

CITY OF

Goleta

New Zoning Ordinance

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

Prepared for:



by:

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners

NOVEMBER 11, 2013

Table of Contents

1 Introduction..... 1

2 Major Themes and Issues 2

3 Current Regulations and Standards 5

4 Review Process..... 14

5 Development Standards..... 20

6 Old Town 30

7 Other Specific Areas of Concern..... 32

8 Technical Issues..... 36

Appendix A: List of Stakeholders Interviewed..... 39

This page left intentionally blank

I Introduction

The City of Goleta is currently engaged in preparing a new Zoning Ordinance to implement General Plan policies. Goleta's General Plan provides policy direction for the physical development, growth, and conservation of resources for a City. The Plan expresses broad community values and goals, gives a vision of how the city should look in the next 20 years, and outlines steps to get there. The new Zoning Ordinance will establish the detailed rules for what can be built and the application review processes required. Zoning is where "the rubber meets the road," as it allows for all of the goals and visions of the city's General Plan to be translated into specific numbers and standards.

In order to learn about the issues associated with updating the Zoning Ordinance, interviews were conducted with a cross-section of "code users" – people who regularly use the Zoning Ordinance in the City of Goleta. The code users interviewed included architects, contractors, lawyers, planning consultants, developers, small business owners, members of the Planning Commission, and representatives of neighborhood groups. City staff members also were interviewed to learn of technical issues associated with permitting, Code administration and enforcement of departments.

The City's consultants conducted interview sessions over a two-day period (October 21-22). The team interviewed a total of 63 interviews in groups of one to four people (see the listing in the appendix). The confidential interviews were conducted by three senior staff from the consulting firm of Dyett & Bhatia – Michael Dyett, Vivian Kahn, and Martha Miller. City staff members generally were not present during the interviews to encourage candid responses. Questions were sent out in advance of the interviews to stimulate feedback from the code users. The interviews conducted were "free form". People attending were given the opportunity to discuss issues of significance to them, and were queried about overarching concerns as well as specific topics.

2 Major Themes and Issues

There was surprisingly strong consensus among all the code users about the major issues related to Goleta's zoning ordinance, but on details, divergent viewpoints also were expressed. While the code users may ultimately differ on some of the exact recommended changes, there was clear agreement that a new ordinance is needed to make zoning more understandable, to improve the review process for all involved, and to support achievement of the City's General Plan.

Those interviewed pointed out numerous ways in which the current zoning provisions actually work against achieving City goals. In addition to the substance of the ordinance itself, there was much discussion of the review process; this is clearly a major issue that people want to see addressed, particularly in terms of making it easier for entrepreneurs, small businesses, homeowners, developers, and other types of small projects. Other issues included development in the city, its form and character along Hollister and in Old Town, as well as a number of other specific areas of concern.

Key issues and suggestions made by stakeholders are organized in a topical fashion and then alphabetically, reflecting the principle that all viewpoints have merit at this stage of the process. Many comments in each topic were consolidated for this report because they overlapped. The main themes that emerged are the following:

1. **Implement the General Plan.** Nearly all of the stakeholders interviewed underscored the importance of following the policy direction that is set out in the General Plan because there is a lot of community support for it. The idea that there should be no General Plan amendments considered at this time seemed to be the “backstory”. Although thought this should not be an absolute rule. Similarly, many said ignore the zoning inherited from the County; focus instead on carrying out the General Plan.
2. **Get the numbers right.** Standards such as 40 percent open space for multi-family residential development do not work. The need to calibrate floor area ratios (FARs) and height limits, so they reflect physical and economic realities (actual floor-to-floor heights that are being built) and make sense, also was mentioned by a number of stakeholders. A final example was parking, and the concern of several of those interviewed that current regulations require “over-parking” with more pavement, which creates more runoff and seems inconsistent with good practices for stormwater management.
3. **Streamline the process.** Many of those interviewed noted that it takes quick a long time to get an approval, and that often plans are reviewed more than once before an approval is granted. With more delegation to City staff for minor approvals, the process can be streamlined.

4. **Eliminate the two-step procedures for Design Review Board (DRB).** Many thought that this is cumbersome and not fair to have to go back to the DRB after a Planning Commission approval. The scope of review for each body also should be clearly defined, and overlap eliminated. Joint study sessions for major projects also was mentioned as another streamlining concept.
5. **Support investment and redevelopment in Old Town.** Much needs to be done, and the new zoning ordinance is a good starting place. Some suggested that Old Town may benefit from some incentive-based tools, which are less important citywide.
6. **Update the sign regulations.** The process for master sign plans is quite overly-detailed, and straightforward standards are needed, particularly for Old Town. Temporary signage should be restricted to the extent possible. High sign permit fees also were mentioned as a problem, but the new zoning ordinance will not be addressing them specifically. Finally, the idea of requiring signs to display the permit number was supported as a way of ensuring compliance with standards and facilitating enforcement.
7. **Put regulations in place to enable second units to be built.** Many noted that the City has not approved a second unit application since incorporation, while illegal garage conversions continue. Second units are affordable housing! Many noted that the State's regulations for second units would be a good starting point.
8. **Respect "sacred cows", such as the Bishop Ranch, and provide opportunities for sustainable living and sustainable urban agriculture.** Much can be done, accordingly to several stakeholders, to support preservation of agricultural land and also allow urban agriculture to co-exist with other types of development in the City. One idea is to allow research projects as an alternative to large parcels on Bishop Ranch, as an experiment in sustainable land use, with collaboration required with a university or any NGO with capacity to undertake research. A reversionary requirement would be imposed, so that if this experiment does not work, the site would be put back into its natural state. Performance metrics would be established in lieu of fixed standards in an underlying zone.
9. **Protect creeks, coastal bluffs and views.** Detailed policy direction is in the General Plan, but refinements are needed to implement the policies and avoid unforeseen consequences or overregulation,
10. **Include regulations for historic preservation.** The City has important landmarks that could be protected through zoning, and this was an initiative in the General Plan. While more work needs to be done on an inventory, the enabling provisions for a historic preservation program can be included in the new zoning ordinance.

11. **Support a multi-modal transportation system.** This would include provisions for bike parking, bike lane connections, trail connections, good sidewalk widths, and coastal access. More could be done to promote alternative transportation through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs
12. **Learn from what the County and other jurisdictions have done.** The regulations inherited upon incorporation have been replaced, and the County has done a lot of research into best practices that may be helpful. Other jurisdictions also may have good models that could be adapted by Goleta to address concerns raised, and stakeholders made a number of specific suggestions for the consultant team to evaluate as the drafting process moves forward.

These themes and the specific concerns noted in the interviews will guide the consultant team's work on the Annotated Outline and the preliminary "modules" of regulations.

3 Current Regulations and Standards

During the interviews, stakeholders expressed many comments about Goleta’s current zoning. Many said that its inherited zoning ordinances from the county needed to be updated and modified to be specific to the City of Goleta and its recent General Plan. Others expressed concern about the level of specificity and flexibility in the code. There were other concerns surrounding open space requirements and the different uses established in the code, in addition to many suggestions about what to include in the code. There was strong consensus that the new zoning ordinance needs to be user-friendly and fair to all.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- City is now looking at where they want to be rather than just fighting off the city, county, and university.
- Don’t use the old county zoning ordinance for anything.
- Maintain some of the relief the current ordinance has on setbacks and height, which apparently is not allowed by the General Plan. The Isla Vista plan might offer some concepts that would work for Goleta.
- New county ordinance somewhat cumbersome. Look at pyramidal zoning approach in the City of Santa Barbara.
- Some things are outdated; the current regulations haven’t evolved. Need to update and create more flexibility. A lot of zones don’t allow any residential. Update based on current uses and envisioned future.

RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL PLAN

- Be future-oriented; implement the General Plan policies.
- Compatibility requirement for General Plan should be included in the new zoning ordinance.
- Confusion between General Plan and current zoning ordinance.
- Deal with environmental issues in the General Plan rather than doing environmental review with General Plan and then doing it again with every project. Study the impacts once, decide how the City wants to develop, and allow that to be implemented.
- Enforcement: General Plan does not address changes to zoning regulations to achieve quality development in the City need; the City has a tradition of complaint-driven enforcement
- Exceptions: pet peeves, would like to see fewer given. For example, for Haskell Landing, the General Plan has a setback that is too much, allows for exceptions to get more units.
- General Plan: the 2008-10 revisions corrected a lot of problems. Greater flexibility. Now it’s a good document, balancing all the various issues.
- Missing sections in code include Historic Preservation, Density Bonus, and Second Units. Check the General Plan because it mandates what needs to be in the code.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- New zoning is to implement the General Plan, but the General Plan is so restrictive that it can be problematic. The General Plan can be interpreted as growth limiting, but how do you reconcile that with a zoning ordinance that is supposed to promote orderly development? The General Plan may need to be amended.
- Very much opposed to any amendment to the General Plan.
- When you start writing the code and see different development standards, don't be afraid to go back to the General Plan and change it. Make the two documents work together. The vision now is different than what it may have been when the General Plan was adopted. No harm in revising that. Goleta is a more experienced city now, we know more about what we want. Make list of what should be changed and do those amendments.
- Worried about taking things out of the General Plan and putting it in the ordinance. Regulations were put in the General Plan because it is harder to change the General Plan than it is the Zoning Ordinance.

