourage cities to increase composting percentages to 75 percent. She believes this is the appropriate time help meet the State goals and consider the limits of the local landfill.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Fuller commented that he just received a notice that Marborg Industries is creating a very large facility that will separate out compostable items as well as all other forms of recycling that will bring the recycling percent up to 85 percent and he noted it is moving in the direction of addressing the state legislation requirements. He was not sure whether we needed to add a requirement on site. He commented also that green bins are used for residents to separate yard waste.</p> <p>3. Commissioner Maynard commented that she believes the separation of compostable materials at the facility is very good but it does not negate the value of separating the composting materials at the dwelling units because this maintains the quality of the materials being recycled and reduces the overall costs of the recycling system.</p> <p>4. Commissioner Maynard recommended making sure that each of the Native American tribes are aware of the Cultural Resources section and has looked over this section; and requested verification by staff.</p> <p>5. Commissioner Maynard recommended additional language be added to Chapter 17.43.030 Cultural Resources Application Requirements to require during each stage of the cultural resources review that if any artifact at any level of significance is found there would also be consultation with the Native American community regarding what would be done with that item.</p>	<p>1. Edits made to this subsection of the NZO to better align with terminology of State programs and for multi-family to have green waste containers as well.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. No additional changes needed.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. Tribe notification will be made as part of both the NZO and the ongoing efforts for the new Historic Preservation Ordinance.</p> <p>5. Edit made to remove exception for previously disturbed ground.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>She believes this is important and in line with the recent legislation that has been passed about repatriation of Native American artifacts back to the Native American community.</p> <p>6. Commissioner Maynard suggested for consideration along with the Historic and Cultural Resources Ordinance ways that could go beyond the CEQA process with regard to Cultural Resources. She suggested considering increased Native American monitoring including previously disturbed spaces.</p> <p>7. Chair Smith suggested staff consider the status of the process for ADU applications and check if any adjustments could be made in terms of the NZO based on feedback and objective data that is available.</p> <p>8. Chair Smith supports some way to timely address inclusionary housing in the NZO process.</p> <p>9. Commissioner Maynard supports Chair Smith’s comments regarding housing.</p>	<p>6. Comment noted. No additional changes made.</p> <p>7. Comment noted. No additional changes made.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p>
<p>Setbacks in Non-Residential Zones</p>	
<p><i>Workshop #9</i></p> <p>1. Commissioner Fuller supports having upper stories stepped back on second stories for residential units where there are zero lot line situations in non-residential zones. He noted it is not comfortable for residents to have their windows exactly above the sidewalk when there are people walking below. He noted a potted plant could fall from a second-story window onto the sidewalk. He would support not stepping back when there is a setback that is, for example, 20 feet.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Maynard commented that the minimum setback for mixed-use should be based on the first-floor use of the mixed use. She suggested a minimum setback of 5 feet rather than 3 feet which seems random as everything else is in measurements of 5 feet. Also, she does not see the rationale for having the setback on the second floor.</p> <p>3. Commissioner Shelor questioned what was envisioned for a 3-foot setback and suggested a lot more could be done with a 5-foot setback, for example, adding landscaping.</p> <p>4. Chair Smith commented in the terms of setbacks, that after having heard more background and information with regard to the philosophical approaches of the two drafts, the 2019 draft makes sense overall.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. No changes made with respect to Old Town (which was the cited example).</p> <p>2. Edit made to increase setback from 3 to 5 feet.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. See response above.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. No edits needed.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Transitional Standards	
Workshop #9	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Shelor commented that he believes when there are transitional zones it is not ideal for residential homes to be overpowered by other buildings and that it was not originally envisioned and may need to be reconsidered. He commented that the idea of setbacks and stepping back in tandem makes sense; however, when considering this along with density issues, the issue of more height will also need to be considered. He believes it is achievable but needs to be done strategically so it is done in the right places where height can be accommodated and it is not destroying views. 2. Commissioner Maynard commented that she still sees the value of the Transitional Standards because it helps with neighborhood compatibility to have some transition between the areas. If forty feet is too long to require for the setback, she suggested considering a shorter distance. 3. Commissioner Fuller stated in general he supports the 2019 Transitional Standards. He echoed Commissioner Maynard’s comments and believes the RM, RP and RH Districts not have a 25-foot height limit and there will not be the probability of three-story buildings. 4. Commissioner Maynard supports the direction to not require the mobile home parks to be set back a further distance than the setback requirement for single-family residences. 5. Commercial Maynard supports the inclusion of the requirement for a 50-foot rear setback in the IS and IG Districts if abutting residential districts, given the additional risks that come up with industrial uses. She noted the picture for this item is appreciated. 6. Chair Smith commented that generally it is helpful to hear the background and an overview of this topic and believes the Transitional Standards are moving in the right directions. Chair Smith could consider adding back in the 50-foot rear setback requirement in the IS and IG Districts, noting protection from the industrial districts would make sense. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted. Such projects would be subject to Design Review Board and a discretionary review of the overall project before the Planning Commission and/or City Council. 2. Comment noted. 3. Comment noted. Height allowances controlled by the General Plan, with options for increase through a Development Plan or Modification. 4. Comment noted. 5. Comment noted. Staff will review Transitional standard from “R” zone to see if it should be revised to be 50 feet and from “C” zone 25 feet. 6. Comment noted. Any associated edit for this standard would be place in §17.10.030(B).
Mobile Vendors	
Workshop #9	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Maynard supports possibly requiring a business license or Temporary Use Permit in most cases for mobile vendors, and she is leaning towards a business license since that is what is 	All comments noted.

