

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Note: Public comment citations are to the November 2015 Public Review Draft</p>	
<p>Chapter 17.01 – Introductory Provisions</p>	
<p>17.01.040.D, 17.01.040.E Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The Proposed Ordinance treats projects in the entitlement process more favorably than projects that have already secured a building permit.</p>	<p><i>Regulations regarding vesting of projects revised. In updated draft, vesting under existing zoning ordinances occurs with the building permit being pulled and construction commencing within 12 months.</i></p>
<p>17.01.070.C Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Section 17.01.070.C establishes two “Specific Plan Districts” but there are no regulations within the Proposed Ordinance related to these districts.</p>	<p><i>Specific Plan references moved to the Overlay Districts section. Regulations are found in the separately adopted specific plans for those areas.</i></p>
<p>17.01.080.B Chamber of Commerce. Request clarification that the abandoned road will take on the zone of the parcel it’s being combined with or absorbed into, rather than the adjacent.</p>	<p><i>This will be done case-by-case. Typically, zoning goes to the centerline of a street, but in some cases if the entire vacated parcel is being merged into one adjacent lot, then the zoning of would most likely be applied to the vacated lot.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.03 – Rules of Measurement</p>	
<p>17.03.060.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. Measuring height should state on lots sloped an average less than 10% to be consistent with 17.030.060.A.2 which states on lots with an average slope of 10% or more.</p>	<p><i>“Average” added.</i></p>
<p>17.03.070 Chamber of Commerce. The City should reconsider the section stating that no landscape area smaller than 5 feet in any dimension will count toward required landscaping because it is particularly limiting.</p>	<p><i>Standard changed to 2 feet by 3 feet.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.03.090 Chamber of Commerce. Clarification should be provided to justify the 10’ minimum horizontal dimension for ground floor and 6’ for balconies. If not based on building code, these dimensions seem arbitrary.</p>	<p><i>Standard change to be 6 feet in all instances. Intent is for these spaces to be truly usable for the residents.</i></p>
<p>17.03.090 Chamber of Commerce. The 20’ dimension and 10% slope requirements on common open space appear arbitrary. In addition, for common open spaces to have less than a 10% slope. It should be clarified whether that is an average slope or max slope.</p>	<p><i>20 foot standard unchanged. Purpose is for the space to be truly usable by all residents of the development. “Average” added.</i></p>
<p>17.03.120 Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider a gross and net differentiation for floor area, particularly because item B differentiates for measuring gross floor area.</p>	<p><i>References to “gross” vs. “net” removed throughout.</i></p>
<p>17.03.120.B Chamber of Commerce. This section excludes mechanical, electrical, other areas not to exceed 2% of the buildings gross floor area, which seems arbitrary. A larger area should be allowed that does not count toward floor area.</p>	<p><i>2% standard removed.</i></p>
<p>17.03.140 Chamber of Commerce. These two definitions are confusing. Recommend a diagram.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. See definitions.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.07 – Residential Districts</p>	
<p>17.07 Chamber of Commerce. The standards section needs to define the permit process.</p>	<p><i>Permit processes included in use tables.</i></p>
<p>17.07 Chamber of Commerce. New residential district excludes greenhouses, raising of field crops, orchards.</p>	<p><i>Uses identified to align with General Plan Land Use Element.</i></p>
<p>17.07 Chamber of Commerce. The City should look at whether the rezoning of many lower density DR zones to Single Family Residential takes away flexibility or allowances that may have otherwise applied with a DR designation before assigning SFD to those parcels.</p>	<p><i>Land Uses determined by the Land Use Plan Map of the City’s General Plan (Figure 2-1).</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.07.010 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The text describing the RM District in Section 17.07.010 states that the District may include both “attached and detached single family dwellings.” Table 17.07.020 shows that “Single-Unit Dwelling, Detached” is a use not allowed in the RM District. In addition to the substantive inconsistency, Section 17.07.010 uses the term “single family dwellings” rather than the defined term that actually appears in the use table, “Single-Unit Dwelling”.</p>	<p><i>Table updated to better reflect General Plan use allowances. No change to single-family reference, as this comes from General Plan language and has no binding impact.</i></p>
<p>17.07.020, 17.10.020, 17.11.020, 17.12.020. Barbara Massey. Concern over Director's Role in assigning the land uses and activities to undefined lands in any district, that should be the Council's responsibility.</p>	<p><i>Language moved from Part II to Part I but remains unchanged. However, this constitutes a Direction Determination that is now appealable.</i></p>
<p>17.07.020 Eileen Monahan, First 5 SB County. Allow child care centers, in addition to family child care homes in residential areas.</p>	<p><i>Day Care Facilities added to RS, RP, RM, and RH with a Minor CUP.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.07.030 Ken Alker, Bruce Alker Construction. Disagreement over Building Height of 25'.</p>	<p><i>Height standards included consistent with General Plan.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.07.030 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Concerned about creating nonconforming structures based on new setback standards in residential districts.</p>	<p><i>Setback standards revised to better reflect existing setback standards.</i></p>
<p>17.07.030 Barbara Massey. Request to add: "Also see §17.25.190."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Not all references to Regulations applying in multiple districts included.</i></p>
<p>17.07.030.C Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Section 17.07.030.C contains a figure depicting various “prototype” configurations for Efficiency Units. This figure is not referenced anywhere and it is unclear how it is to be used — for example, are those the only allowed configurations for efficiency units?</p>	<p><i>Figure referenced has been removed as they did not show enforceable development standards.</i></p>
<p>17.07.030.D.1, 17.07.030.D.3, 17.07.040.A.3, 17.07.050.B.1, 17.07.050.C.1, 17.07.060.D, 17.08.030.D Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Proposed Ordinance contains provisions that are vague.</p>	<p><i>Many of these provisions removed as Part II was revised to reduce regulations related to design.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.08 Commercial Districts	
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. Recommend that owners be specifically notified in the instance they were not the owner at the time of the GP change, or in the instance they did not look at the General Plan when they purchased.</p>	<p><i>No change. These situations are not circumstances that the City tracks or would track.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. If maximum height allowed in Old Town has changed because of coastal zone regulations, again, the inland portion of the City should not also have to reduce their height.</p>	<p><i>OT heights established consistent with General Plan Land Use Element.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. A maximum coverage may not be necessary and could instead be flexible.</p>	<p><i>Lot Coverage standards removed to better reflect existing standards.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. Ground floor transparency should not be mandatory because it is not always a good idea.</p>	<p><i>Requirement removed.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. Is adding minimum 1st floor ceiling heights where none existed before necessary for Goleta?</p>	<p><i>Standard removed.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. Minimum landscaping standards have also been added as a percentage, where most did not have this as a percentage before. These should be closely reviewed in light of new parking and stormwater regulations.</p>	<p><i>Most Landscaping standards removed to better reflect existing standards.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. Front setbacks appear to be smaller except for CR Regional Commercial, which is set at 20'.</p>	<p><i>Setback standards revised to better reflect existing standards.</i></p>
<p>17.08 Chamber of Commerce. Previously, commercial zones had zero, 3, 5 or 10' side setback. Most now have a 5' setback.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Table 17.08.020 Barbara Massey. Requests a CUP be required for Time Shares.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Time share uses support visitors to the City.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030 Barbara Massey. Request to add: "Also see §17.25.190."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Not all references to Regulations applying in multiple districts included.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.A Chamber of Commerce. If the coverage is allowed to increase, then the density, landscape or other standards affected by increasing square footage allowed should be able to be reduced accordingly since the extra coverage will affect these other metrics.</p>	<p><i>Allowance removed altogether.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.08.030 Barbara Massey. Requests height limit remain at 35 ft.</p>	<p><i>No height standard in this table exceeds 35 feet.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.07.030 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Table 17.07.030 Maximum Density is expressed in units per net acre, whereas Minimum Density is expressed in units per acre. 17.03.040 states that density measurement is "calculated using net lot area."</p>	<p><i>"Net" removed.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.B Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Proposed commercial district street setback requirement appropriates private property for public use.</p>	<p><i>Section removed altogether.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.B Chamber of Commerce. This may not be necessary or appropriate in all instances. We do not need pedestrian improvements on these types of properties.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.C Barbara Massey. Request to add: "Also see §17.25.190."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Not all references to Regulations applying in multiple districts included.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.D/E Chamber of Commerce. These would be better left to design review guidelines. Creating blanket and potentially arbitrary requirements is limiting, and not necessary for Goleta.</p>	<p><i>Sections removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.08.030.F Chamber of Commerce. This would likely result in additional impervious areas and increase run off when shared use by car/ped can be done well and serve the intent appropriately. These requirements are seemingly onerous.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Pedestrian access would be reviewed through Development Plan process in most cases.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.F Chamber of Commerce. Item 3 requires walkways must be raised or separated by a physical barrier when painting, alternative surface such as pervious pavers, or other treatments can be more than effective especially for very low-ped use areas.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.G Chamber of Commerce. This should be left to Public Works.</p>	<p><i>No change. Public Works will review projects; however, the statement is still worthy of inclusion in NZO.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.H Chamber of Commerce. These transitional areas should be addressed through design rather than added as a blanket requirement.</p>	<p><i>Distance of transitional standard reduced but included.</i></p>
<p>17.08.030.H Chamber of Commerce. The max height for most C districts is only 5' more (35'). A smaller transitional area would be more than adequate. Absent deleting this requirement, there should be a provision that this could be adjusted with DRB approval.</p>	<p><i>Distance of transitional standard reduced but included.</i></p>
<p>17.08.040.3.d Chamber of Commerce. For lots under one ownership, it is not necessary to have these in place, nor is it appropriate for an owner to grant themselves an easement. This should be deleted.</p>	<p><i>Commercial Center standards removed. Projects would be reviewed through Development Plan processing and DRB.</i></p>
<p>17.08.040.3.e Chamber of Commerce. This should be handled in Design Review and should not be in the Zoning Code.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.08.040.A.2 Chamber of Commerce. Requiring each business in a shopping center to obtain an individual permit could create unnecessary layers of permits and should be reconsidered or deleted. Particularly where a shopping center is under one ownership and leases to individual tenants, this seems unnecessary.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.08.040.A.3 Chamber of Commerce. These seem like design review items, not necessarily needed in the Zoning Code.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.08.040.A.3 Chamber of Commerce. The requirement for on-site public plazas could be more flexible rather than a blanket requirement.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.08.040.A.3.g Barbara Massey. Requests Service Areas be replaced with appropriate wording from §17.25.190.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Design features would be reviewed by DRB.</i></p>
<p>17.08.040.A.4.b Chamber of Commerce. What is the purpose of this distance? Seems an arbitrary distance that could be reviewed rather than codified.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.08.080.A Barbara Massey. Requests all of Part A be removed.</p>	<p><i>Section A removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.09 – Office Districts</p>	
<p>17.09.020 Chamber of Commerce. Consider allowing more uses, including professional and institutional, in the business park zone. The City should reconsider the allowed uses in various zones.</p>	<p><i>Allowed uses determined by General Plan Land Use Element tables.</i></p>
<p>17.09.020 Chamber of Commerce. What is the reason to no longer allow community assembly in the Business Park zone?</p>	<p><i>Allowed uses determined by General Plan Land Use Element tables.</i></p>
<p>17.09.030.A Chamber of Commerce. This can be accomplished through design and should not need specific requirements.</p>	<p><i>Standard maintained for OI. Intent is to protect residential development consistent with HE 2.3(f).</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.09.030.B Chamber of Commerce. This same screening or visual impact mitigation should also be allowed to be achieved with landscaping or other manners, rather than fully articulated as the front façade of the building.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.09.030.C Chamber of Commerce. Should be a Public Works item.</p>	<p><i>No change. Public Works will review projects; however, the statement is still worthy of inclusion in NZO.</i></p>
<p>17.09.030.D Chamber of Commerce. These should all be worked out during Design Review and can be simplified to address pedestrian or street frontage with a simple statement that the buildings are articulated to have attractive street frontages.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.10 – Industrial Districts</p>	
<p>17.10 Chamber of Commerce. The City may want to reconsider why a reduction in 10’ plus a CUP is needed.</p>	<p><i>Ability to go beyond height standard with a CUP removed. General Plan height standard guides.</i></p>
<p>17.10 Chamber of Commerce. The new code reduces setbacks, but it adds lot width/area (only M-RP had a minimum lot area previously) and maximum coverage where no existed before for M-S-GOL.</p>	<p><i>Lot area, lot width, and lot coverage standards removed.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.10.020 Kunin. Table 17.10.020 addresses various uses in this Zone, and definitely allows for both custom and general manufacturing, as well as warehousing and storage for wholesale and distribution, but does not either specifically allow or prohibit the retail sales of the manufactured goods. Will retail sales be allowed.</p>	<p><i>Retail sales would be regulated in this instance as an accessory use, pursuant to regulations regarding accessory uses in Part IV of the NZO.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.10.030 Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Request that no change is made street side setbacks from existing standards.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to better reflect existing standards.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030 Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Request for alternatives for compliance.</p>	<p><i>See response above. Additional changes allowed through Modification and Development Plan processes.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Table 17.10.030 Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Request that front setback is applied to both IG and CG.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to better reflect existing standards.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.10.030 Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Request that coverage ratio of 50% is applied to both IG and CG.</p>	<p><i>Lot coverage requirements removed.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030(A) Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Supports increase in height standard and recommends that only approval by the ZA is required.</p>	<p><i>Allowance for additional height removed.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030 Barbara Massey. Request to add: "Also see §17.25.190."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Not all references to Regulations applying in multiple districts included.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.A-G Chamber of Commerce. Same comments as in Commercial Zones.</p>	<p><i>Many provisions removed. Design reviewed through discretionary review and DRB.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.B Chamber of Commerce. This section should state that it can be reduced to a minimum of 10' or similar to give appropriate expectation.</p>	<p><i>Not included. Planning Commission will consider based on relevant factors.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.C Chamber of Commerce. Separation of parking areas from buildings by 10 ft. doesn't seem necessary for many of the allowed uses in this zone. Reconsider whether this needs to be included.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.C Barbara Massey. Feels there should be no exceptions to the 10 ft. separation.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Design features would be reviewed by DRB.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.D Chamber of Commerce. ADA requirements should be left to state law for areas where ADA is required.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.E Chamber of Commerce. This same screening or visual impact mitigation should also be allowed to be achieved with landscaping or other manners, rather than fully articulated as the front façade of the building.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.10.030.E Chamber of Commerce. Some consideration should be given for whether the property or building can actually be seen from the freeway as well and waived if not.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.F Chamber of Commerce. Should be a Public Works item rather than the Zoning Code.</p>	<p><i>No change. Public Works will review projects; however, the statement is still worthy of inclusion in NZO.</i></p>
<p>17.10.030.G Chamber of Commerce. These types of site layout decisions should be worked out in design rather than codified.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.11 – Public and Quasi-Public Districts</p>	
<p>17.11.030 Barbara Massey. Request to add: "Also see §17.25.190."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Not all references to Regulations applying in multiple districts included.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.12 Open Space and Agricultural Districts</p>	
<p>17.12.020 Eileen Monahan, First 5 SB County. Allow child care centers, in addition to family child care homes in Open Space and Ag Districts.</p>	<p><i>Day Care Facilities added to the AG district with a Minor Conditional Use Permit.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.12.020 Barbara Massey. Request to add that Greenhouses are limited to 10% lot coverage.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Lot coverage for greenhouses now also provides for a greater allowance with a Major CUP.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.12.020 Jennifer Scholl. Suggests allowing battery storage projects in AG district and allow battery storage in setbacks.</p>	<p><i>Battery storage not currently included in the Revised Draft NZO. However, the Key Issues discussion with the Planning Commission will address Battery Storage.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.17 – -AE Airport Environs Overlay District	
<p>Peter Imhof, SBCAG. Suggests revisions of ZO or Airport Environs Overlay District.</p>	<p><i>No substantial revisions made. Uses allowed in part II may be further restricted because of their location in the Airport Environs Overlay in Part III. Consistency with SBCAG’s Draft ALUCP not included as that updated plan not yet adopted. Staff is preparing in parallel for SBCAG’s future adoption of that Plan.</i></p>
<p>17.17.030 Peter Imhof, SBCAG. Request to add the process for Airport Land Use Commission review of plans and projects under state law.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Consultation requirements included.</i></p>
Chapter 17.18 – -AHO Affordable Housing Overlay District	
<p>17.18.010, 17.29.020, 17.18.030, 17.03.030 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. It is unclear how the Affordable Housing Overlay District standards will be applied to small developments.</p>	<p><i>Overlay regulates the percent of affordable housing required. For small projects, refer to Inclusionary Housing Chapter. Language has been revised to address fractional inclusionary units.</i></p>
Chapter 17.19 – -H Hospital Overlay	
<p>17.19.050 Barbara Massey. Feels the maximum lot coverage for medical office buildings remain capped at 40%.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Allowances for lot coverage provided in General Plan policy LU 4.3.</i></p>
Chapter 17.20 – -MP Master Plan Overlay District	
<p>17.20.090 Barbara Massey. Requests all boundary changes to Master Plans go to PC.</p>	<p><i>Chapter removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.25 – General Site Regulations	
