

**From:** [Benjamin Williams](#)  
**To:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**Subject:** New Zoning Ordinance - update?  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 16, 2019 5:00:15 PM

---

Dear Andy,

I am writing to inquire about the timing of the adoption of the new zoning ordinance for the City of Goleta. The current system of relying upon an old zoning ordinance that is inconsistent with the general plan is very confusing to people, and discourages people from doing business in Goleta. This is a poor reflection of the organization and effectiveness of our City government and should have been resolved years ago. Can you please provide an update and time table for when you expect to have the new zoning ordinance completed and in place?

Thank you,

Ben Williams

**From:** [Tara Messing](#)  
**To:** [Anne Wells](#)  
**Cc:** [Linda Krop](#); [Brian Trautwein](#)  
**Subject:** Question re draft Zoning Ordinance  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 30, 2019 12:14:35 PM

---

Hi Anne,

Brian and I are looking forward to attending the open house for the City's draft Zoning Ordinance next Monday. However, we have a question for you regarding Section 17.31.070, "Streamside Protection Areas." The language in the draft Zoning Ordinance is nearly identical to the language set forth under Policy CE 2.2 of the Goleta General Plan. We were glad to see that Section 17.31.070 restates the requirement in subsection (b) of Policy CE 2.2, especially "unusable in its entirety," but based on our conversation at our meeting on January 14<sup>th</sup>, we thought that the Zoning Ordinance would also set forth the process, findings, and evidentiary requirements required before a setback could be reduced. Is this language somewhere else in the Zoning Ordinance? If so, could you please provide the relevant sections.

I look forward to your response.

Best regards,  
Tara

**TARA C. MESSING**  
STAFF ATTORNEY  
906 Garden Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
805.963.1622 x 104  
[www.EnvironmentalDefenseCenter.org](http://www.EnvironmentalDefenseCenter.org)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE: The information contained in this communication may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send this communication to the sender and delete the original message and any copy of it from your computer system. Thank you.



**environmental**  
DEFENSE CENTER

**From:** [Cecilia Brown](#)  
**To:** [Peter Imhof](#); [Anne Wells](#)  
**Cc:** [Mary Chang](#); [brownknight1@cox.net](mailto:brownknight1@cox.net); [paulaperotte@cox.net](mailto:paulaperotte@cox.net)  
**Subject:** ZO SIGN Ordinance  
**Date:** Friday, February 08, 2019 8:46:38 AM

---

Hi Peter and Anne! As a follow on to my Monday meeting with you and initial inquiry about LED signs in the revised ZO, I was so very happy when I read in the sign ordinance that the use of electronic changeable copy signs was much limited as compared to the last iteration of the ZO. This was an important and necessary change. Hurrah! Thank you!

And, the limitation of these signs to quasi public uses (the text of the ordinance uses the word semi-public use, see p. iv-117 and should be changed for consistency) was fortunately tempered by the requirement for at least 400ft street frontage of the particular use and in non residential districts. Well thought out.

However, I think there needs to be some review of the following: Besides gas stations and indoor theater marquee signs, there are currently time and temp changeable copy signs in the city which need to be considered. And they change copy more frequently than 2x per day, an ordinance standard. (Maybe they are listed elsewhere and I missed it, there is much to review.)

There is no mention of what colors can be used on the electronic changeable copy sign. One color, multiple colors in the changeable copy? Copy need not change but color many times over the day could. I think your intent is for one color for the sign, like the gas station pricing signs, but this needs to be clear and specified. I am against the color changes because it goes against

The standard for allowing the copy to change on my twice a day.

There are existing gas station pricing signs and marquee signs which are currently higher than the 10ft height limit of the ordinance. Believe that the 10ft height standard for a sign for a quasi public use that meets the ordinance standards might mean a pole sign, which isn't allowed, or a 10 FT freestanding sign, which in most instances is not appropriate and most likely not be approved by the DRB.

