

**From:** [Deborah Lopez](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk Group](#)  
**Subject:** FW: public comment on Nov. 5 Council agenda  
**Date:** Monday, November 04, 2019 11:36:24 AM  
**Attachments:** [comment to City 11-5-19.docx](#)

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Victor Cox [<mailto:vic.cox.freelance@gmail.com>]  
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2019 11:08 AM  
To: Deborah Lopez <[dlopez@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:dlopez@cityofgoleta.org)>  
Subject: public comment on Nov. 5 Council agenda

Hi Deborah,

Hope you had a great Halloween. Attached is our comment for circulation to Mayor and Councilmembers.

Thank for your help.

Vic & Inge

Nov. 3, 2019 DRAFT

Esteemed Mayor Perotte and Goleta Councilmembers,

Comments on Item # B1 And B2

Why is Council allowing so little time for the residents to understand the staff-proposed wholesale changes to city rules for buildings, governance structures and what's left of the City's environmentally important open space? Staff has changed the order and content of the NZO making it very difficult to understand.

The package approach to changing the building codes is premature in our opinion since some of the new rules seem to hinge on yet to be approved changes in relevant ordinances (the NZO). Why the rush to meet apparently artificial deadlines without understanding all the work done by the Planning Commission?

Also, in our experience, every time staff pushes for quick decisions from Council the results are not beneficial to most Goletans, especially those with lower-incomes. Go across Los Carneros Ave. from City Hall and see what too much housing crammed into too small an area looks like. This is why more time and thought are needed on these decisions. Ask yourselves why doesn't the City require every new development to have adequate open space for residents?

Another example is the (so far as I know) park playground equipment gathering dust in the former Direct Relief warehouse (or somewhere) because rushed, inadequate planning resulted in the purchase of these items with no detailed plan or preparation for where these items were to be situated. The Parks Master Plan calls for each and every park scheduled for change to be done in an inclusive, thorough manner before starting the changes. However, it will be up to Council to make that happen.

Multiple contradictions exist in the "final" NOP draft. For example:

Section 17.30.050 Development Standards: Why is it that a required buffer of at least 100 feet is not mentioned?

D. States new development must not degrade water quality.....lagoons, creeks, wetlands BUT the buffer can be reduced by the "Review Authority." If only one person can make this happen it goes against tradition as well as what is wanted in Goleta.

Section 17.30.060 Makes an exception for the use of insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers within a 100 foot ESHA. Use of these chemicals will damage the ESHA not enhance it.

Section 17.30.070 B The Review Authority may increase or decrease the width of the Streamside Protection Area (SPA) at the time of environmental review. One person should NOT have the power to increase or decrease a requires SPA area. It has to go in front of the Planning Commission and/or City Council.

There are many other ordinary citizens like us who believe we've have had too much density added to Goleta's existing infrastructure at the expense of open space and green areas, and that it's time to pause and think about where we're going so rapidly. At the least, We'd like to see the Council have a rigorous debate on Goleta's future-- before it's too late.

Thank you for listening.

Vic & Inge Cox  
Goleta resident since 1983