



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Thursday, April 18, 2019**

6:00 PM  
City Hall  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California

***Members of the Planning Commission***

*Jennifer R. Smith, Chair  
Robert K. Miller, Vice Chair  
Ed Fuller, Commissioner  
Katie Maynard, Commissioner  
Bill Shelor, Commissioner*

*Peter Imhof, Secretary  
Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney  
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

**CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Smith at 6:00 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Present: Chair Smith, Commissioner Fuller, Commissioner Maynard  
Commissioner Shelor  
Absent: Vice Chair Miller

Staff present: Peter Imhof, Director of Planning and Environmental Review; Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; J. Ritterbeck, Senior Planner; David Pierucci, Counsel, with Best, Best & Krieger; Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney; and Deborah Lopez, City Clerk.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

Speakers:  
John Profant expressed opposition to any ordinance that would prevent a citizen from parking an RV on their own property. Mr. Profant noted the City has allowed developers

to repurpose the only available RV parking in the City while the closest alternative for parking would be Bakersfield.

Dean Young agreed with John Profant's comments noting there is no place to park an RV in the City. Mr. Young commented that most citizens have had RVs parked in their neighborhoods the day they moved into their homes and this did not cause an effect on housing prices or health and safety. He asked what is driving the regulations. Mr. Young concluded that without RV parking it reduces RV values if trying to sell in this county.

Cris Wood, a Santa Barbara County resident since 1977, noted that parking for RVs, boats and trailers has always been allowed. She noted that this has been a working-class community and people have trailers for their businesses that include lawn care, landscape maintenance, construction; as well as RVs and boats. Ms. Wood suggested the City not get involved in personal property rights and not prohibit items from being stored on their property if it is legal and not unsafe.

Cecilia Brown, of the Goodland Coalition, announced a forum on April 25, 2019, at 6:30 P.M. regarding the New Zoning Ordinance at the Goleta Library.

Scott Clark, a 20-year Goleta resident, expressed concerns on the City changing topics of tonight's New Zoning Ordinance meeting on short notice. Mr. Clark expressed appreciation to City staff for their work on the public comments and the proposed ordinance. Mr. Clark expressed concern with the last Planning Commission workshop where 4 members of the public seem to sway the Planning Commission against RVs, boats and campers parked in driveways. Mr. Clark urged the Planning Commission to research the amount of work that was put into this draft ordinance. Mr. Clark had in his possession a petition from 3 years ago with 371 signatures, and he noted another petition would be coming soon. Mr. Clark pointed out residents do not want to be the subject of Home Owners Association type laws. Mr. Clark mentioned the City of Buellton's RV friendly ordinance, and urged the Planning Commission to recommend a similar ordinance.

Andy Eggendorfer, a 57-year Goleta resident, spoke on a survey he had taken and found many homes had motorhomes, boats, RVs, and trailers in the driveways. Mr. Eddendorfer noted a high number of people would be forced to find parking, most of which would be very expensive. Mr. Eggendorfer urged the Planning Commission to think about how the proposed ordinance would affect residents. He and his wife use the RV to visit their grandchildren and having a place to stay. Mr. Eggendorfer noted parking RVs and trailers would not harm housing prices. He questioned the reason for restrictions and noted there may be a large number of complaints from one person.

Craig Buzzell, a Goleta resident since 1973, expressed concerns with the last Planning Commission meeting where he felt resentment towards notifying people about what was going to happen. Mr. Buzzell noted several RVs, campers, and boats parked in his own neighborhood, and the investment value of those vehicles. He observed approximately 7

boats and outdoor recreational vehicles that have been purchased by the owners. He hopes the discussion can continue with information previously gathered.

Ken Lewis, expressed concerns with meetings being moved around, and the lack of public notification making it difficult for the public to come and comment at the correct meeting.

Jimmy Rowe, a Goleta resident since 1968, and home owner, bought a house in Goleta over 6 years ago in order to keep an RV in his driveway. Mr. Rowe noted the proposed setback changes will cause him and others undue financial hardship. He agreed with today's public comments regarding RV storage.

Johnny DiBenedetto, a Goleta resident since 1980, and has had a boat on his property since 1992, noted many residents cannot pay to store a boat. Mr. DiBenedetto asked what is driving the proposed ordinance change that would prohibit boat parking within a driveway.

