

From: [Gillian Fennessy](#)
To: [Gillian Fennessy](#)
Subject: FW: Comments on NZO
Date: Monday, November 04, 2019 3:38:10 PM
Attachments: [NZO 10-5-2019.docx](#)

From: masseybarb@aol.com [<mailto:masseybarb@aol.com>]

Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2019 1:32 PM

To: James Kyriaco <jkyriaco@cityofgoleta.org>; Kyle Richards <krichards@cityofgoleta.org>; Paula Perotte <pperotte@cityofgoleta.org>; Stuart Kasdin <skasdin@cityofgoleta.org>; Roger Aceves <raceves@cityofgoleta.org>

Cc: Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>; Deborah Lopez <dlopez@cityofgoleta.org>; masseybarb@aol.com

Subject: Comments on NZO

Good afternoon,

I know you are thrilled to get one more letter with comments on the NZO. MY comments are attached. These are the issues that are important to the citizens. I hope that you will listen to what the community says and not be pushed into bad decisions by the Planning staff.

Mayor and Councilmembers,

These are my comments on the November version of the NZO.

17.07.020 Large Residential Care Facilities should not be permitted in RS and RP districts. It would be even more intrusive than having a Boardinghouse or Motel in the neighborhood. No one in a single family neighborhood wants up to 13 people living next door. It brings extra noise, traffic, parking problems, and potentially law enforcement problems. Homeowners bought their homes in RS and RP zones because they wanted quiet, peaceful, low traffic, family neighborhoods where they would have a stable environment. Large Residential Care Facilities are inappropriate for single family neighborhoods.

17.07.020 Animal keeping should require a Minor CUP in RS and RP districts. The potential noise, odors, and traffic problems need to be considered in relation to the adjacent residences.

17.07.050 C. Small-Scale Units should have the Parking Requirements placed back in the Zoning Ordinance. Medium and High Density Residential development should provide required parking for Small-Scale Units because some residents will have cars and all will have visitors. A developer shouldn't be able to dump his parking shortage problem on the community.

17.16.040 B.3. and C. Under Residential and Non-Residential Uses Restrictions the ALUP Table 4-1 is mentioned a number of times but is not included in the NZO. Table 4-1 is not easy to find online and the Table should be included in this document. It is only three pages long and could easily be reduced to fit on one page.

17.16.040 D. In the Runway 7 Safety Corridor the word "uses" should replace "features" for what is allowed. Features is the wrong word, it isn't as specific. The appropriate word is "uses".

Table 17.24.080 Under Structures Allowed Above the Height Limit, the section from Chimneys through Domes should be limited to 10%. It is important to protect our views and these features don't improve it but do obstruct it.

17.24.090 C.1.a. Chain-link fencing should have a covering to block the public's view of what is behind the fence.

17.24.130 Outdoor Storage There should be a time limit on temporary storage of construction materials. Too many developments run into problems and take years to finish or to restart a project. The public shouldn't have to look at the piles of construction materials. Many of these lots look like junk yards. If a chain link fence is used for screening it must have a covering to block the view.

17.30.070 and 17.30.080 I strongly support incorporating EDC's draft language setting forth a process, required findings, and evidentiary requirements for decisions on allowing reductions to creek setbacks.

IV-48 17.30.080 The Streamside Protection Area buffer should be a 50 foot minimum buffer like other ESHAs. Just because the General Plan permits reductions to 25 feet doesn't mean that is what the public wants. It was lowered from 50 feet in the original General Plan to 25 feet by a developer's City Council. If necessary, place the 50 foot buffer in the NZO and then amend the General Plan to a 50 foot minimum buffer. The approval of the NZO should be delayed if it is necessary to achieve 50 foot. buffers. After all these years there is no big rush to finish the NZO at any particular time.

17.30.140(B) The Coastal Sage Scrub buffer should be 50 feet, not be reduced to 25 ft. Coastal Sage Scrub is excellent habitat and should be protected for a variety of wildlife. That use it

17.30.160(C) The buffer for Native Grasslands should be returned to 20 feet.

17.37.030 C.4.e. Under Oil and Gas Facilities setbacks should never be allowed to be reduced to less than 25 feet. C.4.e. should be deleted. Less than 25 feet is no real buffer at all.

17.38.010 D. This Purpose to minimize parking is not in the current Zoning Ordinance standards and shouldn't be added to it now. Unfortunately our transit system is inadequate and has limited hours. Many residential streets are covered with cars due to current standards not providing adequate parking spaces. One of the complaints I hear from residents is that we need more parking. They expect the City to fix the problem not make it worse. The only ones who benefit from few parking spaces is the developer. Please delete Purpose D. because it is a bad idea.