<p>17.25.020 Barbara Massey. Requests that Accessory structures are not permitted in setbacks.</p>	<p><i>Revisions made to allow accessory structures within setbacks with limitations. Revisions meant to closely mirror existing allowances.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.A Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to reference guest houses, artist studios, hobby rooms, etc as "Accessory structures."</p>	<p><i>See definition of accessory structure.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.A Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to add square footage criteria.</p>	<p><i>Size of accessory structures addressed through new Permit Requirements section.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.B.1 Ken Alker. Accessory structures should be allowed even when there is no main building.</p>	<p><i>There must be a principal use and primary structure.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.B.2 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to add language.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.B.2 Ken Alker. Concern with language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.D.1.b Ken Alker. Suggestion to keep current zoning language.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to better reflect existing standards and provide greater flexibility.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.D.2 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to allow accessory structures to encroach into side and rear setback lines.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to better reflect existing standards and provide greater flexibility.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.E Barbara Massey. Requests that Accessory structures max. height is 12 ft.</p>	<p><i>Greater flexibility in height standard added.</i></p>
<p>17.25.020.E Ken Alker. Maximum height should conform to the height requirements of the zoning district in which the structure is built.</p>	<p><i>Greater flexibility in height standard added.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.25.030 Cecilia Brown. Concern over ZA Role.</p>	<p><i>Regulation changes to the Review Authority, which could be the ZA, or Director, PC, or City Council, depending on the underlying project.</i></p>
<p>17.25.030 Cecilia Brown. Recommendations regarding Ag Buffer.</p>	<p><i>Language added to provide a starting point for analysis – the standard setback for the base district. This standard will apply in a very limit number of places, and often for small residential lots. There is concern that including a larger set buffer will prohibit use of some parcels.</i></p>
<p>17.25.030 Cecilia Brown. Request for list of unrestricted uses that could be allowed within ag buffers.</p>	<p><i>No included; no development allowed in setback and will depend on the development considered.</i></p>
<p>17.25.030 Cecilia Brown. Request for findings to be made at hearings.</p>	<p><i>Finding added, but not necessarily required to be made at a hearing.</i></p>
<p>17.25.030 Barbara Massey. Concern over ZA Role.</p>	<p><i>Regulation changes to the Review Authority, which could be the ZA, or Director, PC, or City Council, depending on the underlying project.</i></p>
<p>17.25.030.A Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to indicate a minimum and maximum buffer.</p>	<p><i>Change made to establish a starting point for analysis, but no absolute minimum and maximum setbacks added.</i></p>
<p>17.25.040 Cecilia Brown. Staff should explain principle changes.</p>	<p><i>Revisions made to more closely align with existing allowances.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
17.25.070 Barbara Massey. Requests wind turbines be prohibited in Residential District.	<i>Direct reference to wind turbines removed, however, there is still an allowance for energy production systems.</i>
17.25.070 Barbara Massey. Requests athletic field lighting be lower in Residential Districts.	<i>No change made. However, use allowed in Residential Districts is limited.</i>
17.25.080 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to allow columns, gates, entry lights to exceed over 6."	<i>Change made to allow additional two feet.</i>
17.25.090 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for flexibility in required setbacks.	<i>Standards removed.</i>
17.25.090.A Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The mixed-use step-back requirement could be used to control how a residential unit owner allocates living and sleeping space within the unit.	<i>Standards removed.</i>
17.25.100 Cecilia Brown. Request for discussion regarding open outdoor storage.	<i>No response required.</i>
17.25.100 Cecilia Brown. Request for information regarding permits for the enclosed storage containers.	<i>PODs and other temporary storage added to permissible outdoor storage in Residential, Commercial, and Office Districts.</i>
17.25.100.B.1 Barbara Massey. Requests a CUP be required.	<i>Minor Conditional Use Permit required.</i>
17.25.110.C Cecilia Brown. Concern over ZA Role.	<i>Reference changed to the Review Authority over the entire project.</i>
17.25.110.D Cecilia Brown. Questioned regulations for Single Family Homes.	<i>Standards revised to clarify that certain standards do not apply to residential development.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.25.110.D.1 Barbara Massey. Requests the screening include a roof structure.</p>	<p><i>Requirement for roof structure added.</i></p>
<p>17.25.120 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to vet the proposed disclosure language with County Surveyor and Recorder.</p>	<p><i>City does not believe this is necessary, since this is merely a disclosure of notice to any newly created lot within our own jurisdiction.</i></p>
<p>17.25.130 Cecilia Brown. Request to know how these standards were developed.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.25.130 Barbara Massey. Requests that this not be included in the ZO.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.25.140 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for definitive requirements for screening between 2 single family homes be developed based on characteristics of each project.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.25.140, Table 17.25.14.A, Table 17.25.140.A, Table 17.25.140.B Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The screening and buffering requirements are too extensive.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.25.140 Barbara Massey. Requests Table A and B be explained on same page.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.25.150 Cecilia Brown. Feels that DRB's input would be valuable.</p>	<p><i>Comment noted. Section revised to simplify standards.</i></p>
<p>17.25.160 Barbara Massey. Requests clarification regarding solar installation heights.</p>	<p><i>Section revised to provide greater clarity.</i></p>
<p>17.25.170 Cecilia Brown. Would like a reference to the Stormwater Management Plan.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Stormwater regulated in the Goleta Municipal Code.</i></p>
<p>17.25.170 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for more information or reference to City's Storm Water Management Plan.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Stormwater regulated in the Goleta Municipal Code.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.25.200 Cecilia Brown. Concern over ZA Role.</p>	<p><i>Authority changed to Review Authority of the overall project.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.26 – Coastal Access</p>	
<p>17.26.060.C Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for further definition of public access requirements.</p>	<p><i>Some revisions made. Requirements driven by General Plan policy and California Coastal Act.</i></p>
<p>17.26/17.27 Cecilia Brown. Staff should explain principle changes.</p>	<p><i>Staff will be available to discuss the rationale for these Chapters. Focus is on General Plan consistency. General Plan consistency will be a focus of one of the Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.26.040.B.1, 17.31.140.B, 17.31.150.D, 17.31.180.C Barbara Massey. Requests "as close to that as feasible or when feasible" be deleted.</p>	<p><i>17.26.040.B.1 reference remains, 17.31.140.B removed entirely, 17.31.150.D reference remains, 17.31.180.C reference remains. Reference kept in to ensure that the City was not requiring something that was not possible on a site. Feasibility language included in General Plan Conservation Element.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.28 – Density Bonus and Other Incentives</p>	
<p>17.28.020.E Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Redundancies and overlapping provisions are also found within the Proposed Ordinance. As an example Section 17.28.020.E and Section 17.28.030.A.2, while not identical, address the same concept.</p>	<p><i>No change made.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.29 – Inclusionary Housing Program	
<p>17.28.020.A, 17.29.050.A.1, 17.29.050.A.2.c, 17.29.060 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The inclusionary housing requirements are likely to have negative impacts on the production of both market-rate and affordable housing.</p>	<p><i>Regulations driven by Housing Element policy.</i></p>
<p>17.29.050.C/D Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request clarification of "Offsite" and "Land Dedication."</p>	<p><i>Language added to clarify the process and what is expected of developers.</i></p>
Chapter 17.31 – Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas	
<p>17.31 Cecilia Brown. Staff should explain principle changes.</p>	<p><i>ESHA Chapter is new in the NZO and intended to implement General Plan policy. Staff reviewed and revised this Chapter to better reflect the Conservation Element. ESHA will be a topic of discussion during one of the Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.31 Cecilia Brown. Feels that the initial site assessment should take place as part of the normal application process.</p>	<p><i>Language revised so that it is not a Zoning Administrator process.</i></p>
<p>17.31 Cecilia Brown. Concern over ZA Role.</p>	<p><i>Zoning Administrator role in ESHA analysis revised to reflect standard application processing.</i></p>
<p>17.31.030 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for clarification whether requirements only apply to development proposed on the same parcel as ESHA.</p>	<p><i>No revision made. Biological Study required within 300 feet (generally) of ESHA regardless of parcel boundaries.</i></p>
<p>17.31.030.D Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request that requirements may be waived or adjusted when warranted.</p>	<p><i>No change made.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.31.030.D Chamber of Commerce. The City should clarify or edit to be less restrictive. Not all the requirements are necessarily going to be applicable or necessary.</p>	<p><i>No changes made. Some items not that they are only required if certain actions are included in the restoration.</i></p>
<p>17.31.030.D Chamber of Commerce. Staff or the Director should be given authority to waive items on a case by case basis.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.31.030, 040 Brian Trautwein, EDC. Concerned with changes regarding ESHA's.</p>	<p><i>New regulations regarding grading and grubbing, with details regarding proximity to sensitive habitat, added to NZO.</i></p>
<p>17.31.050.B Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to add language regarding fuel management plans.</p>	<p><i>Discussion of fuel management plans included where appropriate.</i></p>
<p>17.31.050.B Chamber of Commerce. "Land divisions are only allowed if each new lot being created, except for open space lots, is capable of being developed without building in any ESHA or ESHA buffer and without any need for impacts to ESHA related to fuel modification for fire safety purposes." This should be deleted or clarified because it could severely limit the ability of a property owner to reasonably build on a lot constrained by ESHA. Fuel management and ESHA can be compatible, and beneficial.</p>	<p><i>This section pertains to land divisions, which is an intensification of use of property. There is no guarantee of right to subdivide. Furthermore, a subdivision would be subject to CEQA review, which would also require Biological impacts to ESHA be avoided or mitigated.</i></p>
<p>17.31.060.B Barbara Massey. Requests the use of toxic substances be prohibited.</p>	<p><i>Revision made. Section B deleted.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Barbara Massey. Request to know who the review authority is.</p>	<p><i>Any reduction will require a Major CUP with Planning Commission approval.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Barbara Massey. Streamside Protection Areas buffer should be no less than 50 feet.</p>	<p><i>No change. Existing language consistent with General Plan policy CE 2.2(a).</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.31.070.1 Barbara Massey. Request that bike paths are prohibited in Streamside Protection Areas.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Language included comes from General Plan policy CE 2.3</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. This language is impossible for staff to interpret consistently if at all. The term feasible itself is an issue.</p>	<p><i>No change made at this point. However, this item is expected to be discussed during the Planning Commission workshop covering ESHA.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. There are no criteria identified for staff or decision makers to use in determining whether there is a feasible alternative. This opens the door for attack of any project and the standard may become a legal argument over reasonable use of a property.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. In reality, it is very difficult for applicants, especially on larger projects, to find support in a buffer reduction of any kind even if the code specifically allows for it. Therefore, the criteria need to be clear.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. Especially when a feature is severely degraded and a project protects and enhances an ESHA, a 100-foot setback could be considered disproportionate to the potential impact of the project itself.</p>	<p><i>See response above. Reductions to SPA buffer limited by General Plan policy CE 2.2(a).</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Topper. Provided recommendations regarding Streamside Protection Area buffers and what to consider when determining infeasibility.</p>	<p><i>Not included at this time. SPA buffers will be discussed during the Planning Commission workshop covering ESHA.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.A.1 Topper. Request a new permit type: Creek Protection Permit.</p>	<p><i>No new permit added. Development in close proximity to creeks (inside SPA 100-ft buffer) will require a Major CUP.</i></p>
<p>17.31.070.E Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Questions what triggers these requirements.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.31.090.A.1 Barbara Massey. Requests criteria for whether an isolated wetland can be filled.</p>	<p><i>Allowance for filling of isolated wetlands removed.</i></p>
<p>17.31.090.B Barbara Massey. Requests second sentence reads: "A wetland buffer must be 100 ft., but be no less than 50 ft. in width."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Language is consistent with General Plan policy CE 3.4.</i></p>
<p>17.31.120 Barbara Massey. Request that all vernal pools be protected.</p>	<p><i>No change to this section. The references mirror those provided in General Plan policy CE 3.8.</i></p>
<p>17.31.140 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to clarify that encroachments may be permitted when justified and mitigated.</p>	<p><i>Section C removed as it addresses individual native trees, which will be regulated separately.</i></p>
<p>17.31.140 Chamber of Commerce. This section is extremely restrictive and internally inconsistent. The City should clarify that encroachments around protected trees may be permitted when justified and mitigated per specific study and recommendations by biologists or arborists.</p>	<p><i>Section revised to limit regulations to woodlands and savanna, rather than individual trees. Individual tree protections to be added at a later date.</i></p>
<p>17.31.150 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request to provide more definition of what a native grassland is.</p>	<p><i>Native grass protections are afforded to areas of ¼ acre or more. Biologists would be conducting this analysis where development is proposed on vacant parcels with grasses present. CEQA will also address this for larger development proposals.</i></p>
<p>17.31.170.A.6 Barbara Massey. Requests a CUP be required.</p>	<p><i>Butterfly research allowance with an Administrative Use Permit removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.32 – Floodplain Management</p>	
<p>17.32.020 Chamber of Commerce. Applicability should cross-reference the Safety Element.</p>	<p><i>No change. FEMA maps are appropriate reference.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.32.060.B Chamber of Commerce. This should be clarified that utility lines such as sewer main lines could be directionally drill under floodways.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Floodplain management regulations found in Chapter 15.10 of Goleta Municipal Code.</i></p>
<p>17.32.080 Chamber of Commerce. There are wetlands NOT in the coastal zone that would not be subject to the Coastal Act and these instances should be addressed.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Floodplain management regulations found in Chapter 15.10 of Goleta Municipal Code.</i></p>
<p>17.32.080.B.3 Chamber of Commerce. Curious as to where or in what context within the City this would apply.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Floodplain management regulations found in Chapter 15.10 of Goleta Municipal Code.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.33 - Hazards</p>	
<p>17.33 Chamber of Commerce. Unfortunately, the CCC’s guiding document about sea level rise is pretty loose and confusing. The City should consider different verbiage or deleting this sentence. IT’s reasonable to expect this is going to change rapidly over time and it can be discussed differently than ‘best available science.’ Particularly since the best available science may include very costly reports, testing, etc.</p>	<p><i>No change. Using best and latest coastal hazard information is necessary to best analyze potential development.</i></p>
<p>17.33.030 Chamber of Commerce. This should be reconsidered for the expected design life rather than 100 years as a standard minimum.</p>	<p><i>Reference to 100 years removed.</i></p>
<p>17.33.030 Chamber of Commerce. “The Report is required to demonstrate that subject to the Report’s recommended measures, all of the standards of this chapter can be met.” This should clarify that the standards can either be met or are not applicable or found to not be a hazard.</p>	<p><i>Reference removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.33.040.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. The staircase item should be consistent with SE 3.1 which talks about wood staircases and “lightly engineered.” The GP should be revised to match this term of “Engineered staircase” as you can’t lightly engineer a staircase.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.E.1 Chamber of Commerce. Item F requires survey work ‘beyond the site.’ This should be defined for a particular distance so as not to be onerous to the property owner. As well, the owner may not get cooperation of the neighbors.</p>	<p><i>No change. It is already qualified to include conditions that might affect the site. The extent is determined by the site-specific topography, so a distance measure would be inappropriate.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.E.2 Chamber of Commerce. ‘No machinery will be allowed in the intertidal zone.’ This may not be possible where the intertidal zone extends to the sea cliff for instance. As well, it may require some beach activity therefore this should not be a prohibition.</p>	<p><i>Restriction removed. Intertidal zone not within the City’s jurisdiction.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.F Chamber of Commerce. It needs to include some kind of verbiage about ‘unless strict adherence would constitute a taking of property by eliminating the development potential on a legal lot.</p>	<p><i>Revisions include the ability to reduce the setback requirement with a Major CUP, which would avoid the Takings issue.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.F Chamber of Commerce. This appears to conflict with legal-nonconforming standards and should instead be handled as non-conforming. If the structure is illegal, then it should instead be subject to the section regarding enforcement.</p>	<p><i>Revisions made. Structures that are nonconforming as to bluff setback would be subject to the Nonconforming Chapter.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.F.2.a.1 Chamber of Commerce. The City should carefully consider flexibility in these requirements particularly where it could constitute a taking.</p>	<p><i>Bluff setback section revised, but standards remain unchanged. These standards align with General Plan policy SE 2.1.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.33.040.F.2.a.1 Chamber of Commerce. The section should include a list of allowed uses in the bluff retreat setback that includes landscaping, structures of limited value or without foundations (planted pergola? Gazebo?) golf course greens, or other nonstructural uses, and drainage features such as the drainpipes and public access staircases in 17.33.040.A.2.</p>	<p><i>Language revised to identify an allowance for passive recreational structures, minor improvements, grading for drainage.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.F.2.b Chamber of Commerce. The City needs to be consistent with design life. (50 vs 100-year life in the hazards section).</p>	<p><i>No change. One is for bluff top setback and the other is non-bluff setback. The distinction and variation are appropriate.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.F.2.c Chamber of Commerce. This should be revised as, ‘when the applicant proposes landscaping it must be drought tolerant’ rather than requiring new landscape. As well, it could consider using ‘low water’ rather than drought tolerant.</p>	<p><i>No change. Landscaping necessary to prevent exacerbated erosion.</i></p>
<p>17.33.040.G.3 Chamber of Commerce. One of the items to allow continued use is item d. “alternatives...have failed” this should also allow for where alternatives have or are about to, or will fail.</p>	<p><i>Revision made to be consistent with Coastal Act. The revision includes discussion of feasibility of alternatives, rather than those alternatives having failed.</i></p>
<p>17.33.050.C Chamber of Commerce. The City should leave these distances to the building code or the expertise of the geotech rather than a blanket distance.</p>	<p><i>Default 50-foot setback consistent with General Plan policy SE 4.4.</i></p>
<p>17.33.050.C Chamber of Commerce. It says nonstructural development may be allowed in these areas depending on how they would withstand or respond... Since structures are defined as ‘anything constructed or erected which requires location on the ground’ and often these are temporary, of limited value, etc. evaluating how they would withstand or respond may not be an appropriate regulation.</p>	<p><i>No change. Language consistent with SE 4.4</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.34 – Historic Resource Preservation	
<p>Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Chapter 17.34 (Historic Resource Preservation) is a placeholder for future regulations that have not yet been drafted. Section 17.41.100 (Historic Signs) also contains a placeholder for a cross-reference to Chapter 17.34. In another example,</p>	<p><i>No change made. Historic Preservation regulations will be adopted as part of a separate projects and brought into the NZO when appropriate.</i></p>
Chapter 17.35 - Landscaping	
<p>17.35 Chamber of Commerce. In general, this section appears to be too directive and requires too much, reduces flexibility, imagination, and ability to creatively address landscaping of a project.</p>	<p><i>Significant revisions made to reduce prescriptive requirements.</i></p>
<p>17.35 Chamber of Commerce. Where a person cannot afford or does not choose to hire a landscape architect, use of the Alternative Compliance provision may be difficult. The City should put these as guidelines in a separate document.</p>	<p><i>Alternative Compliance option removed. Landscape plans will be reviewed by DRB.</i></p>