Angela Tripp echoed the previous speaker and noted she was a volunteer on the Goleta Now Committee which pushed incorporation of the City of Goleta. Ms. Rowe expressed concern over the proposed regulations and urged due thought. Ms. Tripp noted her family keeps a truck camper on their property in order to travel and pointed out that they can visit family and park next to a house as opposed to paying for a hotel.

Rich Eickert, a Goleta resident since 1965, expressed opposition to the proposed regulations and noted there are Homeowners Associations people can move into if they don't like having to see boats, RVs and trailers in the driveways as opposed to driving everybody out that has had boats on their property for decades.

Kathy Elizalde, a Goleta resident for over 50 years, commented that about fifteen years ago, her neighbor bought an RV and her three main windows look out at this RV which she does not like; however, she believes people have the right to keep their vehicles on the property they own. Ms. Elizalde noted the neighbor also has a boat and land terrain vehicles in the front yard.

Kirk Sloan, an RV and jet ski owner spoke in favor of being able to park an RV, boat, or trailer on private property within the front setback noting Goleta the Goodland has historically been welcoming and family-friendly which has many facets this is historically included various types of family-friendly recreation and the equipment that might be involved including vehicles a working people use to earn a living. Mr. Sloan commented to disallow the ability to economically store trailers or motor homes, would constitute a serious taking of financial, convenience, peace of mind, and enjoyment. Mr. Sloan noted he felt like he was the victim of gentrification. Mr. Sloan stated concerns with compliance would be complaint driven, and he mentioned the unpleasant reality that most neighbors would know who the complainants would be, and it encourages complaints against any owner that has unpermitted or non-code improvements on their property.

**A. PUBLIC WORKSHOP**

**A.1 Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance – Height (recap); Floor Area; Fences, Freestanding Walls, and Hedges; Outdoor Storage; Open Space; and Lighting**

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 7 --Staff Report](#)

[A.1 NZO PC Workshop 7 -- PRESENTATION](#)

[A.1 PC NZO Workshop 7 -- COMMENTS 35-39](#)

Staff Speakers:

Peter Imhof, Planning and Environmental Review Director

Winnie Cai, Assistant City Attorney

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager

Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner

Jay Ritterbeck, Senior Planner

Shannon McAlpine, Planning and Environmental Review Intern

The staff report was presented by Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager; Andy Newkirk, Senior Planner; and J. Ritterbeck; including a PowerPoint presentation entitled, “City of Goleta Revised Draft New Zoning Ordinance, Planning Commission Workshop 7 of 9, Presentation by: Peter Imhof, Anne Wells, Andy Newkirk, J. Ritterbeck, April 18, 2019”.

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that Workshop #8 will be held on April 23, 2019, and Workshop #9 will be held on May 9, 2019. In addition, a Joint Planning Commission/City Council Workshop will be held on May 7, 2019.

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, stated that interested persons may sign up to receive email notices of workshops and other pertinent information regarding the New Zoning Ordinance on the City’s website at [www.cityofgoleta.org](http://www.cityofgoleta.org) and also on the New Zoning Ordinance website at [www.goletazoning.com](http://www.goletazoning.com).

After each topic was presented, staff responded to questions from the Planning Commission, then public comment was accepted, followed by Planning Commission discussion and deliberation on the topic.

**TOPIC: HEIGHT**

**Public Comment: Height**

Lorcan Drew, V.P., Watermark Capitol Partners, LLC, the owner of Ritz Carlton Bacara, noted that a more detailed letter has been submitted. Mr.

Drew spoke regarding concerns that there are several areas in the New Zoning Ordinance which the Bacara would not meet. Specifically, the new measurement in height could result in some buildings exceeding the height limit together with the treatment of the projections, chimneys, elevators, stair housing and architectural features. Also, the new ordinance would potentially require more parking not presently required or needed by the hotel. Mr. Drew expressed concern that the new legal non-conforming section would adversely affect the hotel if there was damage to any building, noting if there was damage the owners would want to rebuild quickly without having to go through an approval process. He pointed out that the legal non-conforming provisions are not clear with regard to how it would apply to property with multiple buildings. Mr. Drew stated they look forward to working together to find solutions to ensure the New Zoning Ordinance does not adversely impact the hotel.