Table 17.38.040 (A) An addition should be made to Single dwelling units over 3,000 sq. ft. to have an additional covered parking space. Also "All required spaces shall be provided within a garage" should be added. These provisions are in City Ordinance 03-05 passed in 2003 and they should be retained.

17.38.050 Parking reductions should only be allowed as part of a Discretionary Review.

17.38.050 C.1. Transportation Demand Management is questionable, usually more credit is given than the actual reduction achieved. Transit Accessibility doesn't mean that it will be used instead of a car. Many people run errands or shop at lunch or on the way home and need their cars to carry things. There is more reliance on cars because we don't have an adequate transit system. Both the routes and hours of our transit system are very limited. Before there will be a serious reduction in the use of cars, a system is needed that covers all of Goleta with expanded routes and hours.

17.38.050(D) Giving parking credits for new projects and redevelopment in Old Town will only make an already horrible parking problem worse. This is the time to improve Old Town, not continue substandard parking that hurts the entire community most especially the residents. Reductions in parking for Old Town Redevelopment is the wrong thing to do.

17.38.070 C.1.a. Off-Site Parking should be prohibited in residential districts. There is already a parking shortage and this would only worsen it. The only one helped is the developer who can cram more buildings in too little space. City streets should not be used to meet a developers Residential parking requirements.

17.38.070 C.1.b. The Additional Parking provision is totally inappropriate in Single-Unit Dwellings in Residential Zones. This is turning neighborhoods into vehicle storage lots. It is a terrible addition to the Zoning Ordinance.

17.38.080 A.1. No trailer or RV should be permitted outside an enclosed structure or fully screened area in residentially zoned lots. This degrades the appearance of the neighborhood and decreases the value of homes. Trailers and RVs should be prohibited in the front setbacks. At a minimum all RVs stored on residential property should be screened from view

17.40.030 Window signs should not be exempt; they should be prohibited in residential zone districts. They are not appropriate in residential neighborhoods.

17.52.050 Public notification is extremely important especially if the City really wants public engagement.

The requirement for story poles is very important and can't be left for the DRB to request because staff consistently keeps it from happening. There needs to be standards for story poles. They should be strong poles that show the location and outline the structure, mass, bulk, in three dimensions. More specific standards can be made later but there needs to be something in the NZO now.

I strongly support the Planning Commission's recommendations on Noticing as listed here from page 6 of the November 5th staff report.

Noticing. The Planning Commission recommendation includes expanded requirements for noticing of proposed development. These provisions, which can be found in Section 17.52.050, include:

- 1) story poles for all new structures over 20 feet in height, except for single-unit dwellings,
- 2) on-site posted notices at a minimum size of eight square feet in residential districts and 32 square feet in all non-residential districts,
- 3) mailed noticing for all projects, regardless of the number notices to be mailed,
- 4) a requirement that all mailed and emailed noticing be translated into Spanish, and
- 5) press releases for all proposed development over 10,000 square feet, released at the point of Conceptual Review in front of the Design Review Board, in order to notify the public of the pending project early in the review process.

On-site Posted Notices: The Planning Commission did not provide a permit or approval trigger for the larger on-site noticing in the proposed NZO. Staff believe there should be a threshold provided. If not, even the smallest of projects, such as a new sign in a commercial district, would need a 32 square-foot on-site notice.

- Mailed Notices: The Planning Commission recommended removal of an allowance

for publishing notice in a newspaper rather than providing mailed notice, if the recipients would number over 1,000. This is an existing allowance in the City's current zoning ordinances and under state law. Newspaper notice is most often utilized when the City has a project that would require citywide notification. By removing the newspaper notice allowance, the City would incur significant cost for noticing items like new zoning regulations and General Plan amendments.

17.52.050C.1. Mailed notices should continue to be provided if the recipients would number over 1,000. The newspaper notice is inadequate, few people get the News-Press and the number who gets the Independent is limited. To have adequate public notice there should be mailed notices.

17.58.060 B. Grading and lighting plans should be included at the DRB's Preliminary Review.

17.58.060 The DRB's Required Findings should have the Finding that "The project proposed would be consistent with the General Plan." This is an issue that is not always considered when reviewing a project and is sometimes discouraged by staff when it is. The General Plan is something that should always be considered on any project the Board or Commissions review. For that reason I am asking to have consistency with the General Plan a Finding.

17.62.020 B.1. RS and RP districts should only be allowed to increase the height by 20% in both Coastal and Inland Zones.

Thank you for considering my comments, Barbara