<p>17.35.030 Chamber of Commerce. Has a list of areas that MUST be landscaped and includes all required front and street-facing setbacks, lot perimeters, building perimeters, parking areas and unused areas. This seems a little excessive, particularly lot perimeters which could easily be attractively handled with a fence or something less than landscaping.</p>	<p><i>Significant revisions made to reduce prescriptive requirements.</i></p>
<p>17.35.030.A Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Opposes landscaping standard.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.35.030.C Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Section 17.35.030.C requires portions of a building that front a public street to have landscape planters installed along at least twenty percent of the building face. Figure 17.35.030.C depicts this standard but notes that it applies not only to buildings that face a public street but also to buildings that face a parking lot. Section 17.02.020.C states that the text controls a conflict between text and a diagram. It is not clear however whether the caption to the diagram should be considered text or diagram. These types of inconsistencies should be resolved so that users of the Proposed Ordinance do not have to make interpretations.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.35.040.B Chamber of Commerce. Should be clarified that mounds are not required, simply that these are the expectations when they are used.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.36 – Lighting</p>	
<p>17.36 Cecilia Brown. Requests Lighting meet the most recent requirements of CA Title 24, Chapter 6 and the City's own municipal ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Building & Safety reviews compliance to all Title 24, Part 6 standards during plan check for buildings, signs, and other development subject those requirements, including indoor and outdoor lighting.</i></p>
<p>17.36 Barbara Massey. Requests Lighting meet the most recent requirements of CA Title 24, Chapter 6 and the City's own municipal ordinance.</p>	<p><i>See comment above.</i></p>
<p>17.36 Chamber of Commerce. Like the Landscape section, the rules in the lighting section may be better used as guidelines in a separate document. This section needs to be consistent with industry standard, which changes more often than the City might want to change their Zoning Code.</p>	<p><i>Section revised to removed design language.</i></p>
<p>17.36 Chamber of Commerce. The standards for measuring light need to be consistent throughout the code and definitions.</p>	<p><i>Lumens, watts, foot-candles, and Kelvin used where appropriate.</i></p>
<p>17.36 Chamber of Commerce. Holiday lights shouldn't be restricted to certain dates – are there holiday lights up all year that are particularly offensive? This is an unnecessary code section.</p>	<p><i>Limits on dates of holiday lights removed.</i></p>
<p>17.36.030 Barbara Massey. Request to add Laser lights.</p>	<p><i>Change made.</i></p>
<p>17.36.040.C Barbara Massey. Request to delete public right of ways and shielding be confined to premises.</p>	<p><i>Right-of-way reference removed with a small allowance for light trespass.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.36.050.F Chamber of Commerce. Codifies lighting at gas stations and these do not seem necessary nor do they match potential security requirements or best practices.</p>	<p><i>Section kept in but revised to simplify.</i></p>
<p>17.36.050.F Chamber of Commerce. Flood lights cannot cause glare or light to shine on adjacent property or public right of way. Again, this may not be necessary or match security needs.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.37 – Nonconforming Uses and Structures</p>	
<p>17.37 Chamber of Commerce. Generally speaking, this ordinance should opt out Agricultural uses.</p>	<p><i>No change made.</i></p>
<p>17.37.030.A.2 Barbara Massey. Opposed to language.</p>	<p><i>No change. Intent is not to create a high burden to get a parcel in conformance with allowed uses.</i></p>
<p>17.37.020.B Barbara Massey. Request to remove Zoning Authority role.</p>	<p><i>Authority changed to the Director.</i></p>
<p>17.37.030, 17.37.030.D.2 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Expansion of some nonconforming uses may require structural updates.</p>	<p><i>No change made. While structures not in compliance with the building code may be grandfathered in, there is a concern about allowing enlargements to these structures to further enlarge a nonconforming use.</i></p>
<p>17.37.030.B Barbara Massey. Opposed to language.</p>	<p><i>No change. See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.030.D Barbara Massey. Opposed to language.</p>	<p><i>No change. Intent is to allow some flexibility as NZO may create new nonconforming uses.</i></p>
<p>17.37.030.D.5.c Chamber of Commerce. This provision would be pretty hard to meet considering it is non-conforming use.</p>	<p><i>Findings removed, no CUP required. Intent is to provide greater flexibility for existing uses.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.37.030.D.5.f Chamber of Commerce. City should consider impacts to agriculture or provide allowances where that hazardous material product or waste is regulated by some other agency and the user is in compliance with all applicable laws related to that hazardous material.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.030.E.2 Chamber of Commerce. Specifying Industrial and Oil & Gas is redundant, 17.37.040 doesn't state both Industrial AND Oil & Gas. The two sections should be consistent.</p>	<p><i>Reference removed. See below.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.6.a Barbara Massey. Opposed to language.</p>	<p><i>Limited Exception Determination provision removed entirely.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.A.2 Chamber of Commerce. It does not give clarity on what criteria or when the ZA would be able to waive the material.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.A.2 Chamber of Commerce. One of the requested items for consideration (17.37.040.A.2.f) is estimated expenditures for the improvements, including materials, labor and equipment. Cost of improvements can be calculated any number of ways and should not be a deciding factor.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.D.3 Chamber of Commerce. What about instances where the entitlement exists for an improvement but has not yet been exercised? These are permitted improvements that are not "existing permitted" and could increase the overall intensity of the use beyond current operating limits because they have not fully developed what they're entitled to develop.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.D.4 Chamber of Commerce. What is considered the existing developed industrial site boundary? Is this the existing footprint or the entire parcel?</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.D.4 Chamber of Commerce. Replacement and repair of items could be considered actions that extend the life of the facility.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.37.040.D.4 Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider instances where repair of a tank or structure requires adjusting its location, or construction of a replacement tank or structure adjacent to the existing for the interim while the existing is overhauled.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.040.D.5 Chamber of Commerce. A repair necessarily extends the life. This could be written more clearly to acknowledge that.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.050 Chamber of Commerce. This ordinance appears to be better than the last in the way it limits the initiation of termination proceedings to the Council where it used to allow others to initiate termination. However, it still does not clarify what will trigger the Council to commence termination proceedings.</p>	<p><i>No substantive changes made to Ordinance No. 15-01.</i></p>
<p>17.37.050.2 Chamber of Commerce. Ten days of notice is not enough time to read your mail, consider the letter, hire a lawyer and get your team to a hearing. This should be at least 30 days if not longer. These are legally established nonconforming uses, not illegal uses.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.050.B Chamber of Commerce. Typically, you apply for extensions prior to the expiration, so you should be able to apply for this extension any time up until that 5 years expires. Within 1 year, you'd be appealing back to the same hearing body (most likely). The Modification to a Termination Order goes to the Planning Commission for review. The PC's action is appealable back to the CC. this is a very unusual appeal process. Council with the original decision-> PC to hear the modification and approve/deny -> PC action appealable back to the Council.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.37.050.C.1 Barbara Massey. Request for termination of nonconforming use to be limited to a one-time extension of no more than 5 years.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.37.060 Chamber of Commerce. This section may need to address historic landmarks or include special provisions.</p>	<p><i>Historic preservation will be addressed in a different Chapter pending development of regulations as part of a different project.</i></p>
<p>17.37.060 Barbara Massey. Request to add enlargement of non-conforming structures.</p>	<p><i>No change. NZO may create nonconforming structures and effort is being made to allow some flexibility.</i></p>
<p>17.37.060.C Barbara Massey. Request for section C to be removed.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Based on new standards, this provides a path for nonconforming structures.</i></p>
<p>17.37.060.E Chamber of Commerce. The definition includes the words “is immediately necessary” which is not defined. In addition, a 50% replacement cost limit is inappropriate. There should be no dollar limit to making a structure structurally safe.</p>	<p><i>Section E removed as it is covered in section B, Right to Repair or Restore.</i></p>
<p>17.37.060.F Barbara Massey. Request that any restoration be limited to same size/extent/configuration as previous.</p>	<p><i>Section only provides a path forward if the same size, extent, and configuration.</i></p>
<p>17.37.060.F Barbara Massey. Request to be subject to all requirements in effect at time of replacement.</p>	<p><i>No change made. NZO may create nonconforming structures and effort is being made to allow some flexibility.</i></p>
<p>17.37.060.F.2 Chamber of Commerce. This will be a problem for processing if we have larger scale emergencies such as area fires or earthquakes. This should be considered for a downshift to a ZA decision.</p>	<p><i>No change. Property owner could build new structure to standard and potentially not require a discretionary development approval. In case of a large disaster, additional measures could also be considered.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.38 – Oil and Gas Facilities	
<p>17.38 Chamber of Commerce. This section does not include a list of zones where Oil & Gas are allowed. From a review of all the individual zoning districts appears that General Industrial “IG” is the only allowed zone for any O&G. For comparison, in the old code, Oil & Gas were permitted uses in AG 1 and AG II, M-CR, M-2, RES, RR, C-2, C-3 M-RP, M-1 and REC zones. Also note that with this update some M-1 zoned properties were rezoned, IG (General Industrial) some are zoned IS (Service Industrial).</p>	<p><i>Staff relied on General Plan use allowances for the NZO.</i></p>
<p>17.38.020 Chamber of Commerce. The City should define those items subject to City review authority. The list may be inclusive of items under one or more jurisdictions (DOGGR for example) not including the City.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>17.38.040.A Barbara Massey. Request for height limit to be 35 ft.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.38.040.B Barbara Massey. Request that setbacks be at least 1,000 ft.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Pipeline setbacks consistent with General Plan.</i></p>
<p>17.38.040.K Chamber of Commerce. This requirement should more closely match the GWD process. As written, this section does not detail at what point the unconditional will serve letter is required, and should also acknowledge that the GWD does not provide a final C&WS until late in their process, which does not occur until later in the process. Please review and consider the GWD process chart attached and available on the GWD website. Specifically, steps 6 and 7 outline the Will Serve Letter is CONDITIONAL until there are final building permits.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.38.040.M Barbara Massey. Request that plans are reviewed by the City and copies be available at City Hall.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Project documents will be available at City Hall.</i></p>
<p>17.38.040.M Barbara Massey. Request for The Contingency Plans to be available at City Hall.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.38.050.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. Does this mean the parcel upon which the equipment or improvements are located, or the limits of the improved area or other? Our recommendation is to clarify what precisely is considered “the facility.” In Part VI: General Terms, Pipeline or Transmission Line is defined as “Transportation facilities for the conveyance of water or commodities. Also includes pipeline surface and terminal facilities, pump stations, bulk stations, surge and storage tanks, but does not include lateral extensions or service lines.”</p>	<p><i>Definition of Pipeline removed. Regulations apply to all pipeline locations and all parcels would need to be included in Major CUP application.</i></p>
<p>17.38.050.B.2 Chamber of Commerce. Instances where the City finds the 25-foot setback poses an undue hardship to proposed development, provided that any reduced setback is not less than 15 feet, measured from each side of the pipeline. There should be some definition of what the undue hardship might be.</p>	<p><i>No clarification provided. This is something the Planning Commission would need to determine.</i></p>
<p>17.38.050.B.2 Chamber of Commerce. Exceptions include, “Replacement of a public utility pipeline with a functionally equivalent pipeline” but does not include private utilities nor does it appear to allow replacement of other types of existing pipelines. These exceptions should be expanded to allow more flexibility.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Exceptions limited to only those provided for in General Plan policy SE 8.13(e).</i></p>
<p>17.38.050.B.2 Chamber of Commerce. The City should define what kind of oil and gas pipeline is considered a public utility pipeline since this occurs in the O&G section of the code.</p>	<p><i>Utility lines may include oil and gas pipelines.</i></p>
<p>17.38.050.B.6 Chamber of Commerce. This should reference or recognize safety measures required by other agencies, if any.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Agency consultation will occur during the discretionary review process.</i></p>
<p>17.38.050.B.6 Barbara Massey. Request that emergency shut-off valves be installed on all pipelines.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Conditional Use permit process could consider.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.38.050.C Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider language to clarify and consider many aspects of environment such as instances where the environmentally preferable route or alternative creates a significant additional length of pipe (such as to route around sensitive areas), or would route a pipeline closer to a residence or school, or similar use to be away from something like a wetland.</p>	<p><i>CEQA related findings removed. These developments will undergo environmental analysis because of the discretionary review required.</i></p>
<p>17.38.050.C Chamber of Commerce. The City should be able to make findings that additional length of pipe and distance also increases total area for potential breaks or issues with that pipe, along with additional cost of maintenance or repair when considering the preferred route.</p>	<p><i>Impacts and alternatives will be analyzed through environmental review.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060 Chamber of Commerce. Period of 12 months seems like an arbitrary and unreasonable timeline.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. General Plan policies would still apply when procession abandonment and removal.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060.B.2.b Chamber of Commerce. This also seems like an unreasonable timeline.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060.D.14 Chamber of Commerce. These other agencies may not like to issue their permits without evidence of the local permit, or may not be practical to obtain prior to City approval. Therefore, the City should consider that this be revised to state that the evidence of permit be provided prior to issuance or effectuating the permit rather than as part of the application.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060.F Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider incorporating a definition of "natural conditions."</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060.F.2 Chamber of Commerce. The capacity of nearby streets and highways is not under the control of the owner/operator of an O&G facility. This Finding should be reconsidered.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060.G.1 Chamber of Commerce. It is unknown how long it will take to obtain a D&RP permit, therefore the timeline to commence needs to be tied to that permit issuance, not the cessation of use.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.38.060.G.1 Chamber of Commerce. This should be revised to define what “two years following the start of the decommissioning project” would be. Is it the effective date of the permit or the day employees start disassembling the facility. It should be the date of commencement of disassembly, or alternatively tied to some kind of agreed upon schedule rather than 2 years.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.38.060.G.4 Chamber of Commerce. Does not appear to make sense in context. For instance, as provided, it states “when subsurface pipeline segments are decommissioned, they must be removed along with all debris, except under the following circumstances: b. Areas of ground disturbance must be restored to pre-project conditions, including revegetation of the affected area.” This section should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.39 – Parking and Loading</p>	
<p>17.39 Cecilia Brown. Concern with "stored" vehicles in driveways in her neighborhood.</p>	<p><i>Storage issues addressed in various Chapters.</i></p>
<p>17.39 Chamber of Commerce. Certain Chamber members should have a separate meeting to dive in to the specifics of the new parking and loading standards. Particular design concerns include providing EV charging stations vs. requiring that the infrastructure be available and READY for future use, heat island reduction provisions, wheel stops, expanded drive aisle widths, mandatory selection of Public Works trees in private lots, landscape curb opening requirements, expanded landscape island requirements in terms of size and number, and conflicting vehicle overhang dimensions in text and in figures.</p>	<p><i>General comment. In response, several design-oriented regulations removed.</i></p>
<p>17.39 Barbara Massey. Request for sufficient walkways in large parking lots.</p>	<p><i>Parking lot pedestrian configuration not included. This will be an issue with larger projects and will be addressed through Development Plans and DRB review.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.010.D Barbara Massey. Request for no reduction of parking in residential districts</p>	<p><i>No change made. Parking reductions more focused on non-residential districts. However, parking reductions considered throughout the City.</i></p>
<p>17.39.020.B Michael Iza. Questions how use classification will be determined.</p>	<p><i>Use classes all defined under the draft NZO in Part VI.</i></p>
<p>17.39.020.B Chamber of Commerce. Appears to be a significant improvement to the previous code. Old code required “for additions to existing developments, the increased parking requirement shall be based on the aggregate total of the floor area and/or employees of all existing and proposed buildings or structures on the property.” New code states under “Reconstruction, Expansion and Change in Use of Existing Non-Residential Buildings” that when a change or expansion of use creates an increase of 10% or more in the number of required parking, that the additional parking must be provided for the addition enlargement or change, NOT the entire building or site. Any existing deficiency does not need to be mitigated. To current requirement is to calculate parking requirement for aggregate total floor area/number of employees etc. Therefore, the new language appears to result in less required parking. In addition, a change in occupancy is not considered a change of use unless the occupant is a different use. And, additional parking is not required for reconstruction of existing buildings when there is no increase in floor area.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.39.030.A Michael Iza. Questions regarding language.</p>	<p><i>There is no consequence to parking on the street. However, the required parking must be available. Business hours relate to commercial parking uses.</i></p>
<p>17.39.030.A Chamber of Commerce. It is unclear if this provision is in conflict with 17.39.050.D.4 which allows for shared parking agreements. This provision states that no property owner can sublease, sub-rent, or otherwise encumber the off-street parking spaces required by this chapter. These two should be clarified or cross referenced.</p>	<p><i>If share parking is allowed, that parking is not required pursuant to this Chapter.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.030.D Chamber of Commerce. This is new language and appears to result in less required parking area.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.39.030.E.3 Chamber of Commerce. The way this is written, may disadvantage those affordable owners/renters to have to pay equal price for parking.</p>	<p><i>Section on unbundling removed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.030.F Michael Iza. Questions how 1960 was determined.</p>	<p><i>Reference to 1960 removed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.030.F Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider including reference to the permit process for conversion of garage and if Design Review is required.</p>	<p><i>Not included. This Chapter only regulates parking, not conversions.</i></p>
<p>17.39.030.F Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for flexibility regarding provision of covered parking subsequent.</p>	<p><i>No change. Otherwise, this would negate the covered parking requirement for the homes.</i></p>
<p>17.39.040 Eileen Monahan, First 5 SB County. A typical formula is 1 space for every 2 staff and 1 space for every 10 children.</p>	<p><i>Standard updated but requires one space per employee during the largest shift.</i></p>
<p>17.39.040 Eileen Monahan, First 5 SB County. Allow for alternate parking options.</p>	<p><i>Parking reductions allowed. Parking could also be analyzed during discretionary review.</i></p>