Barbara Massey commented that height modifications should only be allowed to increase up to 10% or 2 feet, whichever is less. Ms. Massey also commented that under no condition should the 50% increase in height be permitted, and stated she believes those who support the increases in height would be those who profit from the development that ruins the quality of life. Ms. Massey commented that the area at Storke and Hollister is already ruined by increases in heights.

Ken Alker commented noted that he wrote a letter to Commissioner Maynard after a meeting in March, 2019, indicating he does not think it is right to restrict the height of houses to 25 feet because he thinks would make for some unattractive two-story houses with some non-gabled, flat, roofs. When it comes to height, he believes people will choose function over form to get the size of home they need which will result in compromises that will not be architecturally appealing. He attached an example of a 2-story home with a 9-foot ceiling to a letter he wrote on May 27, 2016, which is attached to the letter he sent to Commissioner Maynard. Mr Alker stated that his property is located in a DR zone which has a 35-foot height standard and noted his goal is to retain the 35-foot standard at least for the DR zone and eliminating the need to go through the process of height modification. Mr. Alker also made suggestions to consider an overlay allowing the 35-foot standard for DR zones, or to allow anybody with a certain size property to have a higher height which is important in zones such as DR where there is agriculture and the need for barns and utilities.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox agreed with comments by Barbara Massey, public speaker. Dr. Cox believes there should be an opportunity for the public to appeal one step higher for Zoning Administrator decisions, to the City Council.

## Height questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:

1. Is there consensus on the new height methodology?

Commissioner Fuller: Yes

Commissioner Maynard: Yes

Commissioner Shelor stated he likes the direction but is concerned about the 50% height modification, and noted the measurement appears to be fine.

Chair Smith agreed.

2. Any change to the “up to 50%” height Modification?

Commissioner Fuller commented that there are several examples of 3-story complexes that have been built in the past 15 years that do not conform with the old character of Goleta. He would be comfortable with a 30' height limit in single-family zones that allows for architectural diversity. He would like to recommend 30' throughout Goleta as the height limit.

Commissioner Shelor believes the community is concerned about building heights. He noted the importance of story poles. He questioned how the height of the building pad fits with the height of the buildings to go on the pad. He is concerned about the build-up of the pad for the building and the potential it could be subject to manipulation.

Commissioner Maynard recommended going back to the last version of the zoning ordinance with regard to chimneys and decorative structures, etc., and use the language “20% of base district height” as opposed to “20% of structure” to address her concern about the potential for layering of the exceptions.

Commissioner Maynard supports a 30% maximum on Modifications because it involves a high level of review, and not a 50% maximum. She could consider a 20% maximum height.

Commissioner Maynard supports going back to the transitional standards.

Chair Smith would be open to considering bringing some of the transitional standards into the ordinance.

Chair Smith does not support a 50% maximum on Modifications. She noted that 20-30% may be acceptable. She commented that over time as the community builds out and with the continued need to meet RHNA numbers, there may be a need to look at increasing densities in certain areas where some of these Modifications may be appropriate. She does not believe the community would support a 50% height Modification.

Commissioner Fuller supports bringing back transitional standards and noted it created a more enjoyable aesthetic for the community. He supports a maximum 20% height Modification. Also, he has concerns with a 35-maximum height and 3 story buildings in neighborhoods.

Commissioner Maynard clarified that the letter received from Ken Alker has been shared with the Planning Commissioners and is part of the public record.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering a higher maximum percent increase in height for smaller buildings and a lower maximum percentage increase in height for larger buildings.

Chair Smith could support a higher percentage maximum height increase for smaller buildings and looking more closely at the 35-foot standard.

Commissioner Fuller suggested going with the 25-foot height limits and 35-foot height limits to be in conformance with the General Plan but limit the modifications to 30% for single-family and 20% for multi-family.

Commissioner Maynard commented that the 30% height Modification would require an extra review.