Pls review the 10ft height limitations for each kind of sign.

The sign ordinance is much improved and greatly detailed. While this is good it means it will require much careful review to understand the changes from the antiquated county ordinance the city adopted because they are considerable.

I am concerned that the city hasn't allowed enough time for the public to review the sign ordinance. The decision makers who understand signs and are responsible for reviewing and approving them in the city, The DRB, meet Tues Feb 12th to do their review. And this meeting occurs just barely a week after the ZO rollout. Having just gotten my copy of the revised ZO and barely time to read it much less consider the changes, there isn't sufficient time to thoroughly review and understand the 20 pages of sign ordinance standards to prepare for this meeting or even comment on them thru written or verbal testimony.

So, I request the city allow another opportunity for public to share their comments to DRB on this ordinance at later dates. There should be multiple reviews planned not just one. The review of this section of the ZO is being rushed and deserves unhurried and careful attention.

Very very important we get this ordinance right. Dont want any unintended consequences!  
Thank you!  
Cecilia Brown

Sent from my Galaxy Tab® A

**From:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**To:** [Andy Newkirk \(anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org\)](mailto:anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org)  
**Subject:** FW: Draft Overlay Districts - RPZ for Runway 25  
**Date:** Thursday, February 14, 2019 9:29:00 AM

---

**From:** Michael D. Pollard <[michael.pollard1@verizon.net](mailto:michael.pollard1@verizon.net)>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 08, 2019 1:15 PM  
**To:** Anne Wells <[awells@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:awells@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: Draft Overlay Districts - RPZ for Runway 25

Ann:

My concern is that the draft Overlay Map imposes burdens on property (such as mine) that do not exist. The RPZ is based upon a mathematical definition in FAR Part 77, and should not be subject to local determination. SBGAG has been working on an update of the ALUP for many years and they may never get around to it. I think the City would be safe, and more fair to affected properties, stating the current condition in the new zoning ordinance instead of waiting for another governmental agency to apply the Federal definition of an RPZ and then amend the zoning ordinance. I do not know of any Federal law or regulation that stops a City from applying the FAA's definition of an RPZ to the area in the City near an airport.

Ann, I hope we can remove the more severe restrictions imposed on clear zones from portions of properties that are, in fact, not within the clear zone, now and not wait for SBCAG.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Mike

**From:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**To:** [Andy Newkirk \(anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org\)](mailto:anewkirk@cityofgoleta.org)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments for Feb 12 2019 DRB hearing  
**Date:** Monday, February 11, 2019 5:49:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [ZO Sign Ordinance Comments Feb 2019.doc](#)  
[ZO Design Review Section comments.doc](#)  
[February 2019 Lighting Ordinance Comments.doc](#)

---

**From:** Cecilia Brown <[browncnight1@cox.net](mailto:browncnight1@cox.net)>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2019 11:53 AM  
**To:** Mary Chang <[mchang@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:mchang@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Cc:** [Masseysbarb@aol.com](mailto:Masseysbarb@aol.com); [browncnight1@cox.net](mailto:browncnight1@cox.net)  
**Subject:** Comments for Feb 12 2019 DRB hearing

Hi Mary! Would you please ensure that the DRB receives the comment letters at the 3 attachments. This submission is being made jointly by Barb Massey and me on the proposed zoning ordinance pertaining to lighting, signs, and Design Review, all under the purview of the DRB. Ms. Massey will be at the DRB to provide comments and I hope, because there is much material to be discussed, that she is given ample time to do that. We spent much time over the weekend to get our comments to you and we hope that the DRB takes as much time as needed in reviewing the proposed ordinance and our comments. There is much material and detail to be considered.

I hope each DRB member was given a hard copy of the proposed zoning to facilitate their review. , Also, to facilitate their review, a draft ordinance should be available since we reference certain sections in that document without full replication of the information we reference.