<p>17.39.040.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. It is not certain this new condition will result in less required parking: a typical parking study applies a Shared Parking method that determines the cumulative peak parking requirement of the combined land uses, instead of the aggregate number of required spaces.</p>	<p><i>Comment noted. Intent is to create an absolute reduction that would not require a separate justification during discretionary review.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.39.040.A.2 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for clarification if all parking spaces need to be enclosed inside a garage.</p>	<p><i>Requirement for a third space removed altogether.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Table 17.39.040.A.2 John B. Lishman. Feels non-permitted garage conversions is a bigger issue.</p>	<p><i>Where garages are converted, replaced covered parking must be provided. Where not permitted, this is an enforcement issue.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.39.040.A.3 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for 25% reduction allowed for senior housing.</p>	<p><i>Reduction added.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.39.040.A.4 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. 1 space per guest room may be potentially excessive.</p>	<p><i>Revision made to require one space per two beds and no additional parking for employees.</i></p>
<p>17.39.040.D Chamber of Commerce. Appears to be positive in that it allows Exemptions from parking for small commercial uses. "In C districts, the following commercial uses are not required to provide on-site parking when they contain less than 1,500 square feet of floor area: Retail sales, personal services, eating and drinking establishments, food and beverage retail sales, offices-walk-in clientele, and banks and financial institutions." Unless 4 of those types are on a single lot, then the total floor area of those will be used to calculate parking.</p>	<p><i>Exemption removed as this could lead to significantly under-parked sites.</i></p>
<p>17.39.040.E Barbara Massey. Request for no "Credit for On-Street Parking Spaces."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Reduction seen as a reasonable measure when on-street parking is available.</i></p>
<p>17.39.050 Barbara Massey. Request that number of parking spaces only be reduced after review by PC.</p>	<p><i>No change. Additional reductions available through discretionary review.</i></p>
<p>17.39.050 Chamber of Commerce. This section also appears to be positive. The City should consider if a project that would otherwise be approved by the ZA needs to be elevated to a CUP to reduce parking.</p>	<p><i>This Chapter provides several automatic parking reductions. If additional reductions are sought, discretionary review provides a reasonable avenue. Depending on the process, reduction could be made by the ZA.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.050.B Barbara Massey. Request that transit accessibility be nearer than 0.75.</p>	<p><i>Change made to 0.5 miles.</i></p>
<p>17.39.050.E.1 Barbara Massey. Request that Redevelopment parking be deleted.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Reduction provides beneficial incentive for new uses.</i></p>
<p>17.39.050.F Chamber of Commerce. The Criteria for approval of a parking reduction seem reasonable except for item c. which may be hard to prove. The City should rewrite this to be more precise.</p>	<p><i>Section simplified to reference discretionary approval processes.</i></p>
<p>17.39.050.F Chamber of Commerce. Detrimental impact is an ambiguous term and should not be used.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.050.F.2 Barbara Massey. Request for parking demand study.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.060 Chamber of Commerce. It is unclear where or how the City anticipates parking assessment district to be established.</p>	<p><i>Establishment would be by Resolution of the City Council. This section just creates the option for such a district. No specific location identified.</i></p>
<p>17.39.060 Michael Iza. Request to know how fees are calculated.</p>	<p><i>Fees would be identified through an adopted Resolution at a later date. The NZO cannot provide that information.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070 Donald Boneck. Request for more RV parking along Encinas Royale.</p>	<p><i>The NZO does not regulate public street parking restrictions.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070 Harry S. Rouse. Request to clarify difference between RV's used consistently and those that have not been used for many years.</p>	<p><i>RV parking regulations in the Parking and Loading Chapter apply to residential uses. Personal Storage commercial uses regulated separately.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070 Wes Herman. Really appreciated the organization of 2/22 PC Meeting.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.2 Barbara Massey. Request that off-site parking for residential use be prohibited.</p>	<p><i>No change. Provision allows minor flexibility for multiple-dwelling residential.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Christopher and Carol Urwick. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>Recreational Vehicle and Trailer regulations revised. Change made to allow in all setbacks subject to a series of limitations and requirements.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Laura Donner. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 George Dumas. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Jerome B. Compton. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Steve Silva. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 David Geoffrion. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Don McDermott. In support of RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Allan La Fleur. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Linda La Fleur. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Becky Hunter. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Katie & Ken Newendorp. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Johnny Sarena. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Valerie Davis. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Nancy Garcia. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
17.39.070.A.3 Rosemary Resch. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Carrie Jones. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Bruce Trowbridge. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Lise Christiansson. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Curtis O'Shock. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Alan Lipsky. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Paul Morneault. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Gail Elbek. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 John Bedi. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Suzy Dahl. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Lisa Kus. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Aaron Young and Jane Sevier. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Richard Goeden. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 John B. Lishman. Opposed to RV language - so long as it does not intrude public walkways.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Jim Henry. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
17.39.070.A.3 Donald Boneck. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Laura Donner. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Greg. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Petition Packet. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 John Feeley. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Tina Feeley. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Donna Harris. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Donna Harris. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Jerry Sorich. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Patty Enger. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Harry S. Rouse. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Barbara and Ken Greenberg. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Lisa Kus. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Andy Eggendorfer. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 James Kruger. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
17.39.070.A.3 Jane Sevier. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Zeb Dyer. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Dennis and Lynn Kirby. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Jim Henry. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Michael Miller. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Briggs Wayco. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Dan Adair. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Edward Leska. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Linda Slice. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Sue Salder-Pare'. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Darla Sharp. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Harry S. Rouse. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Kathy and George Stark. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Lise Christiansson. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
17.39.070.A.3 Francis Wesley Herman, SB County Fire Department. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Bob Kvaas. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Barbara Remick. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Bill and Kathy Tingle. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Andrew Vineyard. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Darla Sharp. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Barbara Remick. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Joann Moore. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Gary Vandeman. In support of RV language (get them out of front setbacks).	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Dana Trout. In support of RV language (disagreement with NEW language).	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Lori Crestfield. Opposed to RV language (should be allowed to keep RV's).	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 James Fox. In support of RV language (disagreement with NEW language).	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Wes Herman. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Francis Arnoult. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
17.39.070.A.3 Marilyn Hill. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 David Geoffrion. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 David Geoffrion. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 David Geoffrion. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Peter Rasmussen. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Kelly Silva. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Phil Resch. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Michael Leu. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Jim Meyers. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 David Geoffrion. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Don McDermott. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Francis C. Arnoult. Opposed to RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Barbara Massey. In support of RV language.	<i>See response above.</i>
17.39.070.A.3 Don McDermott. Request to increase enforcement and not change the code.	<i>See response above.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Dennis and Lynn Kirby. Suggests limiting it to only one allowance per household and only on paved parking areas.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Duffy. Opposed to RV language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Penkala. Opposed to RV language, especially given recent emergency situations in the region.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Opposed to RV language. Regulations could required RVs to be parked on impervious surfaces or drained of fluids. RVs should also be looked at as tiny homes.</p>	<p><i>See response above. RVs are not allowed as permanent dwelling units.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Jim Henry. Requests a comparing of the new draft ZO and the SB County ZO.</p>	<p><i>Staff reviewed existing standards, which mirror County standards. Revisions provide greater flexibility.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.A.3 Jim Henry. Delete 17.39.070 subsection A-3 above, and amend 10.01.420 to allow residents to park all their vehicles on or adjacent to their property.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Section 10.01.420 of the Goleta Municipal Code is not proposed to be changed at this time. NZO focuses on regulating RVs on private property.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.C Chamber of Commerce. This would create a situation where businesses may not be able to shuttle in employees, or provide off-site parking during events. This parking would be non-conforming except that Section 17.39.030.B in the new code specifically clarifies that existing uses of land or structures will not be considered non-conforming solely on the lack of parking up to the new standard. It will however affect the ability for businesses to expand if that expansion creates additional parking demand (i.e. additional employees) that cannot be accommodated in new or enlarged parking lot(s) on site or within 400 feet.</p>	<p><i>Off-site parking is allowed up to 500 feet, consistent with existing standards. Other off-site parking may be allowed through a Temporary Use Permit. In many cases, new parking standards will lead to parking requirement reductions and additional options for further parking reductions provided for.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.070.C Chamber of Commerce. Recommend striking the limitation of within 400'. The 400-foot limitation should be deleted. The distance from the site can be addressed on a case by case basis, if necessary and if there is a concern.</p>	<p><i>Standard changed from 400 feet to 500 feet to reflect existing standard.</i></p>
<p>17.39.070.C.1 Barbara Massey. Request that all residential parking be required to be on-site.</p>	<p><i>No change. Intent is to provide some flexibility for the development of multiple-dwelling units.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080 Chamber of Commerce. Because there has been no bicycle parking required before, the standards should be flexible.</p>	<p><i>Requirements kept in. Requirement for bicycle parking supported by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080 Chamber of Commerce. The organization of this section should be reviewed.</p>	<p><i>Organization not changed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080 Chamber of Commerce. Where did the requirements for long term or covered parking come from? Covered bicycle parking at 50% is too much.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080 Chamber of Commerce. The definition of long term should be adjusted to be over 8 hours rather than 4 hours. 4 hours is not a 'long term.'</p>	<p><i>No change made. 4 hours captures employees that do not work full 8 hours shifts.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080 Chamber of Commerce. Bicycle parking- Full time employees should be used rather than FTE to avoid overburdening of a site with bike parking area(s). 50% covered is too restrictive and it should be noted that biking is an uncovered activity so in the instance it's raining, the bike is already wet or will be wet from use by an employee riding in the rain.</p>	<p><i>No change. Full-time equivalent retained. Full time employees not used because a business could rely on all part-time employees who work 4+ hour shifts. 50% covered is not just for rain, but also security and helps to keep the location of the parking closer to the building.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080.A.1 Chamber of Commerce. Regarding short-term bicycle parking – how did the City arrive at a 10% of the number of required automobile parking spaces requirement?</p>	<p><i>Seen as a reasonable starting point considering mode share goals.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.080.A.2 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider flexibility regarding distance of bike parking from main entrance.</p>	<p><i>Distance extended to 100 feet.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080.B.1 Chamber of Commerce. Regarding long-term bicycle parking – how did the City arrive at the requirement of 1 long-term bicycle parking space per every five units for multiple family projects? This requirement is 20% long-term bicycle parking. Has the City simulated how this requirement would impact a typical multifamily project also accounting for short term bicycle parking requirements?</p>	<p><i>Intent is to provide quality bike facilities consistent with the General Plan and Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan.</i></p>
<p>17.39.080.B.3 Chamber of Commerce. This section is requiring 50% of required long-term bicycle parking to be covered. How does this relate to the current requirements? We want to ensure the City has fully analyzed how these % bicycle parking requirements will affect a project. We want to have some understanding of the requirement demands.</p>	<p><i>No requirement for covered long-term bicycle parking currently exists. Purpose is to improve mode shift consistent with City's approved Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.</i></p>
<p>17.39.090.A Barbara Massey. Request to change loading area space required for floor areas of more than 3,000 ft.</p>	<p><i>Change made to require loading space for floor area over 5,000 sq. ft.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.39.090 Barbara Massey. Request to read "0 - 3,000 sq. ft. required 0 loading spaces and 3,000 - 30,000 sq. ft. required loading spaces 1 or 2 depending on the use."</p>	<p><i>Table revised. Now 0-5,000 sq. ft. requires 0 loading spaces and 5,001-30,000 sq. ft. required 1 loading space."</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. We encourage balance of competing interests when it comes to parking and that while medians and the like can make a more attractive, the additional requirements should be careful in not forcing more total area of lots/developments dedicated to parking. We don't want to over-park new development, but we do want to have adequate attractive, permeable, usable, parking.</p>	<p><i>Some requirements removed. Intent is not to require overparking of new development.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. The current code appears to have served Goleta parking lots well, therefore the City should be careful in any decision to add more spaces required per use/square footage/unit.</p>	<p><i>Intent is not to require more parking than is required now.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. Requiring these medians and buffers limit mobility through a parking lot, and reduce opportunities for alternative parking configuration during events that may be valet parked.</p>	<p><i>Landscaping Section simplified and made more generalized. Site design, including for stormwater management, would be developed through discretionary review.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. We appreciate how flexible it is, and that its going to change dramatically from what is in the draft, and we look forward to seeing the redline version.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. This section warrants a significant amount of additional attention.</p>	<p><i>Section reviewed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. Some of the wheel stop requirements seem unnecessary and the size and number of medians appears onerous.</p>	<p><i>Landscape island standards removed. Site design, including for stormwater management, would be developed through discretionary review.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. Surfacing requirements are redundant and restrictive. They are already required as part of the City's Stormwater Management Plan. Flexibility is the key to successfully implementing a good stormwater treatment design.</p>	<p><i>No changes made.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. We do not support this section as written. Although tandem parking is addressed, valet parking is not. The ordinance should address the requirements or process for determining if valet parking will be allowed.</p>	<p><i>Substantial revisions made. Valet parking section added.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.100 Chamber of Commerce. The current code allows for 8.5' x 16.5' residential, this appears to be eliminated. The current code also allows 30% assigned compact, so a proposed reduction of 10%. We do not support eliminating flexibility in stall size or amount of compact parking. Parking aisle widths have increased by a minimum of 3' depending on parking stall angle, therefore adding parking area size. If the intent is to reduce total area of impervious or total area dedicated to parking (as it causes heat islands), rules that will result in larger total area of parking lot should not be included in the code. Landscaped islands will be required between a maximum row of 6 spaces. Islands to be 8' wide. The current code states that trees, shrubbery and ground cover is to be provide at suitable intervals. Typical applied spacing is about every 10 spaces with a 5' wide island. The proposed change will increase total parking area size.</p>	<p><i>Compact allowance removed except through discretionary approval. Stall sizes revised to reflect existing standards. Parking aisles and lot configurations revised to reflect existing standards. Landscaping standards revised as well.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.E.3 Barbara Massey. Request that tandem parking be a small percentage.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.E.4 Barbara Massey. Feels tandem parking is only appropriate in garages in residential districts.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.J Chamber of Commerce. Staff is requiring 5% of parking spaces must be EV charging stations. How did staff arrive at the 5% requirement – is this justified. Based on our experience with EV chargers in multi-family projects a 5% requirement would be very high. Perhaps this should require spaces to be EV “READY”.</p>	<p><i>Standard designed to build off Building Code EV ready standard. Standard is an attempt to prepare for future with more EVs.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.39.100.M Chamber of Commerce. We would like to understand how staff arrived at a 50% shading requirement for those areas not in landscape. Where did the 50% number come from? How does it compare to the current requirement? Has staff studied if that is achievable?</p>	<p><i>These standards seek to increase the overall albedo of parking areas to reduce the heat island effect. The 50% shading also creates incentive for solar energy systems to be installed. Currently, there is no such requirement. The standard can be achieved through a single solution or a combination of solutions, including tree coverage that is met over 15 years.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.O Maruja Clensay Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services Consider engaging DRB and City's traffic engineer.</p>	<p><i>Section simplified considerably.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.O.7.b Chamber of Commerce. We would like to understand how staff arrived at a requirement that 25% of the sidewalk is shaded at noon. Where did the 25% number come from? How does it compare to the current requirement? Has staff studied if that is achievable?</p>	<p><i>Standard removed.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.Q.3 Barbara Massey. Feels it should say that separate vehicle and pedestrian circulation systems must be provided.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Site design can be further addressed through project review.</i></p>
<p>17.39.100.R Chamber of Commerce. Is positive in that it allows for Alternative Parking Area Designs which would provide an avenue for an alternative approach to be approved by the Planning Commission if they can show that the alternative achieves environmental design and green building objectives.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.40 – Performance Standards	