Commissioner Shelor expressed concern that the height Modification could result in higher second-story homes than currently exist.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he supports giving some flexibility to single-family homeowners with the maximum up to 30% height Modification and noted that an approval would be dependent on the discretion of the reviewing body.

Commissioner Maynard requested staff restudy the issue regarding how chimneys are measured.

After deliberation, the Planning Commissioners summarized that there is an interest in allowing height modifications, not up to 50% as drafted, and possibly somewhere between 20% and 30%.

3. Are there other height issues within this area that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Maynard suggested consideration about the height of trees around a property and some factors to think about if considering higher height modifications.

Commissioner Shelor requested staff consider what additional structures would be placed on rooftop open space.

Commissioner Fuller suggested possibly making a special exception for pre-existing approved Development Plans and exempt them from non-conformance through the ordinance.

## **TOPIC: FLOOR AREA**

### **Public Comment:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox commented that with the new changes, garages can become habitable space.

### **Questions for consideration by Planning Commission:**

#### **Floor Area questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Are there issues within this area that need to be discussed?

Commissioner wanted to make sure there are no unintended consequences.

Commission Fuller believes the proposed standards are an improvement in measurement and recommended clarification that garage spaces are not habitable space and are separate.

Commissioner Fuller commented that the proposed standards are an improvement in measurement and definitions. Also, measuring stair wells and elevator shafts once is appropriate because they are underneath the roof and are not used for habitable space.

Commissioner Maynard commented that the more consistency with the language used in the California Building Code and the architectural industry would be better rather the creating definitions.

Commissioner Fuller stated that his understanding is there are separate codes in other jurisdictions for garages that do not meet standards for habitable space, and garages are not usually considered habitable



space in the real estate and architectural industries. He noted that garages may have less protection from the elements and are subject to fumes.

Commissioner Maynard initially encouraged garages as habitable space. She later commented that if garages are not counted as habitable space in industry, then garages should not be counted as habitable space unless converted as habitable space; however, it may be challenging if it is not known during construction whether it will be converted.

## **TOPIC: FENCES, FREESTANDING WALLS & HEDGES**

### **Public Comment:**

Barbara Massey commented that fences, freestanding walls, and hedges should be no higher than 4 feet on the front and side setbacks. She recommended lowering the current 6 feet standard to 4 feet for safety reasons so drivers will have adequate visibility when pulling out of a driveway and at intersections. Ms. Massey noted that today she measured cars to see how high the driver sits off the ground at intersections and measured an average that is between 4 and 4.5 feet. She commented that it would be great if the fences were set away from driveways and intersections, although that would make it more complicated to rule.

Ken Alker stated that he owns a commercial property on Hollister Avenue and has hedges on the front along Hollister which are about 8 feet in height. The hedges serve to screen the building and parking from the street and the neighbors across the street. Also, vandalism has stopped since the hedges have grown taller. Mr. Alker thinks there is an advantage for having the hedges taller, and noted his property is in a commercial district.

Dr. Ingeborg Cox noted that chain link fences are being utilized as a wall by a lot of houses that face open spaces. She expressed concern that a wall with the finished side facing an open space would encourage graffiti and a wall would also impair vision when police are patrolling, noting that police would be able to shine a light through a chain link fence at night and see beyond the fence. Dr. Cox questioned whether people would need to replace chain link fences and requested consideration be given to what the financial burden would be for the residents or whether the City would bear the cost. Dr. Cox noted she visited more than 3 sites and observed chain link fences facing open space at all of these sites.

### **Fences, Freestanding Walls & Hedges questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. The NZO carries forward the existing standards. Is this the right approach for fences and walls?

Commissioner Maynard supports a height restriction on the front of the property and a limit of 4 feet within a residential area on the street side of the property. She noted that a light can be shined over 4 feet and that 4 feet can be looked over. Also, a 4-foot height is more welcoming.

Chair Smith stated she could support an adjustment to the standards with the understanding that existing fences would be non-conforming.

Commissioner Fuller supports requiring a counter permit for a fence, wall, or hedge over 3 feet for safety purposes and allowing Public Works the opportunity to review.