For us retired DRB members (both Barb and I have served on the DRB at various times) and for many community members, we know and appreciate the work of the DRB which strives to maintain and determines the character of our community.

The new zoning ordinance will facilitate that, but “devil is in the details” and it is important to consider the details in this document.

Because there are many issues addressed in the three sections of the ordinance and there has been little time for public review of them, we are requesting that the DRB continue their hearing to another date to facilitate further public comment.

Thank you very much,  
Cecilia Brown  
Barbara Massey

**February 2019**

**Comments on draft Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.58 Design Review**

Please accept my comments as outlined below. As a decade long member of the DRB, I understand and appreciate the role the DRB plays in the design review process and would appreciate your full consideration of my comments. Thank you, Cecilia Brown

**Section 17.58.050 DRB Levels of Review**

**1. Reconsider the appeal point in review process:** Most valuable to your process for achieving well designed projects is the revised format for review, that is the return to the Conceptual, Preliminary, and Final review sequence. This was the process the DRB used at its inception and used for many years. It worked well. The truncated version later employed didn't achieve its purpose for a variety of reasons. However, when initially used by the DRB, the appeal point was at Preliminary Review, not at Final as currently envisioned. Setting the appeal point at Final Review when working drawings have been made means that should an appeal be filed on project design, the entire set of working drawings may have to be redone. This is time and expense to the applicant. It would be preferable to set the appeal at Preliminary Review when working drawings have not been made but the design has generally been vetted. Usually it is the design elements of the project that are appealed and these are well known at the end of the Preliminary Review.

**Request: Change the appeal point for the design review process to Preliminary Review.**

**2. Storypoles:** The addition of storypoles in the conceptual review process is needed and welcomed. Thank you! However, there needs to be storypole guidelines established to assist in understanding the size, bulk, scale of a project, determining neighborhood comparability, and impacts to views. Please see the link to storypole guidelines from the County of Santa Barbara and a copy provided at end of this document.  
<http://sbcountyp Planning.org/PDF/Story%20Pole%20Guidelines%20Final%201-09-09.pdf>

**Request: Develop storypole guidelines to assist applicants in erecting storypoles.**

**Section 17.58.060 Findings for Approval**

**1. Lighting Plan needed in order to assist DRB in making their findings.** DRB tasked with reviewing exterior lighting for dark sky compliance. In order to do that DRB needs to see a lighting plan which depicts various aspect of the lighting components for the project (e.g., Cut sheets of proposed fixtures, whether there is light trespass at property boundary, etc.). DRB historically reviewed and currently reviews lighting plans in order to make their dark sky compliant and other findings. Might be impossible without such a plan. Please see my comments on Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.35 and

**Request: Add Lighting Plan requirements in Chapter 17.35 Lighting**



## County of Santa Barbara Storypole Guidelines

### Story Pole Guidelines

Purpose Story poles are a tool to assist decision-makers, staff, and the public in the review of development projects. They assist in making findings regarding appropriate mass, bulk and scale, neighborhood compatibility, and/or minimization of impacts to important public scenic views. Therefore, the accuracy, readability, and articulation of story poles are important to fully understand the proposed project. However, actual site improvements are subject to compliance with approved plans, rather than with representations from the story pole installation.

When Required Story Poles are most commonly requested, on a case by case basis, by the Board of Architectural Review. This document provides guidelines for the installation of story poles. Each of the County Boards retain jurisdiction to modify the requirements for individual cases.