ADDRESSING LAND USES

- Adult businesses: massage parlors – 6 or 7 only, no CUPs, only business license is required. Allow them in commercial zones only, not in office buildings or industrial parks, maybe not in M1, because that would make it seedier (e.g. downgrading the area).
- Adult entertainment will need to be addressed in the code.
- Agricultural property north of 101 between Glen Annie Road and Los Carneros Road is a key development parcel for City. Needs to be designated for a Specific Plan. Has to be mixed use and subject to Specific Plan or Master Plan process.
- Allow mixed-use in neighborhoods that have traditionally been only residential. That will make people want to live here and locate their businesses here.
- Auto-oriented uses: Because of the way Goleta is handling housing, you have to get in car to get anything done. There is a lack of a mix of uses. There are vast areas of residential development, specifically the R-1 and E-1 zones, that currently specifically prohibits commercial use. There should be an allowance for a mix of uses in neighborhoods, maybe with a use permit.
- Bishop Ranch is ideal model of attracting business to locate in Goleta; UCSB is looking for food for 20K students, looking for local sources.
- Bishop Ranch: Agricultural land – lots of opportunity but these will take time to realize.
- Checking cashing – no problems with this use.
- Clean and sober facilities don't necessarily need a license. Adult care needs to be licensed. The ordinance should be clear about licensed vs unlicensed facilities. If it's described correctly we can distinguish between care facilities and clean and sober facilities such that residential areas aren't impacted.
- Clean and Sober Facilities/Houses: Define as a boarding house so it's clear how clean and sober facilities are addressed in the new ordinance.
- Commercial use of residential property is also an issue. Rentals, businesses etc.
- Commercial districts have suburban type zoning that supports strip commercial development.
- Community assembly with church vs. church with a care facility – Are these separate uses or do both come under protection of RLUIPA?
- Distinguish R&D uses that generate potential impacts and use hazardous materials and don't prohibit features that are part of that use. Problem created for exterior storage needed to support this use. If you need a development plan to do this, it will create problem.

- Elwood Onshore facility attracts businesses – worried about hydrogen sulfide leaks; understand that the owner is looking to start up Leases 421 offshore facilities.
- Firearm sales – City has granted 5 home occupation permits allowing this, with stock in trade on-site, Per Code Enforcement, this is not a problem.
- Fiscal sustainability requires being judicious, so a store like Target without high value jobs, is not necessarily a good land use for the City.
- Group care facility looks like student housing. The definitions need to distinguish between these uses.
- Happy Harry's is a good example of a corner store that should be allowed.
- Industrial uses at the end of Kellogg Road should be moved to an industrial area in and around airport safety zones.
- Limit problematic uses in certain areas – franchises, big box retail or simply a franchise. What are the pros and cons? Legal limitations?
- Liquor stores – OK.
- Look at uses today that are not defined: indoor pistol range – where is this an appropriate use? If in M1- with some retail component – why not?
- Massage parlors: it's not as big of a deal in Goleta. Define personal services and distinguish massage parlors from other uses. It's not an adult business.
- Maybe there is an opportunity to bisect residential areas with a zone that allows mix use. This could help create complete neighborhoods.
- Medical marijuana dispensaries... only allow co-op growing, not dispensaries.
- Mixed-use districts: have different standards for residential portion and commercial portion of project.
- Mixed-use would be a great fit in Old Town.
- MRP allows small percentage of retail, but not a lot of facilities that would look and feel like those uses that are now permitted in MRP.
- MRP: All development is subject to development plan, which some interpret as meaning anything is subject to Development Plan. Need flexibility. Some things shouldn't have to go to Planning Commission.
- Office: Planning Commission is seeing large single use projects, needing arterial connections.
- Overlay districts could be used to allow neighborhood serving using in residential areas.
- Provide area for incubator businesses which would keep people in the community. The University and high tech industry is something that Goleta has that other cities don't have.
- Promote triple water use systems.
- Recreational uses in office-warehouse type spaces not allowed in current zoning and may not be allowed in general plan e.g. gymnastic programs, rock climbing etc. Economics wouldn't work in retail area.
- Residential neighborhoods are already developed. How do you inject mixed-use? How do you change neighborhoods? That is a difficult thing to do.
- Smoke shop – tobacco licensing regulations are in process.
- Tattoo parlors: they are allowed, but there aren't any in Goleta.
- UCSB is a tremendous engine of high technology, engineering and materials sciences – supporting spinoff of incubator businesses; but its difficult to get these entrepreneurs space in Goleta. How can regulations be responsive to incubators' needs?
- Use regulations: don't be too overly specific – martial arts vs. dance.

- Westar project – Mixed Use across from Costco, good example for infill, some aesthetics and viewshed issues, but what was envisioned in General Plan – missed opportunity with potential bikelane improvements...made it all the way to the Planning Commission without considering how it related to existing bike lanes.... Too late to adjust site plan.
- Why can't mixed use occur on an industrial site?

OPEN SPACE: WHAT SHOULD BE REQUIRED?

- Big issue: 40% open space requirement is too high for multi family zoning district. Something closer to 20% makes more sense. A sliding scale also may make sense.
- Bishop Ranch: begin with land restoration, get city zoning up to date, and support the entire plan.
- Bishop Ranch: consider how to make it most effective as a community – how to do a test site for alternative building and alternative land stewardship; need housing for young farmers. Aging farmer population. Need more farmworker housing.
- City of Santa Barbara provides open space alternatives, but Goleta's current ordinance dictates requirements for private open space for residential that limit options. Worth looking at all of the projects that required modifications. You will probably find that most of the modifications shouldn't have been necessary.
- Concern about City allowing people to use City parks to run a business, such as fitness classes in parks, dog training, Look at how Santa Monica addressed this.
- Current rule for measurement of open space excludes any kind of paved surface. It doesn't make any sense to exclude all areas of hardscape.
- Ellwood Mesa – inherited from county; community concerned about trails, bridges, signage etc... people don't want changes – minimal amenities, but access with rainy season...protect recreational open space so that zoning can support environmental protection.
- Front yards are being turned into parking lots – need a rule for maximum % paving.
- Look for opportunities to down-zone properties to preserve open spaces.
- Open space requirement currently is not modifiable. This is a problem.
- Open space requirements needs to be evaluated. Developments meet numbers for the required percentage but the open space being offered isn't usable or something that provides public benefit.
- Outdoor living area is a better option; it may be more valuable than open space per se.
- Protect parks and open space. Develop trails. Need community involvement. No regulatory standards for permanent open space.
- Take action to preserve Bishop Ranch through a conservation easement or purchase.

ENABLING URBAN AGRICULTURE

- Add definitions for and protection for existing agriculture. This would include provisions for urban farms, farmers markets, food hubs, community gardens, and backyard gardens.
- Agricultural zoning should be included in the new zoning ordinance. Ag zoning is important.
- Agriculture on infill properties is a novelty. Instead, effort should be put into preserving substantial agricultural parcels. Make the most of infill properties rather than looking back at a time that has passed.
- Allow farm stands, even if they are selling things that include value-added products.
- Allow for workforce housing (farm laborers) in ag zoning districts – want Chamber of Commerce and business community to support.

- Cottage food operations – look at what has been done in Portland and SF.
- Cottage industry – allow in ag zones or other areas.
- Create a "healthy food" city.
- Currently there are unintended consequences, because the ordinance has been making it more difficult to farm. Community wants to encourage ag. but as a small farmer its difficult.
- Do not exempt agricultural grading from permit requirements. Could reduce permit fees, but it should be subject to permits so that the City can evaluate impacts.
- Don't be too prescriptive.
- Fairview Gardens: although its a legal use, it has had difficulties; wanted to provide housing and to have a produce stand – marginalized by zoning, and surrounded by residential development; zoning that implements the General plan could affect the outcome.
- Fairview Gardens: has been a problem for neighbors from time to time; the zoning ordinance should have guidelines and rules for urban agricultural uses being a good neighborhood.
- Food trucks: add standards for them.
- Growing and selling food; tie into cottage food operations.
- Infill parcels have prime soils. Urban agricultural may help to support keeping these properties in agriculture and promote local food.
- Look at AB 823 and AB 551 – look at San Francisco's urban agriculture program.
- Look at the Hollister Ranch; there are no real farmers out there – only second homes, guest houses, lavender farms. Not really farming.
- Make it easier to have a farm stands – no permits required.
- More flexibility for urban agriculture is needed – not just in areas zoned for agriculture – provide this flexibility citywide.
- Promote creation of an “Ag” village – then document performance and impacts.
- Recognize changing methods of food distributions: Community Supported Agriculture (CSAs). Make sure these are allowed where appropriate, no CUPs.
- Retain all existing agricultural zoning.
- Right to farm may be appropriate based on Plan policies on preservation of agricultural lands.
- Sustainable research ordinance – one way to go... Require a CUP for small farmers.
- There are incompatibilities with agriculture and non-agricultural uses in the City.
- Urban agriculture park: this is what could happen at Bishop, on parcels that could be mixed use.
- Urban agriculture: everyone loves it and is favor of rules, but truth is that its preserving open space without paying for open space.

CREATING FAIR, USER-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS

- ‘Good cause findings’ are just an opportunity for politicians to appease the community on developer's back. Put what you want in writing up front.
- Current zoning ordinance is obtuse. The new one needs to be simple and clear. The average person should be able to navigate through the ordinance without someone having to interpret.
- Grouping uses will help make the code more usable.
- Illustrations: a picture is worth 1,000 words. Graphics are important in a zoning code.
- It's hard to understand what you can and what you can't do.
- Language in policies and regulations should be more clear cut and less subject to interpretation.
- Make it easy to use and understand. Do not use “matrix” method that they did in San Diego.