Commissioner Shelor expressed concern about the potential for 6-foot walls adjoining on adjacent multiple lots in residential areas that would result in the walling off of properties from the public right-of-way. He commented if aesthetics are taken into account, 6 feet may be too tall given the possibility of adjoining lots. He suggested consideration that a tall wall, fence, or hedge might be more appropriate if it is set back from the public right-of-way.

Commissioner Fuller commented that he has observed a 6-foot fence along the property line around a front yard and noted it is not a very attractive feature for the neighborhood and would seem to disassociate the property from the community and degrading the aesthetics of the neighborhood. He is not totally in favor of having a lower standard for fencing in the front yard, but he suggested having some communal landscaping in the front yard along with possibly a 3- to 4-foot tall fence at the property line and then also allow a 6-foot fence wall for privacy with a 10-15 foot landscaped setback. He believes the communal landscaping in Goleta adds to the aesthetics in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Maynard suggested allowing 4 feet in height for fencing for the front and street side, and 6 to 8 feet in height on the back and internal area between properties without requiring CUPs or excessive permitting.

Chair Smith could support at least 4 feet in height for fencing in the front yard when considering safety and the purpose of the fencing.

Member Shelor supports at least a 3.5-foot height for fencing in front yards for safety purposes with an additional height in an amount that is appropriate.

2. Should the NZO introduce standards for hedges that effectively treat them as fences/walls?

Commissioner Maynard would encourage including hedges as fences but potentially allowing for much a higher height limit in Commercial and Industrial zoning with a minor permit such as a Zoning Clearance, and keeping the hedges at the height of fences in Residential zones.

Chair Smith supports in general the direction staff is moving with regard to hedges. She noted there could be creative structures or planting that could create issues.

Commissioner Maynard requested clarification with regard to the definition of a hedge and suggested adding cactus.

Chair Smith commented that the definition seems to include cactus.

3. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Fuller suggested adding a reference to Section 17.03.090 Measuring Height of Fence in this section.

Commissioner Fuller recommended adding language to require that slats are placed on the outside of freestanding fences.

Commissioner Maynard commented that there should be a consistency between the Inland and Coastal zones with regard to the vision triangle.

Recess held from 8:37 to 8:45 p.m.

## **TOPIC: OUTDOOR STORAGE**

### **Public Speakers**

Barbara Massey spoke in support of a 72-hour time limit for temporary storage of construction materials, the same as for other materials. Ms. Massey commented that the NZO language in Section 17.24.130 states the 72-hour time limit does not apply to temporary storage of construction materials, and she would like the 72-hour limit to be the same for construction materials. Ms. Massey requested that a number be applied for vision clearance and visibility standards with regard to outdoor storage. With

regard to question #1, she believes the restrictions are not strict enough and people should not be allowed to turn their front yards into storage facilities.

Ken Alker questioned whether there is a problem that exists that the restrictions are trying to resolve and also whether the restrictions are necessary, particularly in commercial district; however, residential areas may be appropriate. Mr. Alker also commented that there might be some specific situations that are being missed with regard to outdoor storage regulations, as the language seems general. He suggested language that will not require screening if the storage items are not visible and are not a problem for the neighbors.

**Outdoor Storage questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Are the NZO standards for outdoor storage adequate, too strict, or not strict enough?

Commissioner Maynard requested staff clarify how nurseries and garden centers account for Outdoor Storage and suggested allowing some leniency for nurseries and garden centers.

Commissioner Fuller commented that there is ambiguity in the language in Section 17.24.130 Outdoor Storage with regard to Permissibility of Outdoor Storage and also the application of screening to different uses, and requested the language be clarified.

Chair Smith commented that her observation is that storage in the front that is adequately screened and gated, and is not bothering anybody, in a residential neighborhood is fairly tolerated. She also commented that the nuisance standards level may be a high threshold to reach.

2. Are there other issues within the area of Outdoor Storage that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Maynard recommended considering restricting the amount of outdoor storage during business hours particularly in terms of preventing sidewalk movement.

Commissioner Maynard suggested bringing back some setback standards for outdoor storage, noting there were requirements in Section 17.24.130.B.2 that existed in the previous draft.

Commissioner Maynard commented that a 72-hour temporary permit for outdoor storage of PODS would fully address her concerns. She believes there are great options for backyard sheds that will meet aesthetic guidelines.