### Standards

1. Story Pole Plan – A story pole plan shall be reviewed by County staff (and the BAR chair where appropriate) in coordination with the applicant prior to installation of story poles. The plan shall include the following:
  - a. Placement of story poles: Sufficient to show the mass, bulk, height and scale of the structures and measured from a permanent benchmark on or near the proposed project. The story poles do not have to and should not depict all the articulations of the building. Major building corners, finished floor levels, significant elements, length of façade within a specific view shed, ridgelines, and a scale should be shown. It may be necessary to stake more than just the four corners of a structure if significant spans are involved. Outline the building footprint with stakes and construction netting or other visible project element. Changes proposed in grade, with finished height and elevations, should be shown by color coding the stakes/poles.
  - b. Materials proposed to be used for story poles. Story poles should be made of 2x lumber (PVC piping is acceptable in some instances) or other sturdy material and 12” wide snow or construction netting. In addition, they should be braced for safety purposes. The orange construction/snow fencing connections should clearly depict the roofline and ridgelines Installed story poles, site key, and associated flagging and/or netting shall be of materials and method of installation to withstand reasonably foreseeable weather or other site factors (i.e. grazing) for the required duration of display.
  - c. Legend: For large or complex projects (at the discretion of the BAR), a story pole plan and legend (11” x 17” black and white) will be posted on the project site and the County’s website to inform viewers about the project.
  - d. Proposed date of installation: The plan is to include the date the story poles are proposed to be installed, as well as the length of time the story poles will remain on site.

2. Story Pole Installation – The story poles shall be installed according to the story pole plan, and:

- a. Certification: The Story pole installation shall be certified by the licensed professional (surveyor, architect, landscape architect, or contractor) who prepared the story pole plan and/or installed the story poles. The certification shall be submitted to staff after installation of the story poles, but before review by the Board of Architectural Review or other review body.

- b. Timeframe for installation: Story poles shall be installed at least three days prior to the BAR meeting.

- c. Story poles shall remain in place for a minimum of seven days after the BAR meeting.

- d. If story poles are damaged, replacement may be required as directed by the BAR.

Staff Responsibility 1. Notification of Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator if story poles are installed for a project on which they are the decision maker. 2. Photo-documentation of the installed story poles

**February 2019**

## **Comments on Revised Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.35 Lighting**

The language in Section 17.35.040C Light Trespass: (All lighting must be directed downward and shielded to prevent light trespass and glare onto adjacent properties....) doesn't reflect nor is it consistent with the language used in the General Plan Visual Resource section (see below) which requires lighting to be "**Fully Shielded, full cut-off, and...to prevent sky glow**" and to be consistent with the ZO language in Chapter 17.58 Design Review where findings the DRB needs to be make in their project review is "**dark sky compliant exterior lighting**" (section 17.58.030 B. 10) and "**all exterior lighting....is dark sky compliant**" (Section 17.58.060 I).

References: General Plan policies: **VH 1.4 Protection of Mountain and Foothill Views**. [GP/CP] and **VH 1.5 Protection of Open Space View** use the following language for lightening: **Downcast, fully shielded, full cut off lighting of the minimum intensity needed for the purpose.** Another emphasis on "Dark Sky" lighting standards is found in policy **VH 4.12 Lighting: A. Fixtures shall be fully shielded and have full cut off lights to minimize visibility from public viewing areas and prevent light pollution into residential areas or other sensitive uses such as wildlife habitats or migration routes. B. Direct upward light emission shall be avoided to protect views of the night sky."**

Request change in Section 17.35.040C to be consistent with General Plan and other zoning ordinance policies.

Light Trespass wording must be changed to" All lights must be directed downward, and fully shielded and full-cut off to prevent light trespass or glare onto adjacent properties and to prevent sky glow."

### **Section 17.35.020 Applicability**

Request making changes as described below in the Exemption section

4. Other jurisdictions, like the county and school districts, need to be included in this section. See the draft ZO with more complete language
5. Holiday Lights: What holiday period is being considered here, it is not clear, it is Valentines Day, July 4<sup>th</sup>? The draft zoning ordinance language about limiting the use of holiday lights during the holidays at year end needs to be restored.
6. Temporary Exemptions: The section must include reason for the requested exemption. Number of renewals must be limited.

Recommend a new exemption for LED string lighting on trees be considered.