<p>17.40.060 Chamber of Commerce. City’s general terms probably don’t need a definition of solid wastes; clearly this is to avoid garbage heaps, junk yards, and helps with vector control, but it should more clearly define what will be considered prohibited under this provision. For instance, clearing of land for agriculture creates, for small periods of time, piles of vegetation (i.e., avocado tree limbs) that could be home to small animals or considered a fire hazard. A recycling facility, as another example, could have outdoor piles of “waste” to sort for recycling that may collect rain water. While the concept is agreeable, this could have unintended consequences.</p>	<p><i>No change. If the instances cited as examples are truly short periods of time, then they would meet the provisions of this Section that they are handled and stored to prevent such issues. If they remain too long and create issues, then they would be considered in violation of this standard. Other stormwater management requirements would address the rain water collection example.</i></p>
<p>17.40.070 Chamber of Commerce. It is not always possible to find the responsible party or to make them pay. The City should provide for an avenue for a property owner, even if they’re not the “responsible party” to prepare some kind of remediation plan and complete that work as a Condition of Approval prior to issuance of whatever permit they’re seeking.</p>	<p><i>Change made. Language now requires acceptance of financial responsibility.</i></p>
<p>17.40.070.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. On a smaller lot, this may not be possible. The City should consider an allowance for a plan of equivalent means to achieve a reasonable level of safety.</p>	<p><i>If the required distance for hazardous materials cannot be met, the City would likely not be approving the proposed use that included such materials based on public safety.</i></p>
<p>17.40.080 Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Request that no change is made to noise standard from existing zoning ordinances.</p>	<p><i>Changes made throughout this section.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.40.080.A Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider adding "Schools" as a Land Use.</p>	<p>Schools a Public/Semi-Public use.</p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Table 17.40.080.A Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider adding footnote to confirm that Community Noise Exposure level is measured at property line.</p>	<p><i>No change. Noise levels would be measured wherever the closest sensitive receptor is, since noise does not stop at a property line. This also matches the General Plan.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.40.080.A Chamber of Commerce. Appears to be equivalent to the previous standards although it simplifies the land use categories somewhat.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.40.080.F Chamber of Commerce. This section sets out thresholds; therefore, the criteria of “objectionable” should be clarified to what that means in relation to the standards.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.40.080.G Chamber of Commerce. The section includes an exemption for “street utility and similar construction projects undertaken by or under contract to or direction of the City.” This should be clarified that it includes improvements in the public ROW that are conditioned/required as part of the approvals for private development projects.</p>	<p><i>Not included in exemptions, but added as a separate section.</i></p>
<p>17.40.080.G Chamber of Commerce. The City should add exemptions for construction noise which is typically mitigated by specifying construction hours. Exemption or relief should also be considered for projects that may require pile driving for pile foundations. The alternative to pile driving is vibrating the piles into the ground which can be problematic for other jurisdictional agencies when they occur near waterways, riparian, etc.</p>	<p><i>Not included in exemptions, but added as a separate section.</i></p>
<p>17.40.080.G Chamber of Commerce. The City may also consider expanding the exemptions to include school bells and school PA systems.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Many schools in residential areas.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.40.090 Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider if this would prohibit, for example barbeque restaurants. The use of the word objectionable is subjective.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.40.100 Chamber of Commerce. This should be clarified that if a manufacturing or industrial use occurs on several contiguous parcels, that the measurement will be taken at the lot line of the exterior of the entire site, rather than the parcel upon which the equipment or process is occurring.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.41 – Signs</p>	
<p>17.41 Chamber of Commerce. We support the City’s establishment of a simpler process for signs that meet the basic requirements without having to go to the DRB or other review.</p>	<p><i>DRB required for Overall Sign Plans and individual signs not part of an OSP.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Chamber of Commerce. The flexibility for sign design is only allowed with Master Sign Programs and that flexibility is limited. It does not allow an increase the aggregate total sign area. The City should consider including guidance and flexibility in the new code.</p>	<p><i>OSPs now provide for increase in total sign area by 10% to incentive comprehensive signage design.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Chamber of Commerce. The City should also consider allowing increase in total aggregate area with a Master Sign Program or in instances where an increase in area can be found acceptable or appropriate by the DRB.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Chamber of Commerce. We support the various allowances for short term signage for things like one-day sales.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Carl Schneider, CSA Architects. Requests substantial revision to the Sign Chapter and provided draft of a proposed Sign Ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Overall structure of the Sign Chapter kept intact. This is a key issue that will warrant further discussion during the Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.41 Carl Schneider, CSA Architects. Requests one set of sign regulations apply for all commercial properties.</p>	<p><i>Variations based on district kept in. These distinctions allow the City to regulate different types of development, including different types of setbacks, differently regarding signage.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Cecilia Brown. Request for a separate sign ordinance for Old Town.</p>	<p><i>A separate sign ordinance for Old Town not included. However, signs fall within the definition of development such that the Old Town Heritage Overlay District will apply. This Overlay requires DRB review and consistency with the Goleta Old Town Heritage District Architecture and Design Guidelines.</i></p>
<p>17.41.030(Y) Cecilia Brown. Suggestions for revision regarding signage in Old Town.</p>	<p><i>10% allowance for window signage removed. However, this allowance was under the exempt section. Window signage still allowed but must fit within the overall allowance for the site. Part VI was clarified to make clear that window signs are considered wall signs for purposes of sign allowances.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Barbara Massey. In disagreement with Sign Ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Significant revisions to clarify permit process for signs. Individual signs require DRB and a Zoning Clearance. Overall Sign Plans brought back and must be approved by DRB. Enforcement is addressed in Part V.</i></p>
<p>17.41 Carl Schneider, CSA Architects. Requests review on updated Sign terminology.</p>	<p><i>Sign terminology updated to add clarity and assure compliance with recent case law.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.41 Cecilia Brown. Request to adopt DRB's proposed language regarding enforcement on Signs.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Overall enforcement of this Title covered in Part V.</i></p>
<p>17.41.010.A Fred Barbaria. Request to add "wayfinding."</p>	<p><i>No change made. Wayfinding not a focus of this Chapter.</i></p>
<p>17.41.030, 17.41.030.S.1, 17.41.030.S.3, 17.41.030.S.3.B, 17.41.030.F, 17.41.030.F.1, 17.41.030.F.2, 17.41.030.S.4, 17.41.030.T Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The proposed Ordinance exemptions for real estate signs are too limited.</p>	<p><i>Directional Signs for Open Houses exemption revised, allowing up to six signs if 2 or more lots involved, size from four to five square feet, and stricter limits on the time the signs can be posted for. On-site Real Estate Sign exemption not substantially changed. Only revision allows height of exempt real estate wall signs to go from 7 feet to 12. Special Event Signs (now One-Time Event Signs) exemption regulations unchanged.</i></p>
<p>17.41.030.F Fred Barbaria. Request to add "3. May not be placed on public sidewalks."</p>	<p><i>Requirement added.</i></p>
<p>17.41.030.K Fred Barbaria. Opposed to proposed distance.</p>	<p><i>Requirement removed. Language now requires signs not be "intended to attract outside attention."</i></p>
<p>17.41.030.S Cecilia Brown. Concern that increase in size and number is not needed.</p>	<p><i>Real estate sign area increase is minor and provides a little more flexibility for those selling.</i></p>
<p>17.41.030.T Cecilia Brown. Concern that increase in size and number is not needed.</p>	<p><i>Special event signs not specifically called out in existing sign ordinance.</i></p>
<p>17.41.030.T Chamber of Commerce. This provision allows for special event signs and should be looked at together with 17.41.040.B to allow a reasonable number of special event balloons, banners or flags since the purpose of a special event sign is to attract attention.</p>	<p><i>One-time event signage standards remain unchanged. Banners and balloons prohibition removed (but would need a TUP).</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.41.040.B Fred Barbaria. Request for temporary permits and/or time limits.</p>	<p><i>Change made. Such devices are now prohibited unless permitted by the City as a Temporary Use.</i></p>
<p>17.41.040.B Chamber of Commerce. Includes the words “otherwise designed to attract attention” and that statement is too broad.</p>	<p><i>Language moved to Wind Movement Devices provision but remains unchanged. Intent is to remain broad to ensure the provision captures new techniques for attracting attention.</i></p>
<p>17.41.040.C Fred Barbaria. Opposed to language.</p>	<p><i>Prohibition consistent with General Plan policy VH 4.13(f).</i></p>
<p>17.41.040.F Chamber of Commerce. This should be revised to allow more offsite signs.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>17.41.040.O.6 Fred Barbaria. Request to change 15 feet to 10.</p>	<p><i>Change made to reference vision clearance.</i></p>
<p>17.41.050 Cecilia Brown. Request to have more complete design guidelines.</p>	<p><i>Individual signs not within an OSP will now go to DRB. As a result, sign design principles actually slightly reduced.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060 Cecilia Brown. Request to eliminate electronic changeable copy signs from ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Prohibition not added, but regulations tightened considerably to limit location and add additional restrictions.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.F Fred Barbaria. Believes it is easier to set a limit for overhang.</p>	<p><i>No change as this is a determination for Public Works.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.H Barbara Massey. Request to eliminate electronic changeable copy signs from ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Prohibition not added, but regulations tightened considerably to limit location and add additional restrictions.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.H Cecilia Brown. Request to ban electronic changeable copy signs.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.41.060.H Cecilia Brown. Request that project description of electronic changeable copy signs be revised to incorporate major impacts.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.H.1 Cecilia Brown. In disagreement with Electronic Sign locations.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.H.1 Cecilia Brown, The Goodland Coalition. Concern over electronic changeable copy signs.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.H.1.g Fred Barbaria. Request for both day and night limits.</p>	<p><i>Light intensity standards changed to reflect ambient lighting conditions.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.J Fred Barbaria. Pointed out that fabric signs as the same as banners.</p>	<p><i>Banners now allowed as Temporary Use.</i></p>
<p>17.41.060.K.4 Fred Barbaria. Rheostats not used any more.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.41.070 Cecilia Brown. Request sign standards follow existing practice that does not differentiate between zoning districts.</p>	<p><i>Differences kept in. This allows for different standards to apply based on different development standards, like setbacks, and different needs to attract customers to a site.</i></p>
<p>17.41.070.B Inaki Villarín, PK Architecture. Request to amend sign chapter to allow rear property lots to have a monument or free-standing sign at driveway access.</p>	<p><i>Allowance added for flag lots to combine allowed sign area with adjacent parcel.</i></p>
<p>17.41.070.B Ken Krutenat, IPT. Request for signage on property.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.41.080.B Barbara Massey. Request to delete non-residential uses in residential districts.</p>	<p><i>No change. There are a few uses that are allowed in Residential districts, and these sign standards would apply to those uses.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.41.090 Cecilia Brown. Request to add "Menu Board for drive through restaurant."</p>	<p><i>Menu-boards not specifically called out as a sign type. The standards for menu boards will depend on what type of sign it is. Note that the size of freestanding signs is significantly reduced from the previous Draft.</i></p>
<p>17.41.090.C.1 Ignacio Villarin, PK Architecture. In disagreement with the Free-Standing sign language.</p>	<p><i>No change made. However, provision added for key lots.</i></p>
<p>17.41.090.C.1 Fred Barbaria. Believes 125 feet is too restrictive.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Intent is to limit their use on small lots.</i></p>
<p>17.41.090.D Fred Barbaria. Suggests addition of "6. Can extend up to four feet over a public sidewalk."</p>	<p><i>No change. Addressed in encroachment permit discussion.</i></p>
<p>17.41.120 Cecilia Brown. Recommends additional language.</p>	<p><i>Nonconforming Signs section revised to limit maintenance over a monetary threshold.</i></p>
<p>17.41.120 Chamber of Commerce. Positive in that it provides clarity for Nonconforming Signs. These can be continued and maintained. However, it only allows for restoration of a damaged sign if the damage does not exceed 50% of the sign area, provided that restoration starts within 60 days of damage. This could be a larger percentage especially for instances of fire or vandalism.</p>	<p><i>No change. The intent of the City is to have nonconforming structures, including Signs, to cease. Also, in the case of fire, it is covered under updated restoration provisions under certain instances.</i></p>
<p>17.41.120 Chamber of Commerce. 60 days may not be enough time to, for instance, collect insurance and have a sign made to replace a damaged sign. A longer period of time should be allowed.</p>	<p><i>Repairs related to restoration extended to 90 days, but permit from the Building Department.</i></p>
<p>17.41.120.B Chamber of Commerce. In other sections of the code, a one-year period is allowed before for non-conforming use is considered abandoned. The time period should be consistent and should not be arbitrary.</p>	<p><i>No change. Sign entitlements not as difficult to receive than certain use approvals, so less time allotted.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.41.120.C.2 Barbara Massey NA Request to remove a nonconforming sign that is a danger to the public - not restore it.</p>	<p><i>Nonconforming sign regulations moved to Sign Chapter. Allowance for restoration of unsafe signs removed.</i></p>
<p>17.41.180.B.12 Chamber of Commerce. Should be revisited if the RV parking ordinance is eliminated as it appears to double up or reinforce that requirement.</p>	<p><i>Regulation removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.42 – Standards for Specific Uses</p>	
<p>17.42 Chamber of Commerce. There are now standards for many more specific uses and activities where none existed before. While these could provide staff with direction when considering new applications, they will likely result in numerous additional non-conforming situations and impede existing business’ ability to expand or continue operation.</p>	<p><i>Chapter reduced with several sections removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42 Chamber of Commerce. The purpose or need for some of these regulations is unclear. Each one of these need to clarify whether these specific uses and activities are considered “primary use” or “accessory use.” For example: see Community Gardens.</p>	<p><i>Standards apply whether the use is Principal Use or Accessory use. Clarification added to Accessory Use section.</i></p>
<p>17.42.030 Chamber of Commerce. This section is problematic in that an accessory use will not be considered accessory if it exceeds 25% of the total floor area in the principal building and accessory buildings.</p>	<p><i>See revisions to provide greater clarity regarding accessory uses. The focus of a floor area limitation is to ensure, through a quantitative standard, that the accessory use remains truly accessory. Accessory use regulations will be a focus of discussion during the Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.42.030.B Michael Iza NA States this ordinance is in conflict with recently passed resolutions regarding marijuana.</p>	<p><i>Cannabis regulations updated since comment provided.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.050 Cecilia Brown. Questions the change from 3 to 4 domestic pets.</p>	<p><i>Dog standard reduced from 4 to 3, but more allowed with a Minor Conditional Use permit.</i></p>
<p>17.42.050 Chamber of Commerce. This section should clarify that the residential use does not have to occur on the same lot as the residence in instances where multiple contiguous parcels are under the same ownership and/or operated as one property.</p>	<p><i>No change. Animal Keeping is an accessory use.</i></p>
<p>17.42.050 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Suggested the Animal Keeping regulations be redrafted to ensure that the provisions regarding impact to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood, as well as noise and odor impacts, apply not only to the permitted small animals but also to the large animals that are permitted.</p>	<p><i>Section substantially revised. Restrictions added limiting ability to have large animals in residential districts and to better reflect existing standards.</i></p>
<p>17.42.050.B. Barbara Massey. There should be no change to the keeping of only three small domestic, household pets. Keeping of more than three small, domestic, household pets should require a CUP. Neighbors should have notice and opportunity to comment on this change.</p>	<p><i>Change made to limit dogs to three, with additional dogs allowed with a Minor CUP.</i></p>
<p>17.42.050.C.1 Barbara Massey. Large animals should not be kept in Residential Districts.</p>	<p><i>Only large animal allowed in Residential districts is now horses, with a large minimum lot size.</i></p>
<p>17.42.050.C.2.c Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider clarification of small animal enclosures.</p>	<p><i>Standard changes to only apply the separation requirement to dwellings on other lots.</i></p>
<p>17.42.050.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. Item 17.42.050.C.2.c. requires that enclosures for small animals are no closer than 25 feet to any dwelling. This should specify to any dwelling on another lot. It is reasonable to allow a person's chicken coop to be close to their own house.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.060/070/080 Chamber of Commerce. It appears these items could be captured in other sections such as landscaping, or, that these items are better left to review by the DRB rather than codified rigidly.</p>	<p><i>References to landscaping from these sections removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.070 Cecilia Brown. Questions the provisions for automobile service and repair.</p>	<p><i>Regulations reduced significantly.</i></p>
<p>17.42.070 Chamber of Commerce. Automobile/Vehicle Service and Repair- This should be reconsidered to allow for occasional overnight storage of vehicles. It is reasonable to allow that in some circumstances where parts need to be ordered that vehicles may need to remain overnight. As well, service stations do not include this prohibition. This section does not appear to include sales or repair of larger trucks, busses, ambulances, etc.</p>	<p><i>Regulation removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.070 Barbara Massey. Why aren't there any provisions for mobile vehicle repair and detailing businesses? This is become more common.</p>	<p><i>Detailing businesses would fall Mobile Vendor based on revised definition of the use.</i></p>
<p>17.42.070.B/D Maruja Clensay Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services Request for more flexibility.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.070.I Chamber of Commerce. This may not be necessary where the vehicle repair shop is located in an industrial or similar area where there are not sensitive receptors. The City should consider whether all of these restrictions are necessary.</p>	<p><i>Regulation removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.080 Cecilia Brown. Questions if there is a permit needed for a mobile vehicle detailing business.</p>	<p><i>Yes. Mobile detailing business would fall under revise Mobile Vendor use classification.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090 Chamber of Commerce. This should be clarified. Do these standards apply to facilities constructed for community assembly only? Or do they also apply to assembly uses in various structures with other primary uses.</p>	<p><i>Community Assembly regulations removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.B Barbara Massey. There should be a greater setback than 20 ft. from a Residential District or Use. There is usually some loud noise involved with</p>	<p><i>Provision removed. Use now requires a Major Conditional Use Permit in most districts where the use is allowed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.090.E Rich Foster. Opposed to proposed Church hours.</p>	<p><i>Community Assembly regulations removed. However, Community Assembly will require a CUP, which may include conditions on hours. This more closely aligns with existing procedures for Churches.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.E Rev. Keith Jones, Good Shepherd Lutheran Church. Opposed to proposed Church Hours.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.E Rev. Canon Brian Cox, Christ the King Episcopal Church. Opposed to proposed Church Hours.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.E Peter Vuehler, First Presbyterian Church of SB. Opposed to proposed Church Hours.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.E Rev. Alan Strout, First United Methodist Church. Opposed to proposed Church Hours.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.E Rev. Doug Miller. Opposed to proposed Church Hours.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.090.E Gretchen Gould. Opposed to proposed Church Hours.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.100 Chamber of Commerce. Will a Community Garden be considered a primary use in any zone? If so, will a shed for storage of tools or a structure with sink or bathroom be considered accessory to the Community Garden use?</p>	<p><i>Community Garden can serve as a principal use. Structures on site may be accessory structures if consistent with the definition of accessory structure in Part VI.</i></p>