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>required in the right-of-way; and then only requiring a minor CUP if there are three or more vendors. She is more concerned about how many mobile vendors are in an area, rather than how often they are there, as it can create traffic and parking issues. She is concerned about how late at night the mobile vendors would be operating, and recommended that a minor CUP may be needed, depending on the location. She is more concerned about how late the vendor is operating than the number of hours the vendor is operating. She also requested clarification with regard to the meaning of “hours of operation”.</p> <p>2. Commissioner Maynard suggested that reasons for exemptions, or for a lower level of approval, could include a birthday party or an internal event for employees that would not cause additional traffic or a program for the distribution of free food. She recommended some equity and a balance between the standards for mobile vendors on the right-of-way vs. on private property. She expressed concern that significant requirements for private property may push the mobile vendors onto the right-of-way rather than a large parking lot where there is more space.</p> <p>3. Chair Smith commented that she likes the general direction of the draft ordinance. She recommended further staff exploration with regard to the regulations, including to address potential impacts such as fire safety, emergency access, and accessibility to parking. She recommended for exemption consideration regarding a one-time use within a certain period of time and suggested maybe some narrow exemptions such as a food truck at a birthday party. Her concerns include the massing of a number of mobile vendors as well as the cumulative impacts when there are multiple single events in a neighborhood at the same time. She thinks that the section regarding event permitting might address some of her concerns. Chair Smith senses that the community enjoys one-time uses on private property. She commented that she has not heard that mobile vendors have been an issue and she does not want it to become a major issue because of massing. She noted for consideration that there would be state law governing the public right-of-way.</p> <p>4. Commissioner Shelor recommended that it would seem appropriate to use caution with regard to mobile vendors.</p>	<p>The entire NZO section on Mobile Vendors will be restudied and revised as needed, pursuant to the direction given to staff.</p> <p>Specific development standards will be developed that would exempt most types of smaller mobile vending occurrences. Those that are not exempt would require approval of a Temporary Use Permit.</p> <p>In all instances, a Health Permit and a Business License would be required prior to operation within the City.</p> <p>Note: This Section would only apply to mobile vending on private property, since recent changes to State law govern vending in public areas and roadways.</p>
--	---

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Commercial Open Space	
<p><i>Workshop #9</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller commented that there will be setbacks in some of these zones that are going to be landscaped setbacks and will provide an aesthetic contribution to the area as well as provide open space in a context of an unused area. He noted that the open space may not be useable, common or private open space, and suggested there may need to be a fourth definition of open space such as including landscaped areas. He noted that landscaped areas have been included as part of the definition of the old open space types. Commissioner Fuller commented that a retail business is not a typical place where people would congregate or expect useable amenities unless it was wanted by the business. He noted there may be workers who would want useable amenities. Commissioner Fuller commented that he is not sure whether there needs to be a requirement for useable open space or common open space except maybe in the context of how it is ancillary to the tenants and the employees. 2. Commissioner Maynard believes there is value in providing open space for employees to use and stated it is consistent with a goal of the General Plan to create an open feel to the community where there is a reduced bulk and an opportunity for outdoor spaces for gatherings throughout all the different regions. She is most overall concerned regarding a significant reduction in landscaping, limitations to lot coverage, and not requiring open space in most of the commercial districts because it creates a dense bulky space and does not allow for outdoor gathering spaces throughout the community; and stated she would like to see more standards brought back. 3. Commissioner Shelor expressed gratitude for Commissioner’s Maynard’s comments linking open space, landscaping, and lot coverage and the impacts of the combined standards. 4. Chair Smith noted a potential in business parks for some limited requirement for open space. She expressed a desire to know what other communities in the region do. 5. Commissioner Maynard supported some amount of common open space for business parks. 6. Commissioner Fuller noted Resolution 03-20 and expressed concern with adding standards that may create nonconforming properties. 	<p>All comment noted.</p> <p>No changes to require Commercial Open Space for new development.</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