### **Section 17.35.030 Prohibitions**

There should be a prohibition on unshielded string bulb lighting like that seen on the patio of the Goodland Hotel. Request prohibition of this kind of unshielded lighting be added to this section.

**Section 17.35.040 General Requirements.** The language in this section states that the color temperature of each lamp must not exceed 3,000K. Request review how was this standard chosen and for what use? To have 3,000K in anything but parking lot lighting is excessive. City will be using 2800K in streets lighting in their new street lights replacing SCE street lights.

### **Section 17.35.050 Supplemental Requirements**

D. How was the 5.0 foot candle determination made? Is this based on the use of LED lighting standards or some older types of lighting? Request review this standard and change to a more relevant standard.

The DRB is responsible for reviewing outdoor lighting. There needs to be a way for them to do that and that is through a lighting plan. They review such plans now and adding a section on lighting plans would codify that practice. To assist in thinking about what requirements might be on the lighting plan, and there may be others required under the California building Code, the City of Goleta Outdoor Lighting Guidelines has a list of what is required and are repeated below as an example. Request a new section be added to the lighting ordinance so that DRB can do their review of lighting projects.

### **Section 17. XX. XXX Outdoor Lighting Plans**

An outdoor lighting plan is required as part of a development application or land use permit with an application for all new outdoor lighting installations on commercial, industrial, office, City of Goleta property and certain residential applications (e.g., multi-family housing). Submittals for other types of projects may be required by the City due to project location, size or proposed use as necessary.

1. An outdoor lighting plan shall include at least the following.
  - a. A site plan showing the location of all buildings, parking and pedestrian areas or other areas where lighting is proposed on the site.
  - b. The proposed location, mounting height and aiming point and angle (in the landscape plan to demonstrate coordination of fixtures and tree plantings. The location of light fixtures and landscaping on adjacent properties and on the street right of way that effect lighting/landscaping on the project is also necessary. For pole lights, a composite drawing of the base, pole, and fixture with the drawing to extend from the ground surface adjacent to the light assembly to its highest point. Foot candle illumination throughout the property and at the property line needed to ensure understanding of light trespass at property lines and lighting levels throughout the parking lot
  - c. Manufacturer specification sheets, cut-sheets, or other manufacturer provided information for all proposed outdoor lighting fixtures to show fixture diagrams, lamp types, wattage, initial lumen output, vertical cut-off level, and shielding information.

Elevations of the building with mature landscaping, poles and fixtures superimposed. If building elevations are proposed for illumination, drawings for all relevant elevations showing the fixtures, the portions of the elevations

**February 2019**

## **Comments on Revised Zoning Ordinance Chapter 17.40 Signs**

There is no information about the differences between what is now permitted in the City's current ordinance and what is in the proposed sign ordinance. These differences need to be known in order for decision-makers and the public to understand the implications of what is being proposed (e.g., Are there changes in square footage allowances from what currently exists?). And some signs proposed in the draft ordinance were eliminated.

In some cases, proposed ordinance language is contrary to the policies in the General Plan. Below are those policies against which proposed regulatory language must be vetted. If the standards don't meet these policies, then they must be eliminated or changed in order that the proposed sign ordinance is consistent with the General Plan.

### **General Plan Policies regarding signage**

**Policy VH 1.4 Minimize structural intrusion into the skyline**

**Policy VH 2.3 for development along scenic corridors... (101 and Hollister) limit height and size of structures and minimize usage of signs**

**Policy VH 3.7 Community Design Character mentions that "character is enhanced through the use of restrained and tasteful signage that conveys an orderly and attractive appearance and enhances city image**

### **Policy VH 4.13 Signage**

**c. Signs shall not detract from views ...or streetscape. Protrusion of signs and/or sign structures into the skyline should be minimized.**

**f. Internally illuminated cabinet signs shall be prohibited**

**g. Billboards and other off-premise signs prohibited**

Review and provide comments or recommended changes to our questions on each of the sections of the proposed sign ordinance addressed below.