<p>17.42.100 Chamber of Commerce. We recommend the City assign to each type of use whether it's considered a primary use, and review the definition of accessory use and structures so that you don't need to, for instance, build a house on a lot before you can install a shed for your community garden.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.110 Cecilia Brown. Request to add language regarding air quality impacts.</p>	<p><i>Not included. Drive-through facilities will always require Major CUPs, which trigger environmental review. Air quality will be analyzed during that review.</i></p>
<p>17.42.110 Barbara Massey. There is no need for drive-in or drive through facilities. They are an unnecessary source of air pollution, traffic, increased gas consumption, and noise. They should not be permitted adjacent to a Residential District if permitted.</p>	<p><i>All drive through facilities require a Major CUP, consistent with existing practice. Impacts analyzed through CEQA process.</i></p>
<p>17.42.110.E.2 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Unclear relationship with "walls along street face must be transparent."</p>	<p><i>Section removed as these facilities will require Conditional Use Permits.</i></p>
<p>17.42.120 Barbara Massey. Emergency shelters need to be spaced further apart than only 300 ft. They should be prohibited adjacent to Residential Districts.</p>	<p><i>No change. Locations already limited in Part II.</i></p>
<p>17.42.130 Eileen Monahan, First 5 SB County. Remove screening requirements, and remove review and complaints section.</p>	<p><i>Several sections, including complaints, removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.130 Barbara Massey. The complaint section fails to provide adequate protection to the community. The complaints shouldn't be limited to residences within 300 ft. of the day care home. It should be at least 1,000 ft.</p>	<p><i>Complaints section removed. Complaints can be made and addressed through standard enforcement process.</i></p>
<p>17.42.130 Chamber of Commerce. While we recognize there are state regulations, they should be interpreted locally in a reasonable way, so that these uses with community benefit are not overly burdened with regulation. Particularly because of the cost to working families in Goleta.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.140 Chamber of Commerce. The regulations appear to be appropriate, and limit additional work to providing a Management Plan and adequate waste disposal. The section should clarify if one-month duration is every day for a month, or several days a week for more than a month, etc. The City should also clarify 17.42.140.F which states that the market “must not obstruct a path that is part of a required pedestrian circulation system.”</p>	<p><i>Language added to clarify when a Temporary Use Permit is required.</i></p>
<p>17.42.140 Chamber of Commerce. The section should clarify if one-month duration is every day for a month, or several days a week for more than a month, etc.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.140 Chamber of Commerce. The City should also clarify 17.42.140.F which states that the market “must not obstruct a path that is part of a required pedestrian circulation system.”</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.150 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Clarification of introductory paragraph and questioning permits for farmworkers.</p>	<p><i>Language revised to provide clarity. Operational permit applies to farmworker housing broadly.</i></p>
<p>17.42.150 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Concerned over restrictions on farmworker housing, including the requirement for a deed restriction.</p>	<p><i>Deed restriction kept in, but broadened to allow full farmworker households, rather than for just farmworkers.</i></p>
<p>17.42.150 Chamber of Commerce. This should allow for occupancy of employees and their family members who may not also work on the same farm, and their children who may not be of legal age to work.</p>	<p><i>Deed restriction language added to include “farmworker households.”</i></p>
<p>17.42.160 Chamber of Commerce. Certain restrictions, like a minimum lot size of 12,000SF as required in 17.42.160.A could reduce an organization’s ability to provide critical social services given the price of real estate in Goleta. These provisions could be reconsidered.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Use class includes uses that need significant amounts of space.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.170 Chamber of Commerce. It should be clarified whether a heliport will be considered a primary use on a lot or accessory only.</p>	<p><i>Removed from Chapter. Considered a feature of a site rather than a use.</i></p>
<p>17.42.170 Chamber of Commerce. It should also clarify if noise level standards created by this code can be met (as measured at the property line of the proposed heliport) given the noise generated by a helicopter. If not, it should be specified that heliports are exempt from noise thresholds.</p>	<p><i>Heliports moved to General Site Regulations and submittal requirement removed. However, a Major CUP will be required and relevant noise issues will be analyzed as part of the environmental analysis.</i></p>
<p>17.42.170.A.1 Barbara Massey. The plot plan should include all land within 1,000 ft.</p>	<p><i>Submittal information removed. Submittals addressed through Major CUP process.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180 Chamber of Commerce. Home occupations are a benefit because they reduce the environmental impacts associated with separate commercial areas, and commuters to these areas. The economy is becoming more diverse, and high land and home costs are supporting this trend. The chamber supports reasonable allowances for home occupations as an extension of supporting live/work units as a feature encouraging progress in the community.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180 Chamber of Commerce. Is positive in that it now allows for one employee in addition to the occupants of the dwelling. The previous code limited the occupation be conducted solely by the occupants of the dwelling unit.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.3 Cecilia Brown. Request that there is some reference to the fact that the cottage food operation must meet applicable State laws and get a permit from the county Health Department.</p>	<p><i>Not included. Not all other state permits and licenses referenced.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.3 Chamber of Commerce. This may be problematic for smaller homes. It should be reconsidered to allow for home occupations in smaller units where 25% of the total area may be smaller than one room.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Standard ensures the Home Occupation does not become dominant use.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.180.B.3 Barbara Massey. There should be a prohibition of any of the 25% floor area being located in the garage.</p>	<p><i>Revision made to clarify that garage can be used, but not if part of required covered parking.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.4 Cecilia Brown. Questions who is allowed on site and where they can park.</p>	<p><i>On-site or in right-of-way. Language added to clarify that tandem parking must be on-site.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.6 Cecilia Brown. Questions where an employee is allowed to park and requests that tandem parking should not overhang onto the sidewalk.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.8 Chamber of Commerce. This provision should be eliminated or expanded for other business types such as an in-home barber or aesthetician that wants to sell shampoo or a skin care product.</p>	<p><i>Standard removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.9 Chamber of Commerce. This provision seems unnecessary. If the residential character is maintained and preserved, the home occupation should not be prohibited or limited from using an accessory building to store supplies necessary for the home occupation.</p>	<p><i>Provision removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.10 Chamber of Commerce. Prohibiting occupations which create the need for additional parking spaces, appears to be in conflict with 17.42.180.B.6 which states that parking required for customers/clients/employees may be in tandem. Provision 6 seems to acknowledge the need for additional parking while provision 10 seems to prohibit it.</p>	<p><i>Provision 10 removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.B.11 Chamber of Commerce. The intent appears to be to prohibit a fleet of cars with advertising on them to be parked near the home occupation. It should be clarified however since it would appear to prohibit, for example, a husband and wife home occupation from using both of their regular vehicles for business purposes. 17.42.180.B.12 appears to meet the apparent intent of B.11.</p>	<p><i>No change to the one vehicle limit.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.180.B.13 Chamber of Commerce. Rather than regulate the size or type of equipment, it may be a better regulation to instead talk about the noise generation limits instead. Otherwise, this code may be quickly out of date with noise-attenuating technology.</p>	<p><i>Regulation removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.C Chamber of Commerce. Repeats the size restriction of 17.42.180.B.3 and should be revisited as well.</p>	<p><i>No change to standard, but restatement removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.D Chamber of Commerce. The ZA should be able to make a determination for some kinds of animal care uses such as a small dog grooming service with one or two dogs a day, or day care for a small number of animals is allowed. In the residential zone, a resident is allowed to have up to 4 household pets. A home occupation should allow for at least that many.</p>	<p><i>Animal Care prohibition removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.D.1 Cecilia Brown. Request for definition.</p>	<p><i>Use defined in Part VI.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.D.2 Barbara Massey. Animal boarding should be added to this prohibition. Taxis are another occupation that should be added to prohibitions. These seem to be popping up in neighborhoods.</p>	<p><i>Animal boarding not added. Taxis not prohibited, but limit of one vehicle for the Home Occupation included.</i></p>
<p>17.42.180.D.3 Cecilia Brown. Questions whether or not taxi services are included.</p>	<p><i>Taxis would be subject to the one vehicle limit per Home Occupation.</i></p>
<p>17.42.190 Chamber of Commerce. The purpose or need for this is unclear.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.200.B Barbara Massey. Should only be allowed with a CUP, not with an Administrative Use Permit.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Clarification that only uses otherwise allowed are allowed as part of live/work units.</i></p>
<p>17.42.200.E Barbara Massey. Outdoor storage should only be allowed during daylight hours.</p>	<p><i>Reference to outdoor storage removed. Outdoor storage requirements otherwise apply.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.210 Chamber of Commerce. It is unclear why this needs to be a provision. This seems unnecessary to state, and if stated what is the intent.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.210 Chamber of Commerce. It's confusing as to what it is imposing on existing uses with the language, "ensuring the conservation and protection of coastal resources."</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.210.B.3 Chamber of Commerce. This item appears to require that if the visitor serving resort/use were to expand or alter its development; it would trigger additional access and protection of resources. In using the word alteration, it is unclear if a simple interior remodel of a space or remodeling of a patio area would trigger this as well. The City should clarify the intent here.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.210.B.4 Chamber of Commerce. Is this meant to take away the ability to have some impact on some amount of habitat? Typically, some impact is allowed if it is mitigated to a less than significant level through restoration or replacement. This should be revised to add language that specifically addresses mitigation of impacts rather than just 'protect.'</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.220 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Consider relying on building code and existing law.</p>	<p><i>Regulations removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.220 Chamber of Commerce. What is the purpose or need for the 10-year requirement?</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.230 Michael Iza. Request for which base zoning districts allow marijuana uses/cultivation.</p>	<p><i>See Cannabis Land Use Ordinance and potential revisions. Regulations to be added in at a later date.</i></p>
<p>17.42.240 Chamber of Commerce. It appears to be good policy.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.42.240 Chamber of Commerce. There is however a prohibition on ringing bells, chimes, music, or make other notice to attract attention to its business. This limitation doesn't seem necessary.</p>	<p><i>Requirement removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.240 Chamber of Commerce. The City should also add language that a mobile food vendor is allowed to have tables and chairs or umbrellas set up during the operation so long as those items aren't in the ROW, and that they can be allowed in the ROW for temporary events with an encroachment permit. This could allow for 'pop up' facilities in parking lots, etc.</p>	<p><i>Standards do not prohibit. Encroachment permits not regulated through this Title.</i></p>
<p>17.42.250 Chamber of Commerce. It is unclear why this classification or regulation is needed.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.250.B Cecilia Brown. Request to change the allowance for what products are sold to reflect products sold by nurseries.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.250.C Cecilia Brown. Request to change standards to allow chain link fences.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.260 Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider expanding this to allow certain temporary tables and seating associated with food trucks and farmers markets. See comment on 17.42.240.</p>	<p><i>Section renamed "Eating and Drinking Establishments". Expansion of regulations not included as those are separate use types.</i></p>
<p>17.42.260.E Barbara Massey. Outdoor Dining and seating should be prohibited in the public-right-of-way. It obstructs pedestrian circulation.</p>	<p><i>No change. Right-of-way seating would need an encroachment permit, so impact would be analyzed pursuant to that approval.</i></p>
<p>17.42.270 Chamber of Commerce. Unclear why this regulation is needed but don't appear to be particularly onerous.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.42.270.B.2.a Barbara Massey. Outdoor sales should be prohibited in the public-right-of-way. It obstructs pedestrian and vehicle circulation and is usually unkempt.</p>	<p><i>Allowed in the right-of-way, but made clear that an encroachment permit would be required.</i></p>
<p>17.42.280 Chamber of Commerce. This section appears to have no other real purpose since the other items listed are already regulations for tattoo and piercing businesses.</p>	<p><i>Section removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.280.A Barbara Massey. The hours of operation should be limited adjacent to Residential Districts to the hours 8 a.m. to 7 p.m.</p>	<p><i>Section removed. Impacts of the use do not justify unique hours of operation. Note that Restricted Personal Services requires a Conditional Use Permit in 3 of 4 districts where allowed and hours of operation may be included as a condition if appropriate.</i></p>
<p>17.42.290.D Chamber of Commerce. People with large weatherproof items that don't require registrations of any kind should also be able to store items out of doors.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>17.42.290.H Chamber of Commerce. Limits hours of operation to 7am and 7pm when abutting an R district or residential use in a mixed-use development. These hours should be more closely considered, or an avenue to expand these hours should be provided in order to avoid conflicts and non-conformities.</p>	<p><i>No change in hours, but inclusion of mixed-use removed as uses in the mixed-use development could be open later.</i></p>
<p>17.42.300 Chamber of Commerce. It is unclear why these regulations are necessary. Item 17.42.300.B.1 limits collection facilities to a building site footprint of 350 square feet. This number seems arbitrary. It appears to me that these should be considered via a Conditional Use Permit on a case by case basis with far fewer codified standards to allow for a normal design process.</p>	<p><i>Section and use removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.310 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Request for clarification of language.</p>	<p><i>Separation requirement is an attempt to avoid clustering. The distance is measured from property lines.</i></p>
<p>17.42.320.A Chamber of Commerce. Is this before the Density Bonus? And is the bonus calculated on this new base density? That would mean an increase up to 55%. Some SROs are former hotels with a common kitchen, so the density is very high.</p>	<p><i>Increased density would be applied before the density bonus is calculated.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.320.A Chamber of Commerce. A little more clarity on how the City plans to combine this boost with the density bonus is needed.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.320.B Chamber of Commerce. While an SRO is not ideal for children, it should not prohibit this potential residential opportunity for a family, for example of a single parent and two kids, or two parents and a kid, etc.</p>	<p><i>The two person standard is common for SRO housing as the size and facilities are not intended for families.</i></p>
<p>17.42.320.C Chamber of Commerce. This could be an issue if an organization tried to convert on old hotel that has small or oddly shaped rooms. Perhaps an exception for conversion of an existing building would be appropriate.</p>	<p><i>No change made, as this could lead to exceptionally small units.</i></p>
<p>17.42.320.C Chamber of Commerce. Regarding parking and SROs, they do not need much parking. The occupants are formerly homeless and many do not own vehicles (except those that lived in their vehicles). Some spaces for staff are needed as well, but overall very little is needed. This is typically not an issue when converting an old hotel because they have more than enough parking.</p>	<p><i>Parking standards for SROs provide in Part IV (1 space per 2 units, with no additional parking for employees).</i></p>
<p>17.42.320.C Chamber of Commerce. Overall the requirements should be easy to accommodate with a new construction project. There should be a little more consideration of how the City would treat conversion of existing structures.</p>	<p><i>Overall requirements of section not changed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330 Maruja Clensay, Suzanne Elledge Planning & Permitting Services. Questioning whether second dwelling units will be allowed on legal non-conforming lots or with legal non-conforming structures.</p>	<p><i>Accessory Dwelling Unit regulations developed through a separate process.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.330 Chamber of Commerce. Previously, design review of second units was a ministerial review only. It is not clear if that is still the case. In addition, per 17.42.330.A., a second dwelling unit is required to get a zoning clearance, and design review can be conducted by the ZA “if no exceptions or modifications of applicable development standards are requested, and all the criteria are met.” However, the design review can be deferred to DRB if that’s not the case. This provision conflicts with the Zoning Clearance procedure in 17.54.030.A of the new code, which states that a zoning clearance is the appropriate permit only when the ZA “determines that the proposed use or building, or alteration or addition, is permitted and conforms to all applicable regulations and standards of this title.”</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Table 17.07.020, Table 17.07.030, 17.39.040.A.2, Table 17.39.040.A.2, 17.42.330, 17.42.330.A.2, 17.42.330.A.3, 17.42.330.B.1, 17.42.330.B.1.f 142 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. The Second Dwelling Unit provisions should be clarified.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.A.2 Ken Alker, Bruce Alker Construction. Offers a suggested change of language - feels it may be overreaching.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.A.3 Barbara Massey. Design Review should be conducted by the Design Review Board.</p>	<p><i>ADU Ordinance process guided regulations included in NZO. Design Review limited by state law.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.A.3.b/c Ken Alker, Bruce Alker Construction. 25' building height limitation in RS zone is too restrictive.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.B.1.b Chamber of Commerce. The effect of this provision would seem to be to prohibit second units on any property with any legal non-conformity. Given the number of existing legal-nonconforming properties, and the potential that the new code is likely to create numerous non-conformities, this does not appear to be a reasonable provision.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.B.1.d Ken Alker, Bruce Alker Construction. Opposed to second dwelling unit floor area of 800 sq. ft.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.330.B.1.d Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider making these minimums and maximums tied to the lot size rather than the maximum as written of “40 percent of the existing original floor plan of the primary unit.” The existing original floor plan is also unclear and in some cases may not be knowable.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.B.1.f Ken Alker, Bruce Alker Construction. Opposed to "guest house" language.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.330.B.2.c Ken Alker, Bruce Alker Construction. Opposed to maximum height of 16'.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.350.A.6 Barbara Massey. There is far too much opportunity for unwanted development.</p>	<p><i>Section and use removed.</i></p>
<p>17.42.350 Ben Werner. Draft SLRI Program language provided.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.42.360.A.1 Barbara Massey. I question the exemption of car washes; it is such a water wasting activity. There are plenty of other ways to raise money especially with the drought.</p>	<p><i>Limitations on exemptions revised, but remains.</i></p>
<p>17.42.360.B.7 Chamber of Commerce. This should be extended to allow for other types of projects such as care facilities and mixed-use developments or others deemed similar by the Director.</p>	<p><i>No change. Intent is to provide living facility for property owner.</i></p>
<p>17.42.360.B.8/9 Chamber of Commerce. This section should allow temporary use to extend beyond one year, either through an extension process or at initial application.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Concern that at a certain point, use is not temporary anymore.</i></p>