Lot Coverage & Landscaping	
<i>Workshop #9</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioner Fuller commented that there is no specific maximum lot coverage requirement but there are variable design standards that will determine the project’s lot coverage as well as setbacks, height, parking ratios that will impact an applicant’s ability to design the site. 2. Commissioner Maynard expressed concern about reduction in lot coverage requirements in commercial districts from the 2015 draft version. She commented that it is unclear to her how the overall lot coverage would be affected when only relying on other standards and without relying on the lot coverage standards proposed in the 2015 draft. She expressed concern about the landscape requirements and common open space considerations overlapping. She also expressed concern regarding the removal of landscaping requirements for commercial districts and the reduction in landscape requirements in commercial districts from the 2015 draft. She mentioned that General Plan Policy VH 4.7.C calls out that office buildings, business parks, institutional public and quasi-public uses should provide plazas, courtyards and landscaped open space to create a campus-like setting and encourage pedestrian access. She commented that not having common open space requirements for office and business parks seems inconsistent. She recommended for clarity that the language, at least for the office and business park districts, indicates there must be open space for consistency with the General Plan. 3. Commissioner Shelor supports having the Design Review Board, in most cases, start with an existing minimum standard then use their discretion to potentially require more rather than have no minimum requirements and have the Design Review Board make the requirement for more. 4. Commissioner Fuller commented that it is questionable with no minimum landscaping requirements in some districts whether landscaping can be eliminated. He noted that most properties will have setbacks and they will likely be required to have landscaping or hardscaped as required by DRB. 5. Commissioner Maynard commented that she has seen projects with inadequate landscaping in commercial districts and on industrial sites; and she believes a modest amount of a landscaping requirement would help this to be addressed. She commented it is not clear how this would affect 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. Correct, many of the other development regulations would effectively limit the amount of possible Lot Coverage. 2. The 2015 draft did not have discretionary review of Development Plans, which have been reinstated in the 2019 draft. As such, the prior draft required many more “paint by number” standards since development was generally permitted outright. Office and Business Park have max. lot coverages of 40% and 35%, respectively. No change needed. 3. Comment noted. No changes made. 4. Required landscaping for Parking and Loading areas discussed in Chapter 17.38. Additionally, the DRB will require landscaping plans for all new development. 5. Comment noted. No changes made. Additionally, those cited

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>overall lot coverage. She noted there are projects on Calle Real and in the Camino Real Marketplace in commercial districts, as well as projects in the industrial districts, that have very little landscaping. She believes this can be addressed by a minimal landscaping requirement for the commercial districts.</p> <p>6. Chair Smith appreciates staff’s comments with regard to balancing the standards and permitting, and how it fits together. She shares some of the Commissioners’ concerns regarding landscaping requirements and suggested staff revisit and consider where there are no minimum requirements. Chair Smith noted while it is helpful to allow the Design Review Board some artistic flexibility it can be helpful to have some minimum landscaping requirements in the appropriate situation.</p> <p>7. Commissioner Fuller suggested if front setbacks are not large enough for commercial districts, maybe there should be larger setbacks, and noted it would result in more landscaping. He believes the landscaping standards for the industrial areas are sufficient and follow the current standards so non-conforming properties are not being created. He commented there is the argument of changing some standards for existing properties and also the argument of creating better standards for the community. He believes that standards need to follow the General Plan. He commented that it is hard to argue against landscaping.</p> <p>8. Commissioner Maynard commented that one of her concerns is keeping the landscape minimum requirement only in industrial districts just because this is the way it was done before.</p> <p>9. Commissioner Fuller noted the use of existing standards to ensure the same development rights for all property owners, whether they developed previously or not. He also noted the alternative view that we could be creating better standards for the community for the future.</p> <p>10. Commissioner Maynard believes it is important to match the vision of Goleta as expressed in the General Plan Policy VH 4.7. She believes requiring a minimum of at least 10 percent landscaping across the board makes sense in most districts, although she suggested skipping it in Old Town because it is so dense. She does not understand requiring the 10 percent minimum for landscaping in industrial districts but not in commercial areas. She supports the 2015 version with 20% landscaping in Visitor Serving. She noted that if landscaping standards came back, she would be less concerned about lot coverage. She supports some modest amount of common open space for office buildings in business parks as well.</p>	<p>examples were approved by the County many years ago prior to Goleta’s Cityhood.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. No changes to landscaping requirements made.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. GP Policy 4.7 uses the term “should” in section b. and c. and the “shall” used in d. would be covered in the Parking and Loading standards (As discussed in NZO Chapter 17.38).</p>
--	---