### **Section 17.40.030 Exempt Signs**

**D. Construction signs** Where were the numerical standards obtained? Please review the standard for 8ft max height for construction signs in non-residential areas. This seems excessive.

**E. Directional Signs:** The draft ordinance had a better definition of directional signs, why was it changed? This one in the revised ordinance is too truncated to know what is allowed on a directional sign. Reinstate the draft ordinance language

**H. Government Signs.** The draft allowed other types of regulatory signs needed on commercial establishment windows and doors. Why was this information deleted?

**Equipment signs:** Why was this section eliminated in the draft ZO? What is occurring is that advertising signs are appearing on gas station pumps, like the small TVs on the gas station pumps at the Gas Depots. These kinds of signs are pure advertising, have nothing to do with equipment identification and add to the visual clutter of the area...

**Window Signs in Commercial Areas.** The draft ordinance restricted signage on commercial window signs as follows: “In non-residential zones, window signs not exceeding 10 percent of the area of the window and transparent door frontage on any building façade (were exempted). Any sign either hung within two feet of a window or attached to a display located within two feet of a window is considered a window sign and must be counted as part of the permitted signage.”

The proliferation of all kinds of signs on non-residential storefronts, most of which are primarily advertising, add clutter to shopkeeper’s windows, degrade the streetscape and allow encroachment of sign area promulgated elsewhere in the ordinance, and is contrary to the General Plan policy about ionizing signage...

Explain why this important standard for signs in non-residential areas was eliminated?”

**17.40.040 Prohibited Signs** Request is to add additional prohibited types of lighting  
Add to **E. Other Light Types. Light Bulb Strings.** External displays which consist of unshielded light bulbs, festoons, and strings of open light bulbs. These kinds of lights are not dark sky compliant.

Add to **L. Roof Signs.** “Signs on rooftops structures such as penthouses, walls, or mechanical enclosures.

Add to **O.** “Signs within five feet of a fire hydrant, street sign, or traffic signal.”

Add to this section the prohibition of **Billboards and other off-premise signs.**

#### **17.40.060 General Provisions for All Sign Types**

**K. Materials.** Description of materials isn’t sufficient to prohibit signs to be made of less than durable materials. Now, some signs are being covered up with plastic-like covers when sign face needs to be updated to a new tenant or sign content changed, like the sign covering the cabinet sign pole sign at Calle Real and Kellogg. There needs to be explicit language to prohibit the use of less than durable materials for signs. There was such language in the draft ordinance. Request add additional standard for sign materials.

**I. Changeable Copy Signs.** Review height standards, color considerations and possible prohibition along scenic corridors.

1. Besides gas stations, indoor theater marquee signs, there are time and temperature signs in the city, these later types of signs need to be included in this section, particularly because they change copy more frequently than the 2x per day, an ordinance standard.

2. Color: what color is allowed for electronic changeable copy signs? One color, like the red in the gas fuel pricing signs or the theater marquee sign or white in the time and temp signs. The intent should be just one color for the changeable copy.

Prohibit color changes throughout the day for the electronic changeable copy signs..

3. Height: Existing fuel pricing signs and marquee signs are currently higher than the 10ft height limit of the ordinance. Also, height for an electronic changeable copy sign for a public/quasi public use (change language in draft ordinance from semi-public use to quasi public since no definition for semi-public use) not might mean a freestanding sign at 10ft. This is too tall and not in accordance with general plan standards addressed elsewhere. Review these standards.

4. Prohibition in certain areas: There is a General Policy Plan policy to minimize the use of signage along scenic corridors (i.e., Hollister Ave). Changeable copy signs should be prohibited along these corridors.

5. There is no mention of the glare from any of these LED electronic changeable copy signs because of the intensity and quantity of LED lights as in the gas pricing signs, like the one at the Fuel Depot. Request you address this in the ordinance.