- Many residents don't have experience with the zoning code and aren't engaged. We need to make this process real to them.
- Need for easy on-line access.
- Not always enough definitions.
- Number one thing the zoning should provide is clear cut rules and regulations that everyone is playing by.
- Put clear rules and protocols in the new zoning ordinance.
- What businesses want is predictability. Then they can make a decision of whether they can live within the rules or not. Make the rules clear and predictable.
- Zoning ordinance needs to be understandable and predictable. The current ordinance is not.
- Zoning ordinance needs to remain simple and straightforward, with clear language.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW ZONING

- Acknowledge and promote use of Zip Cars in the new zoning ordinance.
- Address how to get more performance approaches into zoning.
- All regulations should be "shall" or it shouldn't be a regulation. "Should" should not be used in the zoning ordinance.
- Allow options in the new zoning ordinance for different types of farming.
- An owner should be able to go online and find out everything about zoning as well as which districts provide services to the site.
- Appropriate technologies – need to build these ideas into zoning.
- Be very careful because the regulations and the technology are quickly changing, so don't lock anyone in to the ordinance.
- Be very careful with "shall" and "should". There were weeks and months spent on these words in the General Plan.
- Bishop Ranch – Would like the new zoning ordinance to support having a County owned and operated education center in collaboration with TPL (Trust for Public Land or UCSB).
- Bring out the best in projects.
- Cement crushing –define this use.
- Code enforcement: parking RVs and trucks on the site, this is a significant issue – how to allow additional parking? OK in front setback, with 50% landscaping.
- Complaints about wanting to ensure design is "good design". How will the zoning ordinance relates to this issue? Form-based zoning may be an option.
- Create a floating zone with LEED ND as criteria and with energy efficiency standards.
- Define paving in the zoning ordinance.
- Define what a structure is for zoning purposes. Tree houses and play structures should be addressed.
- Definitions need to be updated. Staff relies on them a lot, and they are out of date.
- Don't be "super restrictive."
- Don't mimic Santa Barbara's attempt to make everything exactly the same... be eclectic, allow funky, but stick with tasteful!
- Emphasis in the new zoning ordinance should be on neighborhoods, not subdivisions. Great thing about Old Town.

- Enforce the regulations on the book. Sign regulations are ignored by many owners, but instead of enforcing requirements, City spends too much time reviewing plans from those who try to conform.
- Engage the businesses and developers to come up with rules that they can live with and that implement community vision.
- Enhance economic development. The zoning ordinance needs to be a tool for economic development.
- Figure out what you want and incentivize people to invest in it.
- Focus on having incentives to reduce existing incompatibilities.
- Form based and performance based zoning may make sense— flesh out choices for community consideration.
- Form Based Code wouldn't work in Goleta.
- GEM: Goleta Entrepreneurial Magnet - will review potential incentives that could be included in the zoning ordinance.
- Goal of zoning is not to attract businesses. It's to protect and enhance public health and interest.
- Green building program: put this into zoning.
- Have incentives for entrepreneurship.
- Historic preservation: the new zoning ordinance should have specific provisions to preserve historic landmarks and contributor elements. Include enabling regulations for an advisory board and an overlay district and an inventory.
- How to decrease sprawl – recognize that this is a politically loaded word.
- Identify what goals and priorities are. If the concern is limited land availability, then you have to allow more density and height.
- Implement SB 375.
- Incentive based standards could be worked in but not sure how that would happen.
- Interviewee is cautious about the new zoning ordinance. Doesn't want much to change.
- Keep and enhance what is in the zoning ordinance for the most part.
- Keep the zoning ordinance and Local Coastal Program separate.
- Land use tables now in General Plan should be in the zoning ordinance rather than in Plan.
- Look at “Net zero” building in Los Altos – zoning allows an urban farm for kids; collective rainwater harvesting.
- Look at Mixed Use Agricultural Parks on East Coast.
- Make zoning more specific; this would help the process.
- Mixed use – it should be allowed by right and not be subject to an overlay zone, allow this in all commercial zones.
- Mixed use has a lot of value.
- Most of what zoning provides is for the community to feel safe and that they will have a livable environment that is aesthetically pleasing.
- Much can be done to mitigate things that bother people (e.g. short-term rental of SF homes to large groups of students).
- Neighborhoods wants stronger language on what makes a neighborhood... more mixed uses and services within walking or biking distance – neighborhood nodes.
- Not sure if current zoning provides sufficient incentives to attract businesses.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- Portland’s experience: Look into what Mark Lakeman and City Repair are doing for specific zoning regulations.
- Provide greater environmental protection.
- Rather than including detailed lists of specific requirements in zoning code (e.g. paving materials), include cross-references to re-direct the applicant to the Muni Code stormwater regulations and other administrative regulations..
- Restrict paving in the entire front yard. We have to stop this.
- Rules of measurement for height needs to be updated and clarified.
- Second units: would be good to have specific rules and standards reflecting State law, so units are built legally, rather than as illegal garage conversions.
- Set out expectations - have a “findings-driven” zoning ordinance.
- Streamlining: would be best to modify ordinance to allow improvements that increase efficiency and safety improvements on ministerial basis, if the project meets certain specified criteria.
- Street trees, pedestrian standards and safety are all zoning ordinance priorities.
- Support creative approaches rather than regulating to stop “bad” development. Identify approaches that are desired in different areas.
- Supportive of a restrictive zoning code that clearly spells out what should happen and provides for penalty if you don’t do it.
- There should not be any tradeoffs or flexibility in the zoning code.
- Transition and compatibility are all about design. The code should recognize that the new projects will be different than current development, and something new can’t be judged based on how it matches what is there today.
- Update parking requirements and sign regulations—they don’t address current trends and expectations.
- Uses: need to know what the problem is so we can develop a use classification system.
- Zoning is a vehicle to get done what the City wants to get done. If the City is in agreement of what that should be, zoning should facilitate that.
- Zoning is essential to high quality of life and influencing aesthetic ambiance. Pueblo Viejo district looks a certain way because of zoning. There may be some complaints about it, but it implements a community’s vision.
- Zoning is important to keep people comfortable in their living situation.
- Zoning needs to have clear criteria and tradeoffs.
- Zoning overall: would like to see more of the Santa Monica model – 3rd Street Promenade with parking structures.
- Zoning that is performance based can address runoff and pollution, smell and sound, and rain harvesting opportunities.

FLEXIBILITY IN THE CODE

- Allow for flexibility, but be clear in where and when flexibility is possible.
- Be careful in providing flexibility so that the integrity of the rules is not lost. At the same time, some flexibility is important. Short term flexibility is necessary. Long term flexibility can be problematic.
- Current zoning provides insufficient flexibility. As a result, it causes a lot of time and expense that shouldn’t be necessary. The new zoning ordinance should be able to meet unanticipated needs.

- Developers should show good faith that they are providing something in return for flexibility. Demonstrate that the good will of the community is not being disregarded in order for developer to do what they want to do.
- Ensure there is enough flexibility in the new zoning ordinance to address all of the issues, get good quality design and allow the Council to be responsive to issues raised.
- Flexibility in residential setbacks could be good. But there should still be enough setback to accommodate cars.
- Flexibility sometimes comes at a cost.
- Flexibility vs. certainty – flexibility is important and should be at the staff level if the changes requested are within say 20% of the standard.
- Flexibility with setbacks is needed. A 20-foot setback does not need to be applied across the board to interior streets of residential development.
- More flexible code would have made some recent approvals easier. Example: Proposed hotel project with FAR that some believe is inconsistent with the General Plan. Some think City is allowing too many rooms. Marriott wanted to combine rooms without increasing floor area. Public doesn't understand that a General Plan amendment wasn't needed.
- Need more options for providing flexibility in zoning requirements i.e. appeals, variances, design review, conditional use permits.
- State up front that flexibility is discretionary.
- There should be less flexibility in the code.
- Use overlay districts to provide additional flexibility.

4 Review Process

One broad topic that was important to many stakeholders was the review process in Goleta and the amount of time required. Stakeholders had many comments to share regarding the Design Review Board (DRB) and the Planning Commission, the types of permits required and permitting procedures, and the overall review process. The general consensus was that the process needed to be clarified and improved, and timelines shortened.

DRB & PLANNING COMMISSION

- Architects have a bad habit of supporting their colleagues who come forward with projects. An architect should not fill a ‘lay person’ spot on the DRB.
- Behind the counter issues, much is done without Planning Commission weighing in.
- Conceptual review with DRB and Planning Commission at same time might make sense (a joint study session); Planning Commission is to uphold the General Plan; DRB cares more about design.
- Consider switching the development review process around with Planning Commission going first, because architects on the DRB don’t care as much about FAR, setbacks, and heights as the Planning Commission does.
- Define duties of Planning Commission and DRB as separate.
- Design professionals should be on DRB. Maybe have a process that allows for peer design review. (San Carlos example)
- DRB spends too much time on sign programs. Belaboring every last detail!
- DRB does a good job.
- DRB may not 100% in line with Planning Commission on the General Plan – developers may be asking for modifications from DRB that Planning Commission would not support.
- DRB should not be looking at interior spaces; this probably is covered in the ordinance setting them up.
- DRB takes the first look at development compatibility with surrounding uses; then to Planning Commission for General Plan conformance. Keep this process
- DRB tends to overreach and get into land use issues. DRB should not be looking at land use issues but the Planning Commission and Council should accept their design recommendations.
- Fewer items should go to DRB for decision. More should go to Planning Commission.
- Findings appear to be needed for design review. “The only way to keep the uglies out.”
- Is Planning Commission getting right projects? Biggest challenge with the process: seems to be a feeling by developers that Planning Commission should be a “slam dunk” after 20 meetings with DRB – Planning Commission feels pressure to approve.

- Major projects should not go to DRB unless it's a joint meeting between Planning Commission and DRB.
- Members of the boards and commissions should have appropriate expertise. For example, DRB members should have design or architecture knowledge.
- Processes that allow flexibility in zoning/ appeals, etc are backwards – earlier Planning Commission involvement needed.
- What can you take away from the DRB? Fold DRB into zoning ordinance, but do away with two – step process.
- Zoom out on design review: some design detail makes sense... but the DRB often asks for too much.

LAND USE PERMITS

- Land Use Permit – problems with process should be fixed.
- Land Use Permits are subject to appeal; it is not a ministerial permit.
- Minor projects, such as garage conversions, should have an over the counter permit.
- Need for a “zoning permit” which would be for permitted development (“by right”). Land use clearance would then come after any required discretionary approval.
- No easy way to get a residential addition approved – Land Use Permit (LUP) process is cumbersome, time-consuming and expensive. Why not make it over the counter?
- The City has not run the Land Use Permit process smoothly. It is a long, drawn out process to get anything done, but it has gotten better.