Commissioner Maynard commented that she supports allowing for outdoor storage that is not visible, particularly in residential areas.

Commissioner Maynard commented in support of not limiting storage of construction materials to 72 hours, noting that it can be difficult to store the materials inside a building that is being built. She suggested addressing visibility concerns with screening and noted the use of construction fencing is used as an option at construction sites.

Commissioner Maynard suggested language similar to the fence guidelines and deferring to Public Works with regard to visual clearance for items being stored outside.

Commissioner Fuller supported not allowing storage in the front yard. He noted people will tend to accumulate items in the backyard and since two-story houses can have a view of backyards, there may be a reason for a complaint from neighbors. He considers this issue as being parallel with the Municipal Code regulations.

Chair Smith commented she could support creating some standards in the direction of allowing some flexibility with certain residential space where there is adequate screening and the outdoor storage is not visible and not bothering anyone else; and noted that clarity is important. She noted there is difficulty in addressing nuisances and believes it is important to have other tools as well to address community concerns.

Commissioner Maynard suggested for consideration allowing for storage of items such as a sculpture garden, art studio or art gallery that might have sculptural pieces located in the back of an art studio, as storage or commercial storage if selling the art pieces.

Commissioner Shelor recommended considering anything that can be done to make sure that the screening is acceptable and appropriate. He expressed his concern that some chain link fencing with mesh screening has become dilapidated over time, and particularly unattractive when it is located close to a public right-of-way.

Commissioner Maynard supported allowing chain link fencing with a mesh cover for construction sites.

## **TOPIC: OPEN SPACE**

### **Public Speakers:**

Dr. Ingeborg Cox suggested the open space should be named “amenity space” or “private open space” for clarification. She noted for consideration that she has observed in recent developments that there are green areas

that have been landscaped with regard to flooding and people cannot use these areas as open space.

Ken Alker questioned whether his project, Kenwood Village Project, would be subject to the new proposed open space requirements. He also questioned whether the requirements have been reviewed by an architect, which he believes would be useful. Mr. Alker commented that he believes it is critical to count the detention basins as open space if the new standards are approved.

**Open Space questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Should area requirements be adjusted?

Chair Smith supported the direction the requirements are moving. Commissioner Maynard supported the direction the requirements are moving.

2. Should staff revise the NZO to clarify “Open Space” to distinguish between the following three types?

- A. Public Open Space
- B. {Private} Restricted Open Space
- C. {Private} Common Open Space

Chair Smith supported the staff proposal regarding clarification of the language and stated she shares Commissioner Maynard’s concerns regarding how common open space is defined.

Commissioner Maynard supported the direction the requirements are moving with regard to usable space.

3. Are there other issues within this area that need to be discussed?

Commissioner Maynard commented that it is important for employees and visitors to have an area for breaks and lunch, and for visitors, and noted lot coverage requirements were removed from commercial sections, and landscaping was removed or reduced, from the previous requirements. She noted that lot coverage requirements were removed from commercial sections and minimum landscaping requirements were eliminated or substantially reduced in most of the commercial sections from the previous ordinance, and she would like to go back to consider the first requirements in the previous zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Fuller suggested the language “private area amenity” and “common area amenity” for clarification, noting these terms are used by homeowners associations. He recommended increasing the amount of private area open space for units and not reducing it. He supported the idea of the open space being usable with minimum widths and horizontal standards.

Commissioner Maynard stated she does not support the following: including rooftop decks in the required open space, including buildings in open space, and using the language “amenity”. Commissioner Maynard supported the language presented in the staff report and requiring open space to be contiguous with the project.

Commissioner Shelor supported requiring private open space for both condominiums and apartments. He commented that open space is a benefit to residents and guests more than just usable space, and landscaping provides a sense of openness. Also, he noted that more open space equals less footprint for buildable space which would be potentially fewer units unless there is an increase in building heights. Commissioner Shelor questioned whether there are calculations that show it is achievable to fit increased usable space requirements, parking setbacks, and maximum height requirements on a project site with 20 units per acre.

Commissioner Fuller supported the approach for minimum standards for private area and common open space amenities and stated he does not believe the current requirements should be lowered. He supported flexibility as long as the standards are met and noted that the developer is working with conditions that are related to and depends on the specific site.