#### **Section 17.040.080 Signage allowances for specific Uses and Special Signs**

**Freestanding Signs.** If a freestanding sign is allowed to be 4ft tall and a max 100sq. feet for sign area, then that means the length would be 25ft. Or if the sign is allowed to be 6ft area dimensions need to be reviewed since not appropriate considering General Plan visual policy standards to “minimize signage.” Review max area for dimensions.

**Menu Boards:** Missing from this or any section in the ordinance is the provision for “Menu Board for drive through restaurants” sign in the current ordinance. These kinds of signs are in use in the City and need to be added to the proposed ordinance. Even though there won’t be many drive-through restaurants in the future, standards for such signs must be allowed. Request that Menu Boards be added to proposed sign ordinance.

Below are some standards from the SB County ordinance 35.38.100e. p. 3-79 that could be used for review...

1. Not to exceed two on-site single face signs
2. Locations limited to adjacent vehicle queuing lane for the service point of the drive-through
3. Free standing menu board shall not exceed eight feet in height as measured from the finished elevation of the vehicle queuing lane.
4. Menu board wall signs shall not exceed the height of the eave of the roof over the wall on which the sign is located
5. Not to exceed 36 square feet total in combined area of both signs unless a sign modification.

#### **17.40.090 Standards for Specific Sign types**

**A-Frame Signs** These are portable signs and not allowed per section 17.40.040. Resolve the discrepancy of prohibiting and then allowing them in this section.

Prohibit these signs in the public right of way or on any walkway on private property.

#### **Section 17.40.110 Non Conforming Signs**

A. **Continuance and Maintenance.** Does this section include allowance for a new sign face if there is no other maintenance or repair needed on the sign? DRB has allowed and reviewed throughout its history a new sign face on pole signs, which are prohibited under this ordinance. Address when a new sign face is allowed on legal non-conforming signs.

#### **Additional Consideration not addressed in the proposed Sign ordinance.**

Why is there no mention of Old Town guidelines in the proposed sign ordinance? This needs to be corrected... There is a General Plan Policy VH 4.2 Old Town which applies. It states that all design shall be consistent with the three pages of the sign guidelines in the Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines.

**From:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**To:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Design Review Elements of NZO - General comments for the DRB  
**Date:** Thursday, February 14, 2019 8:12:12 AM

---

**From:** Fermina Murray <[ferminamurray@gmail.com](mailto:ferminamurray@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2019 3:50 PM  
**To:** Mary Chang <[mchang@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:mchang@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Cc:** Cecilia Brown <[brownknight1@cox.net](mailto:brownknight1@cox.net)>; [Masseybarb@aol.com](mailto:Masseybarb@aol.com)  
**Subject:** Design Review Elements of NZO - General comments for the DRB

Hello Mary,

Like Cecilia Brown and Barbara Massey, I too reviewed the NZO, and since Brown and Massey have excellently covered the NZO's signage, lighting, and DRB review process, i.e. story poles. I would like to focus on general comments. Maybe I am missing important introductory principles, but I did not see any introductory statements of purpose, goals, or principles guiding the DRB NZO document.

So I am requesting you to please include the following ideas for the DRB to consider in their review meeting on Tuesday, February 12, 2019. Unfortunately, I am traveling to NYC to help my son's family with the birth of their second child, a baby girl, and not able to attend the DRB's meeting. The ideas below, I learned and used a great deal in my 12 years serving the Santa Barbara City Landmarks Commission (HLC). They come from the Santa Barbara Urban Design Guidelines and Compatibility Analysis that the HLC uses. I've tailored them to what I think would fit Goleta City's DRB Guidelines. Please pass them on in this email to the Chair and Members of the Design Review Board for their kind consideration. Thank you Mary!

Much appreciated,  
Fermina Murray  
442 Danbury Court  
Goleta, CA 93117

## **Goals and Purpose of the Design Guidelines or Design Elements Review:**

### Compatibility of New Development with the Existing Development

Design developments to complement and enhance the character of Goleta City, the surrounding neighborhood, and existing adjacent developments, while allowing each development to retain a distinctive visual identity.