IMPROVING THE REVIEW PROCESS

- A change in the footprint of the building should be a matter for public discussion and subject to discretionary review.
- A lot of what happens in single family neighborhoods could be approved by staff.
- Add in a reasonable benefit determination process to address this issue in the new zoning ordinance.
- Add DRB study sessions, maybe jointly with Planning Commission.
- Administrative procedures - Zoning Administrator appeals should go to the Planning Commission rather than directly to Council.
- All notice - MAILED to property owner and resident; electric community.
- Allow Staff or Planning Commission to dispose of frivolous appeals.
- Also use a Consent calendar to streamline process – Chair or appointee could handle.
- Any kind of upfront environmental review is helpful and an incentive. It takes issues off the table that don't need to be addressed on a project-by-project basis.
- Appeal period timing is issue identified in county process improvement study. Appeal period too long and too late in process. County used to post only after discretionary approval. Should be at preliminary level. May be later. City Staff are generally super helpful, but permit process at City is still somewhat circular as County process was. Example—TI improvements for restaurant in place previously approved for restaurant requires sign off by variety of county agencies. If City wants to facilitate process, it should coordinate with other agencies.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- Assign an ombudsman: that can work well with developers and homeowners. Someone should be identified as a facilitator that can find source of problem or bottleneck that can make things work better.
- Big projects are easy. Little mom and pop projects are more problematic.
- Can there be an opportunity for Director or DRB to be the only approval body? That would help the process.
- Can't think of any example where a project in the City should have required discretionary review and didn't, or the converse.
- Changes often are approved for project proponents that have been pushing too hard and the results are not always in the City's interest. The new zoning ordinance should address this with better rules and criteria.
- City has a concern about "takings" challenges, so giving exceptions is a way to avoid a Measure G issue. There should be at least one public hearing whenever these are considered. Provide clarity on exceptions in the new zoning ordinance, with an open process, but not one that is burdensome.
- Community doesn't want to slow things down or stop development, but they do want to have the best possible project.
- Conceptual design review before going to the Planning Commission and then going back to the DRB for final check would help the process.
- Conditions of Approval – These are normally "Signed And Accepted", which is good practice.
- Council is not strong enough in holding firm to standards. The City Council is lowering the quality of life for the citizens of Goleta.
- Council says "if not feasible without an exception, then we will give you exception". The Return on Investment (ROI) concern.
- Create a track process with a low level of approval - Type 1 (zoning permit) – that is not appealable. Some community members may not like it.
- Currently, the City uses "development plan approval" as the highest level of approval.
- Currently, everything seems to go through discretionary process, even if it's called a ministerial permit. Having something go through a ministerial process would benefit the process. Have more predictable rules in place rather than have everything be worked out through a discretionary process would be beneficial.
- Design review is not always a great experience. When a project comes from the city (a city project), what is good for them is not what is good for other citizens. Sometimes standards get bent when it is a city project when it might not get bent for other development.
- Don't add a step to process when you are trying to streamline it through a track system.
- Don't down shift decisions to staff level.
- Empower design review to deal with design. Empower the Planning Commission to make decisions.
- Environmental review takes the longest because the Planning Department wants a bullet-proof document, but applicant has to defend the document with a legal challenge.
- Establish a reporting system to show where projects are in processing: what is pipeline?
- Existing provisions for variances, modifications, and waivers are OK. Would be good to have additional provisions that would allow flexibility if applicant can demonstrate consistency. Process under development plan processing exists but is infrequently used. Staff doesn't use this because they're hung up on good cause finding criteria, which is more difficult to meet.

- Fees are too high: \$2,200 for a major appeal and \$500 for a minor appeal.
- From a developer's perspective, the time it takes to secure an approval is important – developers are not sure why it takes so long in Goleta to go through the process. Maybe its due in part to a tradition, inherited from the County, of really analyzing projects in detail and being quite conservative when document are ready to release.
- Have minor project modifications approved by Director without going through permit process.
- Identify areas the city wants to incentivize development (ex. anything between street A and street B) and fast track permits. The way to incentivize development is to put clear standards in place and streamline the Review Process.
- If a project is under 400 SF, you can't see it, it is not a 2nd story addition. City now allows it as an over the counter approval – why can't the City do more on this?
- If a project meets everything in the code, there should be no discretionary hearing. Currently, it's impossible for any project to meet what is in the code.
- If an exemption is for pubic benefit, define what it is and have an open process.
- Improve the processes at City level. If decisions can be made at staff level with appropriate review, this will save time and money and benefit the community.
- In the past, there have been some unseemly delays. A lot of it seems to be that there are inconsistencies between zoning code and general plan. That needs to be resolved. In the process of doing that, hopefully things will be streamlined.
- It's reasonable to have decisions at staff level for projects that are consistent with General Plan and meet the regulations as long as there is some mechanism for the public to weigh in.
- Look at who makes decisions! Provide for more staff-level determinations!
- Make the new ordinance easy to use; shorten process down; merge the separate procedures for development permits and CUPs.
- Maybe developments of four units or less, discretion would reside with Director. DRB can make recommendations to Director. Director can approve on consent if no request for hearing or have a hearing if someone requests one. Director's decision could be appealable straight to Council.
- Maybe we're seeing only one side of the issue. Seems sometimes like staff gives greater consideration to developer's concerns than outcome for those who live here.
- More recent development has been a lot better. Development is only as good as your DRB is. You can write all you want but it comes down to human implementation.
- More visible signs noticing pending projects is also a solution.
- Most administrative procedures for development are done right. Not an issue.
- No case-by-case negotiation!
- Notice of intent to issue a discretionary permit – OK, the idea is “if don't hear from you, it's approved.”
- Noticing: set standards for noticing – have a larger sign size for noticing.
- Occasional, small variances to the zoning code are ok, but that process should be rarely used.
- Permit procedures need to be cleaned up. Many procedures and requirements have been established by policy or through interpretations and are not codified. This leads to inconsistencies.
- Planning Dept gets bogged down on details.
- Political element cannot be ignored. We are serving the community and have an open door to community. The purpose is not to run things through without any friction or public dialogue.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- Problem with notice of decision and timing of appeals. Following discretionary approval, DRB action is appealable. Should be review for conformance with conditions of approval. Ordinance needs to clearly spell out procedures.
- Procedures – Not a lot of appeals. Staff believes that there aren't a lot of discretionary decisions. Council used to grant DRB appeals frequently. Need more in ordinance about basis for approving discretionary decisions.
- Promote community involvement in the process.
- Public projects should be held to same level of standards as private projects.
- Reduce processing time; make infill projects a priority.
- Review the “good cause” findings. This originally was a good idea, because of significant community benefit, but has been too watered down. But the idea that “anything is better than existing land use” is too much of a catch-all to approve exceptions. May not need all the “good cause” findings– first five findings may be OK, but not the 6th.
- Single family residence and duplexes and other small projects should happen at a staff level.
- Smaller project also might ask for Final with no feedback after Planning Commission – no reason to go to Planning Commission.
- Some items that are at Planning Commission level – such as changes in conditions of approval, should be done be staff.
- Staff needs to be empowered and educated to make decisions.
- Study sessions would help the process. It's helpful to hear what PC and CC feel about a project before a project is at the end of the process and so much investment has already been made.
- Substantial conformance needs to be codified. Clarify when in a project in conformance with a development approval and when is a new permit required.
- Substantial conformity process: specify what can be considered as a minor change in response to changes in the local real estate market, leave this up to the Director.
- The process today does not change the project. Just adds time to the approval. There is no value added as a result of the process.
- The process doesn't seem to attract or detract development.
- The process is longest ever involved in – can't seem to get an approval for zoning regulations in a timely fashion. Can't get reliable dates.
- The process is too onerous, takes far too long.
- The process should be simple. It does not need to be difficult or lengthy but it will still ensure that everyone's rights are protected.
- The process should deal with problems, but every project should not be assumed to be creating problems.
- The process was smooth, and staff was helpful.
- The Zoning Code originally had tiers of when Development Plan review is required. That kind of tiering can be helpful in establishing appropriate levels of review.
- Time extensions need to be easier to obtain on development plans, CUPs especially in light of current economic conditions. Perhaps allow extension the first time at staff level
- Timely review of plans by City staff. City staff told him they have to prepare minutes of meeting after receiving info from applicant that was requested at meeting.
- Timing: there are businesses that want to expand here but think that the time it will take is too much. The length of the process discourages investment.
- Too many things go to City Attorney's office for review and that is a bottleneck.

- Too many things go to Zoning Code Administrator for approval.
- Too often, project information comes out at the last minute. Staff reports should come out earlier so the public has a chance to review.
- Would like to have process to allow concept or preliminary review first because of level of detail required to get zoning approval and any determination. Santa Barbara, county and other jurisdictions do this to get early feedback, but City attorney has raised concerns about possibility of applicants raising claims because of investment made in reliance on early review. Agree that code could stipulate that comments are non-binding.
- Zoning Administrator cases do not get notice and oftentimes there needs to be community input.

CEQA REVIEW AND ENVIRONMENT IMPACT REPORTS

- Before there are any decisions made, applicants are required to do an EIR. That is an incredible investment before you even get a decision on the project.
- CEQA is the problem for most projects.
- CEQA Thresholds – were these inherited from County, need stronger measures and discussion on these, in particular those related to GHG.
- City did a General Plan and EIR to allow higher density housing. When the project comes through, even if it is consistent with the General Plan, another EIR is required. This is excessive.
- City should adhere to timelines in CEQA. There is no excuse for not doing so.
- City should look for ways to use State exemptions to CEQA for infill projects. Individually, projects may be OK, but cumulative impacts are not often adequately addressed.
- Everything in the City seems to trigger the need for an EIR. This is excessive. Santa Maria did a Downtown Plan and EIR. The developer built a development of over 200 units that was approved in 6 months because it was consistent with the plan and EIR. Projects in Goleta take five years, even when consistent with the General Plan. This is too long!
- There ought to be some commitment of support of a modification before the developer makes the investment into an EIR.
- Traffic studies are pretty black and white. You just require a study and implement recommendations. Don't need to do EIR to determine this, especially if the level and density was already analyzed in the General Plan EIR.