<p>17.42.360.B.8/9 Chamber of Commerce. Appears to conflict with 17.42.360.A.4 which exempts “on-site contractor’s construction yards, including temporary trailers and storage, in conjunction with an approved project... and is allowed to stay until the completion of the project or expiration of the companion building permit.</p>	<p><i>No change. The temporary work trailer and temporary structure is broader than construction trailers. As such, construction trailers exempt, but other work trailers, like those who will use the new development, need a TUP.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.42.360.B.9 Chamber of Commerce. Instead, for larger projects it should be allowed by right and for longer than 12 months. At present, it is our understanding that up to 3 temporary trailers are allowed without an LUP. More than three need a CUP and a LUP approved by the ZA and the approval is for 2 years. The new code should not be more restrictive or burdensome than the existing.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.43 Telecommunications Facilities</p>	
<p>17.43 Barbara Massey. Request to make review process a CUP.</p>	<p><i>The City is limited by federal law. FCC has taken nearly all regulatory authority for telecommunication. A Minor CUP is required for only very large telecom projects that do not fit into lower permit paths.</i></p>
<p>17.43 Barbara Massey. In support of new "Faux" designed antennas.</p>	<p><i>Comment noted.</i></p>
<p>17.43 Barbara Massey. Opposed to simplified review.</p>	<p><i>The City is limited by federal law as to the type and duration of local review on telecommunication facility projects.</i></p>
<p>17.43 Chamber of Commerce. Should fully concealed antennas (those installed within an existing roof structure/building/ fully screened behind an existing parapet) have a simplified review process? YES What should the review process be (Administrative Permits or Conditional Use Permit) for non-fully concealed antennas?</p>	<p><i>Small and stealth facilities subject to Zoning Clearance.</i></p>
<p>17.43.030.A Chamber of Commerce. "Design review may be required" should be clearer. Review and comment. Easier is better.</p>	<p><i>Design Review before the DRB is required for projects subject to a Minor CUP. Smaller facilities have specific development standards that must be met to be approved by staff.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.43.030.A Chamber of Commerce. What are the Commission's opinions regarding "Faux" designed antennas, for example trees or flagpoles? Yes: Should be an option for reducing visual impact – DRB may prefer/require or suggest.</p>	<p><i>GP policy VH 4.8 discourages faux design for telecommunication facilities.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.44 – Wind Energy Conversation Systems</p>	
<p>17.44.030 Barbara Massey. Request for no exemption to permit requirements of Wind Energy Conversion Systems.</p>	<p><i>Entire Chapter removed as not appropriate for the City's development setting.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.A Barbara Massey. Request to have applicant demonstrate that the blade height will not affect the noise level.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.B Barbara Massey. Request that separation distance be a minimum of 5 or 6 blade diameters.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.C Barbara Massey. Opposed to bright orange/yellow covering.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.H Barbara Massey. Request for noise standards.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.I Chamber of Commerce. It should be clarified that this does this include maintenance roads to be maintained for access between towers.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.J Chamber of Commerce. There should be criteria for significantly adverse so that it is clear for the installer whether just being able to see it/them is going to be significantly adverse.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.44.060.K Chamber of Commerce. This should exclude exterior lights on things like maintenance sheds to be switched on and off when needed or for safety or security lighting or motion sensors when dark-sky compliant.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.44.060.L.3/4 Chamber of Commerce. The City should allow at least one sign per entrance.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Part V</p>	
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. We support simpler processes and clear directions and standards in administering permits. We support the shift to ZA of many kinds of permits.</p>	<p><i>Permit Procedures substantially revised to align approvals and Review Authorities with existing procedures.</i></p>
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. Some decisions currently made at the Director level should stay at the Director level.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. The permit authority table from the 2014 version has been dropped. This table is helpful and should be included in the final code. The section uses Review Authority and Decision-Making Body and should instead be consistent.</p>	<p><i>Review Authority now used throughout. Table added to show decision and appeal roles.</i></p>
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider providing a table for public review and use by the Planning Commission that compares permit types and the old permit authority vs. the new permit authority so the changes are clear.</p>	<p><i>Not includes. However, procedures will be discussed in detail during Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. Development Plans no longer exist in the new code. We strongly suggest and insist that there be specific language on how staff will process changes to existing approved Development Plans and should reintroduce and include Substantial Conformity.</p>	<p><i>Development Plans brought back in to the NZO. Substantial conformity determinations also brought back in.</i></p>
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. There are many instances where Substantial Conformity is highly effective during final processing to make beneficial changes and improvements to projects. In adding Substantial Conformity Determinations, these should continue to be processed at a staff level and without a public hearing.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. Several times in the code, the words Substantial Conformity are used however there is not codification of what criteria or thresholds will be used to determine Substantial Conformity. Will the Modification thresholds become a default guide for SCD? If so, modification criteria should be relaxed to allow the same modifications as the previous code – 20% instead of 10% for instance.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>Part 5 Chamber of Commerce. In some jurisdictions, a section of the code is dedicated to discuss what will happen to projects in process at the time of adoption of the new code. Although staff has verbally indicated how this will go, these kinds of clarification should be in writing.</p>	<p><i>See Part I for regulations on vesting.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.52 – Planning Authorities</p>	
<p>17.52.020 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Concerned that fees for development mitigation, charges, and deposits are not included in the NZO.</p>	<p><i>These dollar amounts are adopted through City Council Resolution and not through Ordinance adoption. This is consistent with existing City practice.</i></p>
<p>17.52.030, 17.53.130.A.4, 17.53.130.B, 17.56.030, 17.56.030.B, 17.56.040, 17.56.060, 17.56.080, 17.56.090 Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Some provisions governing the authority and procedures of various City boards duplicate other City ordinances.</p>	<p><i>Staff will review any Goleta Municipal Code conflicts with the adoption hearing materials and remove any conflicts at that time.</i></p>
<p>17.52.050 Cecilia Brown. Concern over ZA/Director Role.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to Part V to better reflect existing procedures. Changes will be discussed at length during Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.52.050.B Chamber of Commerce. It would be good to know the criteria or minimum qualification of the person(s) allowed to be appointed by the ZA.</p>	<p><i>ZA will be selected by City Manager.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.52.060 Cecilia Brown. Concern over ZA Role.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to Part V to better reflect existing procedures. Changes will be discussed at length during Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.52.060.B/C Barbara Massey. Concern over authoritative role.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to Part V to better reflect existing procedures. Changes will be discussed at length during Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.52.060.H/K/L Barbara Massey. Concern over authoritative role.</p>	<p><i>Changes made to Part V to better reflect existing procedures. Changes will be discussed at length during Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>Mary Ellen Brooks Citizens Planning Association. Requests PC to be the decision maker for all large projects.</p>	<p><i>Review Authorities revised to best line up with existing procedures.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.53 – Common Procedures</p>	
<p>17.53.020.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. While unused fees can be refunded, it would be better practice to collect whichever of the fees is the highest since multiple applications on one project are processed concurrently not in series. We support staff’s decision to remove 17.53.020.c which stated that no refunds would be given. The City should not be entitled to keep unused funds if for instance an application for permit is withdrawn.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.53.040.A/B Chamber of Commerce. These appear to be giving the ZA additional administrative functions (i.e. determination of a complete or incomplete application) that could be accurately and more efficiently completed by staff or Supervising staff with a consult to the Director.</p>	<p><i>Change made to Director.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.53.060 Cecilia Brown. Opposed to noticing boundaries.</p>	<p><i>No larger noticing for large projects included. The 300-foot standard comes from existing regulations and has been revised to include tenants.</i></p>
<p>17.53.060.C.1.c Barbara Massey. Request for no Alternative Method for Large Mailings.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Regulation similar to existing requirements.</i></p>
<p>17.53.060.C.3 Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider providing the signs to applicants to be consistent across projects and ensure accuracy and conformance with these requirements.</p>	<p><i>No change to NZO. This could be addressed through internal procedures.</i></p>
<p>17.53.060.C.3.b Barbara Massey. Request to add the number three (3).</p>	<p><i>No change. One sign per property line should be sufficient.</i></p>
<p>17.53.060.C.4 Chamber of Commerce. The City needs to specifically clarify what types of substitutions are allowed in order to avoid legal challenge.</p>	<p><i>No change. Provision already notes it must be allowed by applicable law.</i></p>
<p>17.53.060.C.5 Cecilia Brown. In disagreement with those who receive additional notice.</p>	<p><i>Additional noticing for drive-through facilities required under the Government Code section 65091(d).</i></p>
<p>17.53.070.D Barbara Massey NA Request to remove the required one or more spokespersons to present testimony.</p>	<p><i>Provision removed.</i></p>
<p>17.53.070.E.2 Chamber of Commerce. It should be clarified that this does not limit applicant's ability to continue a hearing in cases of: will not be able to be represented by their legal counsel on a certain date.</p>	<p><i>No change made.</i></p>
<p>17.53.070.E.2 Chamber of Commerce. While it is common practice that staff consult with an applicant before scheduling a hearing, the City should consider codifying a concurrence process if they are also going to codify adequate justification for continuance.</p>	<p><i>No change made.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.53.090.C Chamber of Commerce. The City should consider flexibility in this provision in cases of clerical errors, or for instances such as: 1) When a condition it impossible to be met within the strict interpretation of the condition, 2) The timing of a condition is applied inconsistent to real world application, 3) The intent and purpose of a condition can be met by alternative or equivalent actions or means. The justification for this request is that Conditions of Approval are made public at the time of public notice which does not often give the Applicant enough time to review the conditions or analyze the ramifications of fulfilling the condition or identify potential pitfalls. Applicants are not often motivated to request changes conditions at a public hearing given the typical timeline to get to a hearing.</p>	<p><i>No change made. Challenge to conditions may be made.</i></p>
<p>17.53.100 Chamber of Commerce. There should be clarification of whether the Director has the authority to change any Conditions of the permit at the time of the Extension or whether the approval is extended exactly as first approved.</p>	<p><i>See section on changes to prior permits and approvals.</i></p>
<p>17.53.100 Chamber of Commerce. The City should identify any the criteria that may be used to deny an application for an extension or clarify this is a by right extension.</p>	<p><i>Section rewritten and now includes two findings.</i></p>
<p>17.53.110 Chamber of Commerce. Nowhere in the code does it define Substantial Conformance or give any standards or Findings for Approval. The City should provide direction on what could be considered Substantial Conformance.</p>	<p><i>Definition added. Procedures for SCDs included similar to existing process.</i></p>
<p>17.53.110.A Barbara Massey. Request for review by the PC.</p>	<p><i>No change. Procedures carried over from existing procedures.</i></p>
<p>17.53.120.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. This is not a reasonable timeline and is ripe for abuse.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.53.130.C.3 Chamber of Commerce. The City should identify a more reasonable approach to dealing with applicants or owners who may be out of sync with their approval.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>17.53.130.C.3 Chamber of Commerce. This section also needs to reference the Enforcement section and procedures and how the two sections interact.</p>	<p><i>Not included.</i></p>
<p>17.53.130.E.6 Chamber of Commerce. The CCC will notify the City if a project they acted on is appealed.</p>	<p><i>Section moved and rewritten.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.54 – Zoning Clearance</p>	
<p>17.54.020 Barbara Massey. Request to change certain "P" designations.</p>	<p><i>Some approval processes changed. However, overall structure unchanged and many uses will not need a Zoning Clearance, or Land Use Permit, if they are an allowed use.</i></p>
<p>17.54.030.B Chamber of Commerce. Unlike the County, applicants won't have to get a follow-on Zoning Clearance for projects that have other permits which is a positive change, however it is unclear what vehicle they will use to get from approval to issuance.</p>	<p><i>Zoning Clearance will now serve as the post-discretionary permit.</i></p>
<p>17.54.030.B Chamber of Commerce. This section states that the ZA can defer the decision to the PC, but then B says the Planning Commission may not impose conditions of approval on a Zoning Clearance. It seems odd and could lead to confusion that the ZA can refer something to PC but then ties their hands as to the input they provide. Is it meant that the PC can suggest conditions but not require them?</p>	<p><i>Planning Commission review removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.55 – Use Permits	
<p>17.55 Chamber of Commerce. This appears to mean that Administrative Use Permit process is going to be used for Development Plan Amendments. This should be clear if that is the intent. Again, there needs to be a simple process for substantial conformity.</p>	<p><i>Development Plans added back in to draft NZO. Substantial Conformity Determinations added to updated draft.</i></p>
<p>17.55.020.A Barbara Massey. Request to change certain "AU" designations.</p>	<p><i>In the majority of cases, uses previously requiring an Administrative Use Permit now require a Minor CUP.</i></p>
<p>17.55.060 Chamber of Commerce. In general, this section needs to be clarified and compared with the discussion of construction offices and trailers elsewhere in the code as there may be inconsistencies.</p>	<p><i>Temporary Use Permits pulled out and established as a separate permit type.</i></p>
<p>17.55.060 Chamber of Commerce. Construction offices and trailers need to be a by-right or simplified process that is wrapped in to the approval of the overall project.</p>	<p><i>Require a TUP pursuant to Part IV.</i></p>
Chapter 17.56 – Design Review	
<p>17.56 Chamber of Commerce. We appreciate the limitation of conceptual review to one meeting.</p>	<p><i>Chapter significantly revised and will be discussed in workshops. Limit on conceptual review removed in revised Draft NZO to give City the time necessary for appropriate review prior to project moving forward to ZA, PC, or CC hearing.</i></p>
<p>17.56.020.B.3/6 Barbara Massey. Request for review by DRB.</p>	<p><i>ADUs not subject to discretionary review per State law. All signs subject to DRB review, unless part of an approved OSP.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.56.030.A.1 Barbara Massey. Request for no limits on meetings.</p>	<p><i>Limit on conceptual review removed in revised Draft NZO to give City the time necessary for appropriate review prior to project moving forward to ZA, PC, or CC hearing.</i></p>
<p>17.56.030.C.2 Barbara Massey. Concern over staff role.</p>	<p><i>Staff review of design aspects of a project significantly reduced and narrowed.</i></p>
<p>17.56.030.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. This re-review should be specifically limited to the items not in substantial conformance. Again, what is considered substantial conformance needs to be clarified.</p>	<p><i>SCD for signs approved as part of an OSP is reviewed by the Director. All signs receive some form of review.</i></p>
<p>17.56.030.D Barbara Massey. Concern over timing of review.</p>	<p><i>DRB would have the discretion to expedite review of smaller, simpler projects only if the majority of the Board agreed and voted affirmatively as such.</i></p>
<p>17.56.040 Chamber of Commerce. This section should outline what level of detail is expected to be complete for review at each stage, similar to the application form. In addition, it should outline what DRB may not comment on - including whether the DRB has the authority to review storm water-related items, and other public works-approved items. In some cases DRB may request things contrary to direction given by public works or necessary to comply with state-level regulations.</p>	<p><i>Chapter significantly revised and will be discussed in workshops as to the final levels of review and required detail for the proposed project plans.</i></p>
<p>17.56.050/060 Barbara Massey. Request to be replaced by Municipal Code Chapter. 2.08.</p>	<p><i>Municipal Code Chapter 2.08 to be revised to retain only the Administration and Personnel components, consistent with the other Chapters of Title 2. All Design Review specific standards will be moved to Title 17.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.58 – Coastal Development Permits	
<p>17.58 Chamber of Commerce. Since this code is not intended to serve as the coastal zoning ordinance in the near-term, until after Coastal Commission review, Review and comment on this section will be deferred to a later date.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.58.080.A Barbara Massey. Request for all permits to be heard by PC.</p>	<p><i>Not included. Current standard for CDPs included.</i></p>
<p>17.58.080.C.1.a Barbara Massey. Request for clarification.</p>	<p><i>Section completely rewritten.</i></p>
<p>17.58.080.C.2 Barbara Massey. Request clarification on loss of appeal ability.</p>	<p><i>This section simply indicates that an aggrieved party must submit an appeal of the intent to waive a public hearing before the ZA if they wish to have a public hearing. Otherwise, the decision-maker moves to the Director, where the decision will be made without a hearing. The ZA also has the discretion to refuse to entertain a request for a waived hearing by an applicant.</i></p>
<p>17.58.110.A.3 Barbara Massey. Opposed to review period schedule.</p>	<p><i>Comment noted. Consistent with Coastal Act requirements.</i></p>
<p>17.58.120.B Barbara Massey. Opposed to language.</p>	<p><i>Comment noted. Consistent with Coastal Act requirements.</i></p>
Chapter 17.59 – Modifications	
<p>17.59 Cecilia Brown. Opposed to new standards.</p>	<p><i>Chapter significantly rewritten to better reflect existing allowances for Modifications.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.59 Cecilia Brown. Request to keep public hearing with ZA.</p>	<p><i>Zoning Administrator the Review Authority for Modifications if the project is not going to a higher Review Authority.</i></p>
<p>17.59 Cecilia Brown. Request to keep The Substantial Conformity Determination guidelines.</p>	<p><i>Substantial Conformity Determinations brought in to updated draft.</i></p>
<p>17.59 Chamber of Commerce. This section should be reworked by the City. Staff indicated to the PC that the 10% number came from the Coastal Commission rules. Staff did not specify that the code could have a separate standard for INLAND areas of the City.</p>	<p><i>Chapter significantly rewritten to better reflect existing allowances for Modifications.</i></p>
<p>17.59 Chamber of Commerce. A larger % of modification should be independently considered for inland areas if that is indeed the case that the CCC would push back on a number larger than 10%.</p>	<p><i>Chapter significantly rewritten to better reflect existing allowances for Modifications.</i></p>
<p>17.59.020 Chamber of Commerce. The previous code allowed for modifications for up to 20% in some of these criteria and should revert back to those larger allowances for greater flexibility.</p>	<p><i>Potential modifications revised to reflect existing modifications.</i></p>
<p>17.59.020 Chamber of Commerce. Specifically, for setbacks, 10% of a 10-foot setback is one foot, or a 5 foot setback is even less to the point that they are unusable.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.59.020 Chamber of Commerce. Modifications should allow for greater flexibility for development in the setbacks because in many cases, these are reasonable and allow for better design.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.59.020.H.1 Chamber of Commerce. The City needs to clarify whether this is to apply to creation of new lots only, or whether it applies to existing lots. Examples of instances where this is unreasonable may include minor lot line adjustments between two non-conforming lots. This may also unreasonably limit certain types of beneficial use or good design/development on lots that may not conform to minimum lot area, width or depth.</p>	<p><i>Allowance removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.59.040 Chamber of Commerce. This should also include positive or beneficial findings such as projects that provide a benefit, are inclusive of new or exciting design features, or somehow use leading-edge technology or other best practices so that modifications can be granted in positive instances in all districts not just residential districts.</p>	<p><i>Findings revised. One of two Modification specific findings includes better architecture/design.</i></p>