Incorporate natural features and landscaped open spaces into developments to provide a sense of openness and continuity, and enhance the environment of the City grid.

Design developments to respect the arrangement of buildings and open spaces on adjacent sites and provide opportunities for enhanced circulation, solar access, and views.



## Human Scale Character – Visual Relationship Between Development and Pedestrians

Preserve the human scale character of the City by using design techniques that reduce the apparent size, bulk, scale, and height of buildings.

Provide visual interest for pedestrians by incorporating building details that relate to the surrounding built environment at a human scale.

Encourage pedestrian activity on the street through building design. Frequent building entrances, window at pedestrian height, and outdoor activity spaces create a lively, pedestrian-friendly environment along public streets.

## Pedestrian Facilities and Amenities

- Create and maintain a continuous, convenient network of pedestrian facilities throughout Goleta City to reduce dependence on the automobile.

Provide pedestrian amenities, including street furniture, landscaping, lighting, and trash receptacles, to make walking more attractive and convenient.

Design and locate pedestrian facilities and amenities to promote the uninterrupted flow of pedestrian traffic. (our safe suburban sidewalks and pocket parks are examples of this goal).

Create pedestrian links to transit and bicycle facilities to increase the convenience of transit and bicycle travel. (Train stop could use this).

## Building Equipment and Service Areas

- Design and locate building equipment and service areas so that they do not dominate the appearance of the site or interfere with pedestrian or vehicular circulation.

Building equipment and service areas include, but are not limited to, rooftop equipment, mechanical and electrical equipment and conduits, HVAC ducts and piping, fire equipment, water backflow devices (e.g. fire protection, landscape, and domestic water systems), trash facilities, recycling facilities, utilities, satellites dishes, antennas, loading/unloading areas, and site building and drainage facilities.

## **Findings For Approval**

This section should include compatibility analysis such as:

Does the project comply with all applicable City Code, Policies, and Guidelines?

Is the design of the project compatible with architectural qualities and characteristics which are distinctive to Goleta City and the particular neighborhood surrounding the project?

Is the size, mass, bulk, scale, height, and scale of the project appropriate for its location and its neighborhood?

Is the design of the project appropriately sensitive to adjacent federal, state, or city landmarks or other nearby historic resources? (Example the Islamic Mosque and its proximity to Stow House and Lake Los Carneros Park). (Stow House is on the National Register of Historic Places, a federally registered historic resource).

Public Views of the Ocean and Mountains: Does the design of the project respond appropriately to established scenic public views of the ocean and mountains? (Hilton Garden Inn is a violation of this).

Does the project include an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping?

Does the project enhance the building and pedestrian experience.

**From:** [donotreply@godaddy.com](mailto:donotreply@godaddy.com)  
**To:** [Andy Newkirk](#)  
**Subject:** goletazoning.com Public Comments: Form Submission  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 13, 2019 9:26:59 AM

---

**Name:**

David Low

**Email:**

dlow@ucsb.edu

**Subject:**

RV parking restriction

**Message:**

I am concerned about the new RV parking restrictions. I live on a corner lot such that my driveway is not visible by my neighbors. I am thinking of purchasing a camper van (Mercedes van -based) that I will park on my driveway, but I think the new ordinance will prevent me from doing this. This will not be unsightly, and the camper will not be much larger than a large SUV. If the new ordinance prevents this for me or my neighbors then I am very much against it. I can see regulating really large RV parking, but not relatively small camper vans that can also be used for everyday travel.

***This message was submitted from your website contact form:***

<http://www.goletazoning.com/public-comments.html>

Use your free GoDaddy Email Marketing Starter account to follow up with contacts who agreed to receive email campaigns! Click [here](#) to get started.

2252629598