5 Development Standards

Stakeholders voiced many concerns about development in Goleta and whether it fits with community character and the vision of the General Plan. Many stakeholders expressed a strong desire to establish new and modify existing development standards, which were primarily inherited from the County's zoning code. Other issues of importance were the density and intensity of development, current parking requirements vs. actual parking needs, heights, and signs; there was strong consensus that each of these topics needs updating to be suitable for Goleta today and the implement the General Plan.

DEVELOPMENT GENERALLY

- Allow for expansion onto sidewalks to encourage infill or reuse of older sites.
- Allows for truly transit-oriented development. Need this to encourage development in Old Town in particular.
- Apartment development: allow them to be successful:
 - Open space and coverage requirement have to be revised. Ideally, the City should have a flexible standard that reflects density and the fact that different types of housing should have different standards.
 - Parking: look at the standards carefully – there is too much parking required for multi-family housing, which translate into too much paving on-site.
 - When garages are required, they are typically not used; however, in apartment complexes with carports, you don't have a parking problem because the spaces are used as intended.
 - Few are surveying parking built in terms of actual demand. This information could help in preparing the new zoning ordinance.
 - One apartment developer noted that the City's General Plan Housing Element has stated that modifications should be granted if needed to get housing built, but a decision on a proposed modification comes "at end of the game", after substantial costs have been incurred, including in some cases the cost of an EIR. The proposed modifications may well be denied, rendering the project infeasible. The new zoning ordinance should fix this.
 - Height limits need to be revised: 3 story limits are acceptable, but the actual limit in the current zoning does not match a 3 story concept for commercial buildings. This is because the vertical distance between floor plate is 13 to 14 feet, floor to floor (12 ft. is the minimum for upper levels; 15 ft. on the ground level). To be viable and also allow for pitch roofs, the height limit should be 40 to 45 feet.
- Bishop Ranch: Support planned development (PD) – master planning – on six parcels, show how to increase density and create synergies with farmlands. A 40 acre minimum parcel size is a deterrent to investment in a sustainable land use.

- Community benefits: have developers provide public benefit along with private development. Adopt a philosophy that development should provide for what the City wants. It's about a balance. Look at supporting City goals with private investment. Development should implement things such as a master bike plan for the City and provide public space. City has to be ready with what they want in order to ask for it as a component of the proposed development.
- Concern with how buildings look from the street and the livability of the community.
- Create standards that allow for multi-generational arrangement of development.
- Developers like fee simple development, with no CC&Rs and dedicated alleys.
- Development agreements: City can get more, but may have to give up more; should be transparent and may not deal adequately with cumulative impacts and longer term maintenance.
- Development provides impact fees and things such as park fees. That should be enough.
- Development should provide bike paths, enhance walkability, provide open space and public space, provide coastal access, and respect views.
- Do not allow developers to get subsidies and make sure the new zoning ordinance does not let this happen. This would not be acceptable to Goleta residents.
- Early action on modifications is desirable; maybe this could happen in a pre-application conference?
- Investment and development should serve the community and population.
- Kellogg: City needs to be ready to allow development here.
- Problems with second floor additions.
- Require greater side setbacks for habitable room.
- Shorter time limits rather than incentives are more important
- Small lot planned development provisions could be great but it's never used because there are some weaknesses.
- Storefront improvements – no more redevelopment agency (RDA), but voluntary projects are coming forward to encourage infill.
- Target is trying to build on Los Carneros. Support for development on five parcels available, but zoning doesn't allow this use. Fed Ex and athletic club now on site. A lot of mitigation would be needed. Not sure whether rezoning to allow Target would be consistent with the General Plan. Current zoning would also prohibit rebuilding City Hall on current site.
- Transition between uses should be required in the new zoning ordinance.
- UCSB: Multiplier effects from expansion, when Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) is implemented, will exacerbate the situation.
- UCSB: Study impacts with university participation.
- Walkability: provide for complete streets and healthy streets.

DENSITY AND INTENSITY

- Agricultural density limits: propose that as a land use alternative on Bishop Ranch, as research into sustainable living concepts, the City could allow up to ten 1,000 square foot cottages – allow this as an experiment, with performance metrics established for research into alternative building material, cluster development, onsite water systems, stormwater management, onsite food and goods production, . Require collaboration with a university or any NGO with capacity to undertake research. Have a reversionary requirement so that if this experiment does not work, the site would be put back into its natural state.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- Biggest challenge is how the City deals with continued intensification of land use. Single family development will become duplex and multiplex development.
- Bishop Ranch at 240 acres, has more of an upside potential for new zoning that implements the General Plan.
- City has aversion to density. Hardly ever able to achieve density allowed.
- Conflict between building owners and business owners concerned about impact on rents.
- FAR is problematic. Need to make it clear that FAR is not a hard and fast rules; it's a suggestion. If it is going to be a hard limit, the FAR limits need to allow for a reasonable development type. For example, 0.5 FAR is too low for hotel development.
- FAR limits currently do not account for design.
- FARs for commercial – ensure enough community benefit is there to justify a higher FAR.
- FARs prevent development – if they are fake numbers that should not be in a zoning ordinance.
- Housing density – this can be part of a strategy for mixed use for the community.
- North of Hollister – problematic for density increases.
- Santa Barbara has average unit density overlay that would be interesting to look at in order to incentivize smaller units. They also have density incentives for rental, coops, and other types of ownership and identify a variable setback requirement which allows for an averaging.
- Single Family FAR is a guideline – pretty much ignored. Maybe add in to the new zoning ordinance.

HEIGHT

- Allow additional height for a pitched roof.
- Allow building feature like rotundas, subject to height restriction.
- Allow flexibility within the 25 foot height limit in residential areas to accommodate pitch roofs – height should not be an absolute standard.
- Clearly define how height is measured and allow for projections into the height limit. Screening for air conditioning unit should be allowed to project into the height limit.
- Concern about heights of development blocking mountain views. Would not advocate for allowing heights higher than the existing limits. There may be some areas where height limits should be lowered.
- Have a variety of height allowances to mark significant areas. To some, 35 feet seems to be the tallest anything is allowed to be. Maybe there should be some allowance for higher heights with stepbacks of upper stories.
- Height limits should respond to site conditions and floor-to-floor requirements.
- If the City is going to allow three stories, 35 feet is restrictive. Allow 40 or 45 feet.
- Require story poles for any project going through design review and exceeding specified height and floor area increases.
- Set realistic height limits – 45 feet in commercial areas.
- Support an averaging approach for measuring height.
- The 35 foot limit makes a three story building very hard to fit in, particularly on smaller lots. Three stories can fit but you lose articulation and interesting design as well as livable spaces (ventilation, light, etc). If you are going to allow three stories, allow three well designed stories.
- The existing height limit is a problem. It doesn't need to be raised to 60 feet, but it should allow for a well designed three story building.

- Three stories is plenty in Goleta.

OTHER DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

- Accessory structures in side yards and front yard setbacks are very restrictive in the existing code. This is a problem as we need to allow these structures for storage, trash bins, etc.
- Add in an incentive for sloped roofs.
- Add provision for zero lot line development.
- Allow for a reduced front yard setback to 12 ft with an 8 ft porch.
- Allow projections above the height limit for things such as architectural features, etc.
- Animals: need standards for domestic and barnyard animals.
- Averaging setbacks should not be allowed.
- Big canopies in front yards and driveways – are they allowed? Are they structures per Building Code? Even if not, should City regulate?
- Blank walls: do not be allow blank wall along streets, especially in Old Town..
- Build to lines, parking setback to the side or rear of building, transparency, and building orientation are all the types of standards that are appropriate in mixed use districts. Also, allow a lot of coverage and allow open space to be located on upper stories. Supportive of a flexible build to requirement of within five feet of the property line but need to consider width of existing sidewalk and the street.
- Building setback vs. fence height– 3 ft is preferred– at corners maybe have reduced setback of 10 ft or 7.5 ft.
- Businesses turn their backs to the street. Businesses and entrances are oriented to the automobile rather than pedestrians.
- Create alternatives to existing setbacks.
- Create real front porches – a livable porch space is at least 8 ft deep– see Fillmore zoning ordinance.
- Current standards allow a four-six foot wall in the front setback. That should not be allowed.
- Development in Goleta should have better design, be ‘greener’, and be smaller.
- Development standards are not always being met; too many requiring good cause findings. Everything is getting variances and modifications.
- Do not allow straight-in streets – these are a real nightmare – set minimum cul de sac dimensions.
- Fences: lots of problems with 6 ft. front yard fences– most other cities is 3-4 feet, with views into front yards; also address hedges.
- Formulate standards that reflect the community.
- Have clear standards.
- May be acceptable to sacrifice some private space in the front of the building if there is a public area along the right of way.
- Minimize use of modifications. Today, all projects need “modifications”, such as parking in setbacks, and the new zoning ordinance should eliminate having to do this whenever it makes sense to do so.
- Modifications that people are asking for result in superior project.
- Need certainty in standards and the process, clear rules and consistent application.
- Need to have very definite standards with no exceptions. Do not back off of requirements.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- One benefit of a form-based code approach is that it tells you where a building can be located on a lot. The new zoning code should provide this type of direction.
- People's Self Help Housing tries to create a space for tenant enjoyment. The tendency of others is to try and squeeze an affordable housing project in; make it smaller, increase setbacks, etc. Setback flexibility is helpful in accommodating amenities for residents (community center, courtyard, etc). Green space on exterior is visual but not really usable for residents.
- Performance standards are OK as long as they are measurable and the City can enforce and monitor performance. The City may need to include a monitoring fee.
- Rear yards: address need for expanded size in medium density and high density zones.
- Revise standards to require national tenants to get out of standard box
- Set a maximum driveway width standard as a % of front lot width or 20 ft.
- Set a percentage of stores that can be chains, if possible.
- Set minimum garage size – 20 ft x 20 ft clear interior
- Set standards for menu boards on restaurants – size also is an issue – no more than 30 SF.
- Setbacks: how to communicate what they are to the public?
- Tighten standards; tighten or eliminate “good cause” findings.
- Use graphics to explain setbacks.
- Wineries: want standards, such as recently addressed by the County.