<p>17.59.040.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. This seems unnecessarily limiting. The change may intend to do one of those things but also have other collateral purposes or benefit.</p>	<p><i>Finding removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.62 – Development Agreements</p>	
<p>17.62.060 Chamber of Commerce. This process appears to be a new one, and should be reconsidered if yearly is appropriate. Additionally, it shouldn't be applicant initiated.</p>	<p><i>Requirement for yearly review removed.</i></p>
<p>17.62.060.A Barbara Massey. Request for annual review of development agreement compliance to be handled by City staff.</p>	<p><i>See response above.</i></p>
<p>17.62.080.B Chamber of Commerce. Should not reference Land Use Permits if the City eliminates this.</p>	<p><i>Intent was to reference zoning permits generally. Reference changed to "development projects".</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.63 – Amendments to Zoning Regulations and Zoning Map</p>	
<p>17.63 Chamber of Commerce. This section is lacking an Application Requirements section as is found in the subsequent GPA section. The findings do not include that the amendment is consistent with any specific plan. The LCP amendment section does include that verbiage.</p>	<p><i>Application requirements removed from GPA Chapter. Findings changed to better reflect existing findings.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.63.020.A Chamber of Commerce. Previously, the Director, or Planning Commission could also initiate. City may consider adding these as qualified applicants or initiators. Initiation of Amendments goes to the City Council for review. Factors considered include 17.63.020.C.2. “the amendment proposed appears to have no material effect on the community or the General Plan.” A change in the zoning of a parcel, or the text of a regulation would change the allowed uses of a property therefore would have a “material effect on the community.” This should be reconsidered.</p>	<p><i>Revisions made to better reflect who can initiate a zoning amendment under existing zoning ordinances.</i></p>
<p>17.63.040 Chamber of Commerce. I believe the current requirement is two readings at the Council. PC makes their recommendation by a majority vote.</p>	<p><i>Revision to clarify public hearings and required second reading.</i></p>
<p>17.63.050.C.2 Chamber of Commerce. Do we want the word necessary or should this be written that the change aids the City in achieving the balance.</p>	<p><i>Finding removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.64 – Amendments to the General Plan</p>	
<p>17.64.040.A Chamber of Commerce. Previously, the Director, or Planning Commission could also initiate. City may consider adding these as qualified applicants or initiators. Initiation of GPAs have the same 5 Factors as Zone changes. Same comment about ‘no material effect’ for this section (17.64.040.C.2.) as for 17.63.020.C.2.</p>	<p><i>Not the case. Existing practice is only the City Council can initiate. Existing practice codified. Initiation factors for zoning amendments removed as those only apply to GPAs.</i></p>
<p>17.64.060 Chamber of Commerce. This section should clarify that the review procedures commence after a positive result from the initiation process.</p>	<p><i>Clarification added.</i></p>
<p>17.64.070 Chamber of Commerce. Public hearing again states that only one hearing is required at the PC and one at the CC which is an improvement over the current process which is two readings at the CC. The findings do not include that the amendment is consistent with any specific plan. The LCP amendment section does include that verbiage.</p>	<p><i>Section consistent with current requirement for one hearing in front of each body. No reference to Specific Plans as this is not included in Government Code. LCP amendment Chapter removed.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Chapter 17.65 – Amendments to Local Coastal Program	
<p>17.65 Chamber of Commerce. Review of this section should be deferred until the CCC has reviewed the document and provided their comments. The LCP Amendment process looks much like the Zoning Amendment and GP Amendment processes.</p>	<p><i>Chapter removed.</i></p>
<p>17.65.060.A Chamber of Commerce. There should be a codified time limitation so that this filing is within a certain number of days after approval by the CC.</p>	<p><i>Chapter removed. Procedures identified in Coastal Act.</i></p>
Chapter 17.67 – Enforcement	
<p>17.67.030.C Barbara Massey. Request for code enforcement.</p>	<p><i>No response as this an issue outside the purview of the NZO.</i></p>
Chapter 17.70 – Use Classifications	
<p>17.70.020 Chamber of Commerce. It does not include gymnasiums or other sports facilities uses that represent more than 20 percent of overall square footage, convention centers, or facilities, such as day care centers and schools that are separately classified and regulated. The City should consider that many churches and community assembly buildings provide day care and school uses and be sure that these are provided for and allowed as child care is one of the most expensive financial burdens for families living and working in Goleta.</p>	<p><i>Some uses only allowed as accessory uses, consistent with Accessory Use standards.</i></p>
<p>17.70.020 Linda Blackburn. Request for information regarding Assisted Living Facilities in the new ZO.</p>	<p><i>Assisted Living Facilities allowed in RM, RH, CG, and OI with a Major CUP.</i></p>
<p>17.70.070 Chamber of Commerce. In general, it seems like there are many accessory uses not listed here, so this may need some kind of catch-all additional language.</p>	<p><i>See regulations of Accessory Uses in Part IV.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.70.070 Chamber of Commerce. A caretaker unit seems like an accessory structure, not use, and it seems like they're missing some accessory uses like storage or limited retail sales associated with some kind of medical office or personal care business.</p>	<p><i>Caretaker unit an accessory use, consistent with the General Plan. See regulations of Accessory Uses in Part IV.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Live/Works Units- The word incidental may be unnecessary. In addition, it may be that a residence is converted to also have a work space, so the definition should be flexible to allow for the reverse instance or instances where structural modifications are not required/needed. Instead, consider referencing building code.</p>	<p><i>No change. Live/work Units a commercial use classification that is allowed in CC and C-OT, but not allowed in residential districts.</i></p>
<p>17.70.070 Ben Werner. Request for change in definition of Sustainable Living Research Site.</p>	<p><i>Use class removed.</i></p>
<p>Chapter 17.71 – List of Terms and Definitions</p>	
<p>17.71 Chamber of Commerce. This section lacks any definition of Substantial Conformity or Substantial Conformance where these terms are used in the code in a number of places. This needs to be defined. This section is in alphabetical order, so a specific code references are not listed in each, instead, the defined term is in bold. Page numbers in the initial pages of this section would be extremely helpful.</p>	<p><i>Definition of Substantial Conformity Determination added.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Carl Schneider, CSA Architects. Requests Sign Terminology be modified/added.</p>	<p><i>Some changes to sign terminology made. However, not all suggested changes made because the overall structure and terms used in the Sign Chapter did not change. Signs will be a key issue discussed during the Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Accessory Use- Providing a percentage is not needed and may be unintentionally or intentionally too restrictive. Compare to old definition.</p>	<p><i>See regulations of Accessory Uses in Part IV. Percentage removed from definition.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Aggrieved Person- "...or who, for good cause, was unable to do either, and who objects to the action taken on such permit and wishes to appeal such action to a higher authority." Does the underlined portion come from case law or other interpretations? If not, it is the general understanding that you had to show up at a hearing or write a letter to have 'standing' to appeal. The City attorney should weigh in if they haven't already.</p>	<p><i>Appeal language removed from definition.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Alteration- The word "alteration" is used as a trigger word for triggering other requirements such as design review. Questions: Is site work or flat work included in 'alteration'? Is seismic retrofit considered a repair and maintenance or an alteration or neither? Staff must add clarification to this.</p>	<p><i>Most times an "alteration" would constitute development and would be subject to some level of zoning and/or building review.</i> <i>Some site work that requires grading is subject to zoning requirements. Seismic retrofits are exempt from zoning.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Building- It appears rational that trailers are not considered buildings because they are instead vehicles.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Building, Accessory- These definitions are shorter than the old code, and could be added to. At a minimum, they should be revised to include 'incidental to the main structure or use' on the same lot.</p>	<p><i>Accessory Building definition removed.</i> <i>Accessory Structure definition uses the terms subordinate and incidental.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Building, Accessory- If an attached accessory building is considered part of the principal building, we may see problems with square footage calculations. The new definitions do not specify whether they can be used for overnight accommodations, or if they can contain kitchens, etc. This appears to be beneficial as it would appear to allow more freedom of use of accessory buildings and structures. Compare to old definition.</p>	<p><i>Definition removed. See Accessory Structure regulations. Accessory structure with plumbing requires a Zoning Clearance. Guesthouses allowed but require an NTPO.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Building, Principal- It seems positive to have removed the second sentence that used to exist with this definition which stated, “in any residential, agricultural, or estate district, any dwelling shall be deemed to be the principal structure on the lot on which it is situated.”</p>	<p><i>No response required. Reference to “principal dwelling” (rather than “any dwelling) included in primary structure definition.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Carport- Many carports are three-sided and this should allow.</p>	<p><i>Change made.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber. Floor Area- Should have a differentiator between gross and net.</p>	<p><i>No change. Floor area will be further discussed during Planning Commission workshops.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Incidental Use- This seems like an improvement over the old definition however, the City might consider adding the word necessarily so it reads, “but is not necessarily customarily associated” to allow for new uses or innovations that the code may not be set up to recognize. Compare to old definition.</p>	<p><i>Definition removed. Only used once previously in NZO.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Lighting- Should be consistent with the discussion and measurements of lighting elsewhere such as sign ordinance.</p>	<p><i>Lighting standards revised within the document.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Maintenance and Repair- This seems like an improvement over the old definition.</p>	<p><i>Definition slightly revised, but only minor changes made.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Permitted Use- For consideration. No definition exists in the old code.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Pervious- Should include permeable.</p>	<p><i>Permeable now defined to include pervious material.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Primary Use- Similar to the comment before, a percentage is not needed here and may turn out to be too restrictive or unintentionally prohibitive.</p>	<p><i>Percentage removed. Size of accessory uses now discussed in detail in Accessory Use section.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Principal Use- Same as before. A percentage is not needed here.</p>	<p><i>Percentage requirement removed.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Structure- Check against ‘awning’ whether it matters if they have removed trailers and sidewalks. Compare to old definition.</p>	<p><i>“Awning” not a defined term in existing City zoning.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. Structure, Temporary- A work trailer or construction office may have a pad or some other means to secure it on the ground to meet manufacturer’s recommendations. Should the definition clarify that these are temporary structures?</p>	<p><i>Typically, temporary work trailers are not tied-down to a pad, but if they are, such details and manufacturer requirements would be reviewed by building and safety staff, not NZO standards.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Chamber of Commerce. See Tree definitions. And tree definitions do not exist.</p>	<p><i>Reference to tree definitions removed.</i></p>
<p>17.71.020 Carl Schneider, CSA Architects. Suggests Zoning Admin. definition be modified.</p>	<p><i>Change not made. Clarification of Zoning Administrator made to make clear the ZA is selected by the City Manager.</i></p>
<p>General Comments</p>	
<p>Gary Vandeman. Word count comparison request.</p>	<p><i>Not provided.</i></p>
<p>Ingeborg Cox. Concern over budget on ZO.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>Ingeborg Cox. Concern over consultant’s role.</p>	<p><i>No response required.</i></p>
<p>Ingeborg Cox. Requests citizens gain more information regarding the GP changes.</p>	<p><i>No General Plan Amendments considered with the NZO. Staff will discuss General Plan consistency in the NZO during Planning Commission Workshops.</i></p>
<p>Michael Iza. Request to take out many inconsistencies and errors in the draft ZO.</p>	<p><i>General comment. No response required.</i></p>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Michael Iza. Request for the process to slow down.	<i>Staff has spent considerable time to review comments and make revisions.</i>
Michael Iza. Request that staff categorize major issues that PC and Public see as main issues.	<i>Staff prepared a Key Issues Guide to help foster discussion during the Planning Commission workshops.</i>
Michael Iza. Opposed to timing of Public Review Process.	<i>Review process has been revised.</i>
Michael Iza. Request for focused workshop and/or group stakeholder meetings that will assist with the final ZO.	<i>Staff welcomes meetings with interested parties, stakeholders, and groups.</i>
Lindsey Baker, League of Women Voters. Request for executive summary.	<i>Executive summary provided, but several other documents produced to aide in review.</i>
Lindsey Baker, League of Women Voters. Concern over ZA Role.	<i>Permit Procedures and Review Authorities will be discussed at length during Planning Commission workshops. Role of ZA significantly reduced.</i>
Lindsey Baker, League of Women Voters. Staff should explain principle changes (how standards have changed).	<i>Staff provided a Summary of Changes from the Nov. 2015 version to the January 2019 version. During the Planning Commission workshops, staff will discuss key changes from existing zoning ordinances.</i>
Mary Ellen, Brooks Citizens Planning Association. Staff should explain principle changes.	<i>See response above.</i>
Mary Ellen, Brooks Citizens Planning Association. Request that public comments are made accessible to the public and city officials.	<i>All public comments posted on GoletaZoning.com.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Katie Davis. Request for solar on new buildings.	<i>Not required, although State law will mandate for some structures in coming years. Energy discussion part of Key Issues Guide.</i>
Kathleen Toro. Concern over Old Town zoning for residents.	<i>Residential land uses guided by the General Plan.</i>
Kathleen Toro. Request for more definition about zoning laws related to IG District.	<i>Uses allowed in IG are based on the uses allowed in in General Plan Table 2-4. These include various industrial and auto-related uses. The reference to “noxious impacts” is consistent with the General Plan description of IG found in Land Use Policy LU 4.5. With that said, the NZO includes performance standards intended to address compatibility issues and also has specific standards for certain uses. In addition, certain uses that are allowed in IG will still need Conditional Use Permits, where the City can condition the use to assure neighborhood compatibility.</i>
Barbara Massey. Concern by the lack of public discussion on ZO.	<i>The City will conduct another round of extensive public comment, including at least 7 Planning Commission workshops and at least 4 open houses. In addition, staff will meet with any interested party to discuss any items in the Revised Draft NZO and all written comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and posted online.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Ingeborg Cox. Questioned if there is a Spanish Translation of the document.	<i>Full document is not translated into Spanish. Spanish interpretation will be provided at Open Houses.</i>
Robert Atkinson, SyWest Development. Requests information to ensure the ZO does not reduce potential development for property.	<i>Zoning district for a given parcel is dictated by the General Plan Land Use Map (Figure 2-1).</i>
Barbara Massey. Requests that all information relevant is included in respective chapters.	<i>Overall structure of the NZO unchanged. Cross-references have been added where appropriate.</i>
Ingeborg Cox. Request that GP is left alone until ZO is complete.	<i>General Plan Amendments not proposed at this time.</i>
Ingeborg Cox. Request for information on who can participate in meetings.	<i>Meeting are open to the public.</i>
Ingeborg Cox. Request that all public hearings be accessible on TV.	<i>Public hearings on the NZO will be televised.</i>
Barbara Massey. Feels it is unreasonable that the public only receives 3 minutes to comment on 7 sections.	<i>The City will conduct another round of extensive public comment, including at least 7 Planning Commission workshops and at least 4 open houses. In addition, staff will meet with any interested party to discuss any items in the Revised Draft NZO and all written comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and posted online. Staff will provide additional outreach as needed.</i>
BL Borovay. If this zoning ordinance is as important to Goleta's future as the city says it is, it should move forward on a schedule that from the start of this final phase, encourages and furthers the comment and discussion.	<i>See response above.</i>
Massey. The NZO should only be adopted when ready, when it properly protects residents, and after adequate time to review revisions is provided.	<i>See response above.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Relles. Do not conduct public review over the summer, ensure sufficient outreach, and include flexibility into review process.	<i>See response above.</i>
Smith. Expressed interest in how process will change with new Planning Director and concern about the schedule for review and adoption.	<i>See response above.</i>
Michael Iza. Requests review process not go too fast and for staff to explain changes.	<i>See response above. A Summary of Changes detailing revisions from the Public Review Draft will is provided.</i>
Smith. There should be Spanish translation at public outreach events.	<i>Spanish interpretation will be available at Open Houses.</i>
Michael Iza. Request for informational kiosks.	<i>Staff will consider additional outreach options during the review of the Revised Draft NZO.</i>
Harry S. Rouse. Request to survey every residential property for compliance with building codes.	<i>Not provided.</i>
Lisa Kus. Request to know where our consulting firm is from.	<i>Consultants are from Central Coast.</i>
Harry S. Rouse. Disappointed in the enforcement of existing codes and regulations.	<i>City nuisance regulations are found Goleta Municipal Code Chapters 8.01 and 12.13. Additionally, the NZO includes an Enforcement Chapter in Part V.</i>
Kristen Miller, Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce. Request to know when changes are proposed and how they are made known to all parties involved.	<i>See Summary of Changes and Track-Changed version.</i>
Kristen Miller, Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce. Commends the City for the amount of work being put into the ZO.	<i>No response required.</i>
Kristen Miller, Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce. Content with the effort for streamlining certain aspects of the permitting process with the addition of a Zoning Administrator.	<i>Revisions made to keep Review Authorities fairly similar to existing zoning ordinances.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit. Acknowledgement letter from State Clearinghouse for review requirements.	<i>No response required at this time.</i>
James Kruger. Request for safer sidewalks.	<i>The City maintains a Capital Improvement Program through the Public Works Department that includes projects to improve sidewalks throughout the City. The NZO does not directly address this issue. The City also has a Public Tree Advisory Commission to address issues with public trees.</i>
Mary Scott. Feels the City is "out of touch and failing to represent the wishes of the majority of Goleta residents."	<i>The City welcome public comment on the Revised Draft NZO from all City residents and interested parties.</i>
Craig Minus, Coastal Housing Coalition. Encourages the City to adopt zoning provisions and approval processes that facilitate: modest single-family homes, second dwelling units, multiple-unit dwellings (duplexes, garden apartments, etc), and mixed-use projects.	<i>Variety of housing types and approval processes included draft NZO.</i>
Craig Minus, Coastal Housing Coalition. Encourages increased flexibility in development standards (e.g. setbacks, parking, lot coverage) for projects that supply workforce housing.	<i>Flexibility included for various types of housing, however, workforce housing is not specifically addressed.</i>
Craig Minus, Coastal Housing Coalition encourages senior and assisted living facilities.	<i>No response required.</i>
Jennifer Smith. Noted that it is important to understand changes from existing regulations.	<i>Staff will discuss changes in detail during Key Issues workshops with the Planning Commission.</i>
Peter Imhof. Stated that State law requires a consistency review by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) of the new Goleta Zoning Ordinance prior to adoption by the City Council.	<i>Staff will review the Revised Draft NZO with SBCAG staff.</i>

Response to Public Comments

Public Comment	Response
<p>Krista Pleiser, SBAOR. Although the Proposed Ordinance appears to be generally well organized and edited, additional attention is required to ensure that terms are sufficiently defined and use of these terms is consistent throughout. For example, the term “Building Permit” is used in its capitalized form throughout the Proposed Ordinance, although that term is not defined and sometimes the term is not capitalized. “Landscaping” is defined but the term (and its variants “landscape,” “landscaped”) is used in the lowercase throughout the Proposed Ordinance. Defined terms should be indicated as defined terms by the use of capital letters and should be used consistently throughout.</p>	<p><i>Staff and consultant team spend considerable time clarifying language and apply capitalization where appropriate to better assist readers of the NZO.</i></p>