Additional discussion was requested by the Planning Commission regarding substantial changes to maximum lot coverage, minimum common open space, and landscaping requirements for commercial districts. Commissioner Maynard requested further discussion of commercial open space.

## **TOPIC: LIGHTING CHAPTER 17.35**

### **Public Speakers**

Cecilia Brown commented that she appreciates efforts to update the zoning code; however she believes lighting standards have changed considerably and are very much different from what is being proposed and the standards are much different today. She noted that she and Gretchen Zee, as members

of the Design Review Board, wrote the first lighting guidelines that the City used for several years. Ms. Brown recommended that the language for lighting standards language be updated and include standards that are more current and. She noted that the California Building Code is a good reference for lighting code language and there are technical standards she recommended incorporating into the zoning code that support Dark Sky standards. She suggested staff borrow standards and language from the Model Lighting Ordinance.

Ken Alker commented that that from his experience with regard to fluorescent light bulbs, the size of the LED bulbs are getting more specific, and recommended not going below 3000 kelvin, because the bulbs may be difficult to find. He also noted in his opinion, there is not much difference in illumination from 2500 to 3000 kelvin.

### **Lighting questions for consideration by the Planning Commission:**

1. Any comments or input on string-lights?

Commissioner Maynard supported the prohibition of unshielded string-lights outside of the holidays in Section 17.35.030.

Commissioner Fuller recommended string-lights should meet the same standards of any other lighting that includes complete shielding and no light trespass. He suggested making an exception for lighting with very low wattage.

Chair Smith commented that a narrow exemption on string-lights could be appropriate.

2. Staff has already indicated several revisions are being made based on previous feedback, but are there other changes Planning Commission would like to see?

Commissioner Shelor suggested staff consider language that would allow for an exception for flexibility for up-lighting if the applicant can prove that the lighting will be appropriate and acceptable.

Commissioner Maynard recommended additional consideration regarding whether the City should have exemptions and thinking about where the City needs to have exceptions rather than creating a broad exemption for all City facilities. She recommended City street lights should be fully shielded and cut-off, and approximately 3000 kelvin.



Commissioner Maynard suggested considering bringing back the following sections that were eliminated from the previous zoning code: 1) Section 17.35.030 that prohibited landscape lighting other than low-voltage accent lighting (because there could be more landscape lighting); and 2) Section 17.35.040 which was a height limitation off of the roof which was also eliminated.

Commissioner Maynard recommended that it is important to include language where possible for lighting that is fully shielded, fully cut-off, and at the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.

Commissioner Maynard recommended referring to the International Dark-Sky Association for guidance for recreation field lighting standards, noting there may be a need for more specific guidelines for unique situation of recreational fields in addition to the lighting trespass guidelines.

Commissioner Maynard suggested considering guidelines regarding the amount of illumination on car lots at night when closed, and noted her concerns including the extreme brightness late at night, the amount of usage of electricity, and the effect on the night sky.

Commissioner Fuller commented that hopefully car lots will not require as much lighting when closed. He agreed with Commissioner Maynard's comment regarding the amount of illumination on car lots.

Commissioner Maynard supported considering the language in the model ordinance provided by Commissioner Shelor, or refer back to the previous draft with regard to gas stations.

Commissioner Maynard recommended limiting the number of consecutive renewals of temporary lighting in Section 17.35.020.

Commissioner Shelor requested consideration of adding flexibility to the language with regard to the light temperatures and other lighting standards to keep up with the new technology involved.

Commissioner Fuller stated that his preference for the lighting temperature standards is 3500 to 4000 kelvin as an appropriate level.

Chair Smith generally supported Planning Commissioners' comments to consider the model language with regard to lighting.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Anne Wells, Advance Planning Manager, reported that Workshop #8 will be held on April 23, 2019, and Workshop #9 will be held on May 9, 2019. In addition, a Joint Planning Commission/City Council Workshop will be held on May 7, 2019.

### **C. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment at 10:07 p.m.

**Note: The video of the meeting is available on the City's website at <http://www.cityofgoleta.org/i-want-to/news-and-updates/government-meeting-agendas-and-videos>**