HOUSING

- Allow denser type housing in Old Town and other areas. That will provide more housing options for students and staff.
- Allow for a palette of materials: cobb homes, rammed earth homes, smaller homes.
- Allow for multigenerational housing projects – single family with granny units at 16 units per acre. That type of housing can go a long way in meeting housing needs.
- Changes in neighborhoods occur with remodels, landscaping, infill, alterations, and additions – zoning ordinance needs to recognize that.
- City of Santa Barbara R-3 and R-4 districts are good examples of RM districts that provide flexibility and variable density.
- County allowed garage conversions by right so we don't have any ability to regulate these pre-existing conditions. This is particularly a problem because we are a college town.
- Developers are OK with a rental housing affordability requirement.
- DR district was drafted when there was more of a suburban type of development envisioned. This is not longer the case.
- Goleta is alternative to Santa Barbara. Future population likely to be significantly older. Entire south coast an international retirement destination. Opportunity to upgrade housing stock but keep lot sizes small. Allow alterations that are compatible with area.
- Home remodels – need for guidelines on compatible materials, second stories, private views, don't protect but “encourage.”
- Housing market: need for more small lot single family: 3,500 and 4,500; with homes from 1,800 to 2,500 SF; setbacks, one zero lot line – 5 ft. side yard and then 5 ft. to 15 ft between structures.
- If you want to attract housing, allow more density.

- Incentives for rental housing or employer housing would be good. Something like Average Unit Density program in Santa Barbara. Worker housing should not be subject to the inclusionary requirement.
- Mix is better than separate locations for market and affordable units.
- Most purchases of smaller town homes prefer indoor livable area, not outdoor living area, they prefer living well and going out.
- Need forward thinking in 'empty-nester' housing, housing designed for those whose kids are gone and want to stay in Goleta, but don't want so much to maintain. Accommodate people who aren't ready for 'senior housing' but are ready to downsize and have easy access to services, sort of an 'aging in place' concept. It's a great way to use some infill parcels.
- Need to allow for a variety of housing types – apartments, attached housing, small lot subdivisions, townhomes, etc.
- Over time, the university will grow which will put more pressure on single family areas to accommodate more density. It's very hard for single family areas to redevelop to accommodate more density. As a result, eventually we will have to look for new growth areas.
- Residential neighborhoods north of Highway 101: second units, legitimate cause, expanding homes, using them as rental properties. Issue affected by growing UCSB enrollments – problem in residential neighborhoods. Should be a temporary structure that can be removed when no longer needed or justified. Second units respond to a legitimate need, but have unintended consequences. Similar to second story issues.
- Room rentals – City needs to get its Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT).
- Room rentals: set a minimum 14 or 30 day term, not the whole house for 3-day weekends by fraternities.
- Room rentals: single family residential homes being turned into vacation rentals is going to be an issue. Goleta needs to address vacation rentals and needs a 'boarding house' ordinance.
- Second unit standards may be overly restrictive.
- Second units are needed, and the new zoning ordinance should allow for them.
- Set precedent for different forms of housing in new zoning ordinance: recognize importance of integrity of materials. Imported timber, stucco, is ridiculous. Local materials are available.
- Townhomes: 3 bdrm, 1,200 to 1,600 square feet in size; tuck under parking, two story structures. Rear yard 10-15 ft. minimal decks, balconies are not in demand.

LANDSCAPING

- Allow flexibility in providing shading in parking lots through means other than tree canopy.
- Goleta developed with 3-4 foot parkways. Large trees were planted in the parkways which led to buckling sidewalks. Now there is a movement to take large trees out. Many roadways don't have any trees. That has a substantial impact on the character of the community. There either has to be a wider parkway (5 feet) if you want to keep character and the large trees (not possible in all of the areas) or keep the narrow parkways and plant smaller trees. However, smaller trees do not provide same character as large trees.
- Hedges as front barriers need to be defined in the code.
- In many jurisdictions, landscape bonds are typically between 0 and 3 years (except Santa Barbara which requires 5 years for oak trees). Goleta staff put into the conditions of approval that there is a 10-year landscape bond and 5-year graffiti bond. This is excessive. There should be standards, not done on a case-by-case basis.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- Landscape and buildings coverage requirements on suburban model, which may not reflect current reality.
- Landscaping is important. Have requirements for size, materials, and maintenance of landscaping.
- Part of the character of Goleta is suburban. There is a front lawn or some area of landscaping in the front of buildings. This should be retained.
- Promote edible landscaping – Portland is doing this on a 7 acre public park that has an edible landscape. Achieve Beauty, social justice; helps eliminate hunger.
- Support sustainable practices but landscaping should not look like weeds.
- Trees/space: no minimum size; set this in the new zoning ordinance.
- Use native plants in public spaces.

LIGHTING

- Allow only downlight or internal can, halo light.
- Complaints about bright LED that are inside – not regulated, could do through no glare.
- Lighting ordinance – County is just starting on one, City can learn from this.
- No uplighting.
- Site lighting. Dark sky should be goal but this objective doesn't equate with low pole height. If light source is farther away fewer taller poles can provide more light on the ground.
- Zoning concerns: hear from buyers about not enough lighting, particularly uplighting and street lighting, dark streets at night – security issues – address for walkways.

PARKING

- Address parking issues and overcrowding through a residential parking permit program, not through requiring more parking per unit. This is more of an issue in single family neighborhoods so don't address the 'problem' with a broad brush approach.
- Allow developers to put parking wherever they want as long as it's landscaped.
- Allow for parking reductions when parking demand studies support less parking.
- Allow for two-car tandem spaces on small lots, where appropriate. Every house does not need a three car garage.
- Carports for parking can provide transitional space, but relief may be needed if only non-residential.
- Consider having a reduced parking requirement within a certain proximity to transit.
- Current parking requirements are adequate if not more than what is necessary.
- Don't allow parking between street and the building. It does not create an inviting streetscape.
- Don't give a concession if the City is not going to be a beneficiary. Don't give a parking reduction unless the developer is providing in-lieu fees, bike path, public space, or other benefits to the City.
- Don't know if retaining artificially high parking requirements and allowing in-lieu payment to fund public parking is a good approach.
- Don't require parking for peak days of the year, like holidays. That results in too many parking spaces. The requirement is too high.
- Encourage reciprocal parking arrangements – through cross-easements and access.
- EV charging stations – 5 to 10% of all parking spaces.
- Formulate parking requirements based on today's standards.

- Get in-lieu fees for parking where possible. Don't necessarily lower parking requirements, collect fees for the parking people aren't providing and then use those fees for public parking and parking management, especially in Old Town. Observe the rules or provide compensation for bending the rules.
- Greater support of MTD and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) would justify reductions in city-wide standards.
- High parking requirements do not support current thinking of environmental development
- If there automobile access to recreational areas, there must be parking. It may not always be necessary to provide auto access to recreational areas. If there is no auto access, parking is not needed.
- Intentional parking restrictions never result in less cars. Instead, it moves parking to places it wasn't intended it to be.
- Likes idea of parking demand management districts.
- More ZIP cars.
- Over-parking occurs, with adverse effects on costs, the visual appearance of projects and also has stormwater runoff implications.
- Parking is a problem when garages are required because people do not use their garages for parking.
- Parking is currently allowed in front of buildings. Makes you feel like you are in no-mans land. There are some actually very nice buildings but you can't see them because you can't get past the parking.
- Parking location standards (locating parking to the side or behind buildings) are fine to have.
- Parking lots and site circulation: shade trees, separate walkways. City only recognizes wheel stop not a curb overhand – this means you may lose 2 to 2.5 ft. of landscaping unnecessarily..
- Parking lots are not designed well. They are vast areas of asphalt. Require a larger tree canopy.
- Parking reductions: very low income development projects (e.g., SROs) need little to no parking. Maybe just enough parking for staff and a few guests. Very few of these residents own cars.
- Parking requirements are grossly outdated. They need to be updated to today's standards.
- Parking requirements should be related to proximity to services and transit.
- Parking standards are suburban in nature that do not match the needs and demand of development. Senior housing is an example. There is no reduction in parking requirements but the actual demand is less than with other types of residential development.
- Reduce parking requirements. Sharing parking may work. Employees park in front of businesses. Santa Barbara has off-site parking for employees.
- RV parking: some accommodation should be provided for certain types of RVs to be in the side yard, subject to screening, but limits may be appropriate because of fire hazards and privacy concerns.
- Shared use of parking areas should be allowed.
- Standards need to be flexible according to specific uses.)
- Where is the problem for parking? In most places, there is no problem with parking requirements affecting development; in the future, expect less car use with greater transit service, better bike lane system and more walkability.

SIGNS

- Avoid potential for signs becoming outdoor advertising.

