

From: [Andy Newkirk](#)
To: [Andy Newkirk](#)
Subject: FW: Statement re: Zoning Ordinance
Date: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 8:44:42 AM

From: april reid <aprilreid@live.com>
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2019 8:57 PM
To: Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Statement re: Zoning Ordinance

Dear Ms. Wells:

I was born and raised in Goleta, CA. Please include my comments with the other public comments for the new Zoning Ordinance.

Attached are a few final requests regarding the final Zoning Ordinance:

17.01.040- Implement a sunset clause that would encourage developers to finish their projects, i.e. December 2021 or some time near that date. Otherwise, developers can wait decades to finish their plans under the old Zoning Ordinance without any motivation to finish. In fact, some projects have already been around for over a decade with no end in sight. It is important to build as many new developments as possible with the values of the Goleta citizens as defined in the new Zoning Ordinance.

17.30.120- The buffer for creeks should be at least 100 feet, if not more. The Kenwood Village Development is proposing 60 units (13 single units, 20 duplexes and 27 triplexes) on approximately 10 acres next to El Encanto Creek. However, the developer's own environmental report states that there are endangered species living in the creek. Despite this, the developer is proposing building much less than 100 feet from the El Encanto Creek. Building close to the creeks can harm the endangered species. Waivers and/or exceptions for developers who want to build closer than 100 feet should either be eliminated or strongly discouraged. In the past, waivers have been given out to developers easily. Once the endangered animals are gone, they can not be brought back. So, it is vital that we are proactive in protecting these animals.

17.30.150- It is also vital that we protect rare plants and shrubs from being destroyed by removing them to make way for large duplexes and triplexes, like the Kenwood Village proposal, which, if approved, would actively remove and eliminate rare shrubs.

17.38.040- Under multiple-unit developments, I would propose the following: a. Keep the studio and one bedroom units at 2 spaces per unit; b. Change the two or more bedroom requirement from two spaces per unit to 1 unit per family unit, meaning if a developer wants to develop 27 triplexes, as in the Kenwood Village Project, then the developer must have 81,

or 27 x 3, parking spaces, one for each family unit; c. Require one additional guest parking space for every 2 units. This way, the developer would be responsible for the parking spaces in their own developments. Otherwise, the residents will be parking on the neighbors' streets. Unfortunately, at this time, most family units will have at least one vehicle. In fact, on my street alone, to the best of my knowledge, I am the only person who has only one vehicle, every one else has at least two, if not more. Without parking, my neighbors park on the street and some park in front of my house as it is. If the developers do not create sufficient parking for the residence, the problem will not simply go away. It will flow over into the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

April Reid
Goleta resident