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<p>11. Commissioner Shelor commented that he believes the zoning ordinance imposes many standards that supersede discretion and he does not understand why landscaping is different. He would like to ensure that whatever the minimum landscaping requirement is, it is equal to greater than what would be required when adding up all the setbacks, the land, the unused areas, and what is required for stormwater management.</p> <p>12. Commissioner Fuller commented that for Open Space and Resolution 03-20, he was looking at commercial as retail use, and not industrial, office park, or business park districts. He noted that because Resolution 03-20 is for non-residential and includes “shall”, the analysis is up to Design Review Board.</p> <p>13. Chair Smith shares some of the concerns regarding landscaping and commented that the landscaping consideration is worth a second look. She stated that she may not view the issue as broadly as Commissioner Maynard. She noted it might be helpful to research what is being done in other communities near Goleta. She suggested there could be the potential for some sort of blended requirement in the business park districts and noted her primary concern is the business park districts.</p>	<p>11. Comment noted. Adequate landscaping is inherently subjective and is best suited to the Design Review Board’s input and discretion.</p> <p>12. Comment noted.</p> <p>13. Planning staff will continue to research the topic and make any appropriate revisions to the NZO for the next public release draft that is prepared for adoption later in 2019.</p>
<p>Exemptions</p>	
<p>Workshop #9 Chair Smith requested staff consider if the standards for fences change in the NZO, that the language in the Design Review Board section is consistent with the changes.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The NZO will be reviewed to ensure internal consistency.</p>
<p>City Lighting</p>	
<p>Workshop #9 1. Commissioner Fuller supports not having the lighting standard and therefore allowing the approval to be made by the Design Review Board. He noted that there are places and situations where a more daylight or neutral kelvin would be appropriate and believes the Design Review Board, the applicants, and people who will be using the property should have the opportunity to determine what temperature of lighting they want.</p>	<p>All comment noted on the topic of lighting.</p> <p>Planning staff will continue to discuss the issue of Kelvin temperatures with</p>

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Commissioner Shelor believes that the technology seems to be changing and probably will be changing rapidly, and he wants the city to stay with the technology and not fall behind. He does not believe one size should fit all with regard to the standards. He read, in part, a comment letter received a few months ago suggesting a neighborhood desire for 2800K temperature in neighborhoods and a higher temperature at intersections and other appropriate places. He noted he would not want an industrial look in his neighborhood. Commissioner Shelor suggested discussing this issue at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting with regard to the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) consistency hearing. 3. Chair Smith commented that good points were made in the comment letter that was received and read in part by Commissioner Shelor. 4. Commissioner Fuller pointed out the sample color of the low Kelvin temperature and the moderate Kelvin temperature on the staff presentation. He commented that the low Kelvin lighting temperature is approximately 2700K which is a yellow color that would take out the other colors in the neighborhood. He noted that lighting that goes lower than 3000K would result in more amber colors and wash out the colors in the neighborhood. 5. Commissioner Fuller commented that the total amount of light (wattage) in a certain area should be a consideration in addition to the temperature of light. 6. Commissioner Maynard pointed out that she commented at a previous workshop that she had a concern about the exemption for city facility from lighting standards and she did not support it. 7. Chair Smith commented that one alternative would be to include this type of exemption in a set of design standards. 8. Commissioner Maynard commented that she would be open to staff advising if there is another document appropriate for the requirements. She noted that a lot of projects are small enough not to require Design Review Board review. 9. Commission Maynard encouraged retaining the maximum LED lighting standard in the zoning ordinance and keeping the maximum at 3000K which would keep it in line with the dark sky guidelines and provides an upper limit. 10. Chair Smith supports keeping an upper limit for lighting temperature in the NZO. She noted that technology may change, but there would be an upper limit for the lighting temperature for now. 	<p>Public Works and Current Planning staff.</p> <p>If the temperature standards are better suited within another document other than the NZO, staff will recommend deleting this provision.</p> <p>Staff is aware that technology is changing rapidly and wants to ensure that the NZO does not codify antiquated provisions and requirements that would either be difficult or impossible to meet.</p>
---	---

NOTE: The comments contained within this Table are from Draft Minutes that have not yet been approved by the Planning Commission

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

11. Commissioner Fuller and Commissioner Shelor do not support retaining the 3000K maximum standard in the zoning ordinance.	
--	--

DRAFT Planning Commission Workshop Minutes to be included within THIS table:

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

PENDING Joint City Council/Planning Commission Workshop Minutes yet to be added to THIS table:

- *Joint Workshop (5/7)*

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)