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

- Businesses have started placing flag, window signs, and sandwich board signs everywhere. Spell out sign requirements and stick to them.
- Costs of review exceed the cost of an illegal sign, so there is no real incentive to go through the process.
- Current ordinance allows pylon sign, but in fact these should not be allowed.
- Don't prohibit funky signs, OK with variety.
- Existing sign ordinance is too detailed; why should you have to go to DRB for a master sign plan and pay high fees? Why not have pre-approved standards?
- Fees for signs should be nominal amount. Minimal staff time is needed if standards are met.
- Get control of signage! Update signage allowances and have guidelines that support cohesion.
- Like the idea of putting a sign permit # on the sign itself.
- Look at the option of having a separate Sign Committee as in Santa Barbara. It could be a subcommittee of the DRB or director level decision.
- No blinky neon signs!
- No internally illuminated signs, no pole signs, no roof signs, no electronic messaging, only time/temperature signs; no A-frame signs.
- Prohibit all portable signs: human signs, banners. Provide examples of what is expected in sign plans. What is acceptable? No pole signs! Don't allow sign twirrellers!
- Public hearing signs should be 4x8 with large font so that they are visible, perhaps with graphics.
- Require all sign lighting to be on timers.
- Revise the appeal point for sign approvals – most projects are evaluated at preliminary stage but for signs, need to move to final design stage.... So this can be done in one session.
- Seasonal signs: maybe these are OK but be careful – so they do not morph into undesirable signs that stay up all year.
- Sign plans – have a generic sign plan approved by DRB.
- Sign programs –silly to bring them up to the DRB and then to Zoning Administrator, and then back to DRB.
- Sign programs seem to be only for retail.
- Sign programs should be approved at the Staff level..
- Signs meeting program should not have to go back to DRB..
- Signs: need clean-up of standards –address banners and pop-up flags, these are not defined.
- Sizes stipulated may not work. One sign per façade doesn't work for large building. No distinction for large buildings, large and small businesses.
- Temporary signage – have a 30 day permit.
- Temporary signs are a problem; only allow an A-frame sign during hours of operation.
- Too many signs....do not want to degrade community.
- Too much review of shopping center signs.
- Window signs: set a maximum percentage, including interior signs within 3-5 ft. of a window that are clearly oriented to the passerby.

RESOURCE PROTECTION

- Allow for water harvesting.
- Drainage; ESHA and habitat, frogs and butterflies, delicate habitat. All should be addressed.
- Extend coastal policies inland to protect resources; don't allow filling of wetlands.

- Fracking regulations? Only if this is feasible within City limits.
- Many coastal policies should be extended inland, especially ones that protect resources. For example, don't allow filling of wetlands in the inland areas of the City. Because wetlands are isolated, the General Plan allows filling of wetlands. Coastal Zone protections for wetlands should be applied equally throughout the entire city.
- Map critical areas and protect them through zoning.
- Not happy with State stormwater requirements.
- Remnant habitat spaces – not big enough to survive on their own. General Plan wants on-site mitigation for habitat, but community might be better off to have off-site restoration of larger habitats.
- Should be less flexibility in resource protection standards.
- Water table is a big issue; could be sink hole hazards.

SUSTAINABILITY

- Allow for solar structures in parking lots.
- Compel developers to build greener buildings, including solar, xeriscaping, native plants, low flow fixtures, etc.
- Cool cities initiative – why has this not been adopted?
- Dedicated EV charging station – wouldn't hurt.
- Enable more sustainability based on performance.
- Establish “right to research” sustainable land use practice just as there is a “right to farm”.
- Include standards to protect solar access.
- Make new development “solar ready.”
- Make sustainability a key element, not an obstacle.
- Support Low Impact Development (LID) and rainwater harvesting; composting toilets also are coming
- Support passive solar and appropriate technologies for water
- Support solar.
- To be sustainable, avoid being too crowded.

6 Old Town

One topic that was brought up in many interviews was Old Town. Many stakeholders expressed concerns about the need to revise the current regulations that apply to the neighborhood. In general, an overriding concern was that Goleta has the opportunity to create a unified and specific identity for the community, with Old Town becoming the “heart” of the Goleta community with distinct character and special uses.

- Allow mixed-use, less parking, fewer setbacks, more height, and more density.
- Any incentive to improve quality of housing units in Old Town would need to be coupled with an affordable housing requirement.
- Can Goleta create some sort of “Funk Zone” in Old Town? Zoning code should be flexible enough to allow City to facilitate a “Funk Zone”.
- Every project along Hollister should always have a sidewalk in front of it.
- Give some incentives to develop in Old Town (e.g., reduced or waived fees). Have different rules and fees in Old Town in order to attract development there.
- Height limit should be at least 40 feet (if you want to limit development to three stories) or 45 (if there is some allowance for four stories) in order to encourage redevelopment and mixed use. Retain ‘mean’ measurement approach to measuring height.
- If you make Old Town look like today, you lose the character that is from yesterday. Physical redevelopment of Old Town would kill it.
- In Old Town there is a parking problem for residential uses. Commercial uses typically have parking behind buildings.
- In Old Town there just simply is not enough room to accommodate modern standards of development.
- Incentives for property owners to work together on shared parking would be great.
- Industrial uses and finishes not allowed in Old Town although industrial uses adjoin. Should be celebrating the industrial area. Old Town Goleta is the equivalent of the funk zone in Santa Barbara. Celebrate that.
- Keep community character and home-town feel.
- Keep the minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet; maybe increase it.
- Larger theme: how to transform Old Town into a more viable place.
- Lot consolidation is needed to get enough land in order to accommodate development.
- Need greater flexibility to allow development that sense in Old Town. Need to allow more latitude. Until parking problem is solved, can’t do much. Most of the buildings don’t have parking. Until City invests in a parking structure, little will happen. Shared parking and City acquisition of parcels to create parking should be considered.
- Need to consider uniqueness of Old Town.

- Need to create welcoming feeling. Worth looking into standards to make Old Town more pedestrian friendly. Need more community gathering places.
- Old Town - commercial and office areas—form-based standards might work here with less focus on uses.
- Old Town - residential neighborhoods. Some smaller ag sites designated for residential. Any way to get sidewalks in existing developed areas.
- Old Town – have funky murals, community gardens, make it more colorful, invite in cultural organizations; more trees. More mixed use, cottage industries.
- Old Town design guidelines exist but not specific enough. Written as if all of the current businesses could be removed and replaced. Were one to follow guidelines all national tenants would replace local.
- Old Town Goleta is the equivalent of a neighborhood shopping area, it’s not a destination. There is no core to the City.
- Old Town is already built out. In order to revitalize Old Town, consider raising height limit.
- Old Town is not characterized by the highest and best use of land: this is in part because there are not that many major landowners on Hollister.
- Old Town is struggling with issues – don't want to drive people out, but may to have fix it up. It probably is a “Superfund” site.
- Old Town needs more pedestrian and bike amenities and infrastructure.
- Old Town needs more than just a project or two because there is so much blight. The City needs to invest in that area in order to get development.
- Old Town really needs attention.
- Old Town: on small lots, zoned for multiple units, should be able to do a duplex, can’t get parking and two units – maybe allow tandem spaces.
- Parking issues needs to be solved. The Walker report included recommendations for Old Town. City needs to implement that and provide replacement parking.
- Processing should be expedited in Old Town.
- Promote parking on the side or in the interior of blocks.
- Public art in Old Town may encourage infill.
- Require development to be oriented toward the street in Old Town rather than to parking lots. Some stores on Hollister don't have an entrance on Hollister. For example, Carepeteria has a door that faces Hollister but the door is locked. Another example is Sage and Onion. The building is on the corner. However, the building entrance and windows face the parking lot, not either of the streets.
- Residents in Old Town Goleta typically don’t want to change the character. They will be resistant to change.
- There should be lower parking requirements in Old Town.
- Wide streets and low buildings do not create a sense of place. Higher buildings can help create a sense of place, especially in Old Town.

7 Other Specific Areas of Concern

Stakeholders shared many comments about multiple specific issues. Many comments were about affordable housing, which is also an important topic in the Housing Element Update that is being done concurrently, as well as the parking situation and current parking standards in the city. Other stakeholder comments addressed the airport, the coastal zone, community character, creeks, and mobility, sustainability, and urban agriculture. Some liked affordable housing overlay zones; others said why not have this program be citywide.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- Actual parking demand in affordable housing is less than the current requirement. Between one and 1.5 spaces per unit is adequate. Santa Barbara requires 1 space per unit plus 6 spaces.
- Buellton has set aside areas in affordable housing overlays. This helps affordable housing because appropriate locations are identified ahead of time.
- Developers, including affordable housing developers, need certainty in the regulations and the process.
- Do need to have a certain number of units to make a project feasible. Reducing density can make development infeasible. Affordable housing projects are usually between 35 and 40 units in order to help be competitive for tax credits and to make the project pencil out.
- If you have a mixed-use ordinance, be cognizant of how affordable housing fits in. It's difficult to make mixed-use projects pencil out, especially for a nonprofit developer.
- In-lieu fee option for inclusionary housing helps give flexibility in location of housing and where fees are directed.
- Lompoc's review process for affordable housing is very straightforward. The fewer number of review bodies that a project needs to go through helps streamline the process and supports affordable housing.
- More affordable housing!
- Parking requirements for affordable housing should be reduced. Affordable housing residents are not typical residents. They are making 60% or less of median income. Knee jerk reaction is that you need two parking spaces per unit. If affordable housing developments provide two parking spaces per unit, many parking spaces remain empty.
- People's Self Help Housing is supportive of continuing the inclusionary requirement. It supports service industry workers, farmworkers, and others that depend on PSSH. Developers often turn over their requirement to PSSH. That way, the requirement but the developers don't need to do the heavy lifting.
- Providing affordable housing avoids overcrowding because one family can afford the unit rather than multiple families having to pool resources in order to pay rent.

- Santa Barbara recently created the “priority housing overlay” which helps to reduce development risk because the city has already identified areas that are prioritized for affordable housing. The city also did an EIR over a large area with a master traffic study. If you develop within that area, no traffic study is required. This is helpful.
- Whatever the process is, getting the requirements to the developers early in the process is helpful.
- Why have an affordable housing overlay? Why not promote affordable housing citywide?
- With the affordable housing projects there is an on-site manager, so there is the ability to manage parking and address any issues.

AIRPORT

- Airport expansion is an issue. Didn't initially involve City. Latest configuration will cause large area of city to become nonconforming because of conflict with the Airport Land Use Commission plan. Interested in how the new zoning ordinance will deal with airport conflict issues.
- Airport environs: the City has a good cooperative relationship with the City of Santa Barbara Airport on noise and disclosure for uses on the perimeter of the airport.
- Airport safety zones: Old Town and La Patera areas, hotel use probably better than residential (
- Airport management is opposing residential development nearby because of hazards and noise impacts.
- Airport over flight zone: review and update it.
- At the end of the Airport runway, some storage space for RVs and similar needs may be a reasonable use.

COASTAL ZONE

- Coastal access: dilemma on getting there, but don't always want full vehicular access,
- Coastal bluff setback issues should be addressed.
- Coastal bluffs to the west present a particular zoning issue – PUDs seem to not have enough parking, so spillover onto city streets
- Coastal bluffs: be reasonable about what the rules are – don't call a golf cup on a green a “structure”. This makes no sense and prevents golf course development that could be modeled on the Links at Spanish Bay up at Pebble Beach or the Scottish courses.
- Coastal Zone;; overall impressions, glad of extra scrutiny that CCC can give a project.
- County looked into amortization – ability to remove the Ellwood Facility, this would provide coastal access.
- Get the LCP certified by the Coastal Commission so that there is more local control over decisions.
- Have the Coastal Zone standards within the zoning ordinance, but with separate columns if standards are different
- Many land uses that are not consistent with LCP and CCC process – administrative citations – only had this authority in last six months.
- Support coastal access.

COMMUNITY CHARACTER

- Goleta does not have the public spaces that it needs. Camino Marketplace acts as de facto public gathering place.
- Goleta needs to have its own identity. The City is very linear and bifurcated by Hwy 101. There is not a lot of cohesion.
- Goleta's environment and climate attracts businesses to the area. The best way zoning can attract business is by protecting the environment.
- Highway 101 is a challenge to unity the City. This could also be used as an opportunity to give a visual clue of the City, to let people know that there is something there to attract them off the highway.
- How to preserve character building elements? What is "off-limits"?
- More focus on design goals is necessary. Goleta has its own interesting agricultural roots. That could be manifested in architecture and help create sense of place.
- Neighborhoods should be preserved.
- Protecting character – allow home occupations but no guns
- There is nothing to let people know whether they are in City, County, or Santa Barbara. Do something to let people know they are in Goleta and gives Goleta a sense of place. One mechanism is to have street signs that are designed specific to Goleta.
- Viability of a community is supported good circulation

CREEKS

- Conservation Element Policy 2.2 requires a creek setback of 100 feet. That policy allows for reductions where a 100 foot setback is infeasible. The City always reduces setback without justifying the reduction. The policy is not being implemented in a way that meets the intent. The City doesn't make the necessary findings.
- Creek setback requirements may need to be made larger in AG Zones.
- In order to make a larger creek setback feasible, allow a credit or allowance to relocate the developed area. For example, reduce parking, reduce the front setback, or allow an additional story.
- Infeasibility means precluding use of parcel, resulting in a taking. City should be required to get financial information from applicant to determine if there is a taking. Only if there is a taking should the City reduce the creek setback.
- Open space in projects could be used to help protect creek habitats.
- Stream protection zones policy in Plan allows for reduction to less than 100 feet. Basis for reduction unclear.
- The 100 feet creek setback is inadequate; it should be increased. It does not provide enough habitat.
- There should be allowance for some public use within the 100 foot creek setback. There should be some allowance for permeable development within the setback.
- There should be some incentives for infill development, but creek protection should be continued.

MOBILITY

- Goleta is impacted by a transportation system that is not well understood, compared to Santa Barbara.
- Hollister is the main arterial, with Cathedral Oaks functioning as a secondary arterial, but it has no transit service.
- Impacts to traffic circulation resulting in LOS D going to F.
- Mobility LOS is needed rather than just moving cars. Ordinance should make clear that multiple modes need to be accommodated.
- Transportation alternatives for employees. May need to include more trip reduction requirements and incentives in the new zoning ordinance.

8 Technical Issues

In addition to the major themes discussed, stakeholders had many other comments to share on diverse topics, ranging from the city's boundary to a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

Those comments listed under the last heading of "Other Comments" were the only comments made on a topic but are included here to ensure that all stakeholder concerns mentioned during interviews were included in this report.

BICYCLES

- Bike spaces – like City of Santa Barbara facilities with loops, covered, but having them secure is not as important, but good idea.
- Need nexus for bike lanes.
- No development should go in without some accommodation for a bike path.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

- The City's Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), as detailed in the General Plan, need to have special treatment in the zoning ordinance.
- Recognize City's dual role of managing municipal resources and implementing CIPs and administering the zoning ordinance.
- There will be push back on special rules for CIPs. Be prepared.

CITY BOUNDARY

- A prohibition on expanding urban/rural boundary may incentivize infill development.
- Agricultural parcels should not be included in urban zoning. They should be outside of urban rural boundary.
- The City should have stable urban rural boundary that is different from City boundary. Bishops Ranch is in urban boundary but it should be out of the urban boundary.
- SB 375: firm boundaries are part this mandate. Build this idea into the ordinance.

NOISE

- Noise: look at noise impacts from industrial uses when they are adjacent to multi-family or single-family, with reasonable time limits for compliance.
- Noise: CNEL is a 24 hour standard; the zoning ordinance should have a nighttime noise standard.
- Set construction noise limits – time and also dBA- conditions of approval

NONCONFORMANCE

- Address the problem of pre-existing nonconforming uses and buildings and do not create new nonconformities.
- Be careful of creating nonconforming development. Don't create hardships, especially for residential development.
- Nonconforming provisions are unclear.
- Where you are keeping R-1 zoning, don't create unnecessary nonconforming.

NUISANCES

- A lot of times people are exposed to things that they don't know can be harmful. Think about zoning in a way that reduces the chance of people to be exposed to pollutants. There is an oil and gas processing facility in the City with the potential to cause pollutants and there is a recreational use and a hotel near it.
- Density can create nuisances. When people live in denser circumstances, they don't necessarily give up what they like to do when they lived with more space (BBQ, fireplaces, etc). With density, impacts occur that would not happen in a lower density area. If you have more density, you may need to see about changing people's behavior and limit things such as firepits, pets, etc..
- Incompatible land uses create nuisances. For example, a restaurant with pizza oven caused an odor nuisance with adjacent office use. And, a pet grooming home occupation caused a traffic issue.
- Number of pets in residential uses is a nuisance issue that needs to be addressed in the ordinance.

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TDR) PROGRAM

- City has always been opposed to multi-jurisdictional TDR program. The City could participate in a multi-jurisdictional TDR program that could bring some development pressure off Gaviota coast. It would increase density in the City but could protect other areas. Santa Barbara has said they would participate as well.
- The Environmental Defense Center would only support an increase in density if there is a transfer of development rights from areas that are more environmentally sensitive.

VIEWS

- Along Hollister Avenue and 101, the issue of view protection needs to be reconsidered. It should be better defined and evaluated to see if it's even practical.
- General Plan view corridor policy is ridiculous—Projects can't block view of hills from passing cars on Hollister Ave and passing trains.
- General Plan requires maintenance of view corridors, which will prevent implementation of hotel overlay that allows greater height. Bringing buildings along Hollister up to property line would also conflict with view corridors policy. Is preservation of views important in urban corridor? Maybe this is where flexibility comes into play.
- Protecting views is important in but it's a slippery slope and needs to be clearly defined. Any time you build a building, you are blocking someone's view. There should be clear standards.
- Set out standards – deal with view shed issues – not amorphous language, be clear: what is a view corridor, how to translate the policy into the zoning ordinance – don't leave it up to interpretation.

OTHER COMMENTS:

- “Don’t give up on common sense.” Keep that in mind.
- A pure Planned Development district would be great.
- Area north of Hollister to City limits. Lots of different uses but no planning. General Plan concentrated on what was there and what had happened before not what it should be. Convinced Council area should be changed to residential. Business owners in area objected. With a new zoning ordinance, we can say uses that are there can remain, but use the new ordinance as opportunity to explore what can be done in future.
- At the Air Pollution Control District, all rules that are adopted and permit conditions that went in place had to go through enforcement review to ensure that the rule can be enforced. There has to be measurable ways to determine if something is enforced.
- Pay attention to grading, particularly in flood zone.
- Stormwater requirements: be more stringent than State regulations. The ordinance should not include specifics but it should refer to City’s “Stormwater Management Plan” equivalent.
- Current regulations perpetuate a suburban quality of development.
- Feasibility is difficult to define.
- Geography: big factor, affects runoff, goes into ocean, creeks, expensive to take care of.
- Geological hazard evaluation. Maps at counter may need to be updated. Require additional information with applications.
- Natural threats: earthquakes, fire, tsunami, rising sea levels (Goleta Beach controversy).
- Need more community participation. Upgrade while allowing people who live there to remain there. Avoid gentrification. Upzoning only along Hollister.
- REACH Code – This is setting standard that is greater than Title 24.
- Remember what Yoga Bera said: “No one goes to that business, its too busy.”
- World Health Organization: air pollution causes cancer – 500 ft separation for housing is needed along freeways to protect residents.

Appendix A: List of Stakeholders Interviewed

The following list includes all stakeholders interviewed, excluding City staff.

Adomaitis, Vyto	Marshall, Ken
Anderson, Ginger	Massey, Barbara
Benevedo, Morgan	Miller, Kristen
Bennett, Michael	Onnen, Eric
Bilsten, Ellen	Piekert, Detty
Bradley, Kip	Plowman, Lisa
Brown, Cecilia	Poirer, Paul
Brown, Peter	Relles, George
Carman, Jennifer	Rosin, Carla
Connell, Margaret	Schizas, Kim
Daniels, Brent	Shelor, Bill
Dressler, Terry	Towbes, Michael
Easton, Ed	Trautwein, Brian
Farr, Jim	Wagner, Steve
Giles, Tim	Wells, Owen
Greig, Steve	Werner, Ben
Haggard, Ken	West, Meg
Knight, Ken	White, Troy
Kushnerov, Valerie	
Lauletta, David	
Manson-Hing, Chris	