



**SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
JOINT WORKSHOPS BETWEEN THE  
PLANNING COMMISSION AND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2008**

5:30 P.M.  
City Hall  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, California

***Members of the Planning Commission***

*Kenneth Knight, Chair  
Brent Daniels, Vice Chair  
Edward Easton  
Doris Kavanagh  
Julie Kessler Solomon*

*Patricia Miller, Secretary  
Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk*

***Members of the Design Review Board***

*Bob Wignot, Chair  
Thomas Smith, Vice Chair  
Scott Branch, Architect  
Cecilia Brown, At-Large Member  
Simon Herrera, Landscape Contractor  
Chris Messner, Landscape Contractor  
Carl Schneider, Architect*

**CALL ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The special meeting workshops were called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL OF PLANNING COMMISSION**

Present: Planning Commissioners Easton, Knight, and Solomon.  
Absent: Planning Commissioner Daniels and Kavanagh.

**ROLL CALL OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

Present: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, and Wignot.  
Absent: Member Smith.

Staff present: Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller, Advance Planning Manager Anne Wells, Contract Planner Pat Saley, and Recording Clerk Linda Gregory.

## **PUBLIC FORUM**

No speakers.

## **AMENDMENTS OR ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA**

None.

### **A. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

#### **A.1 Minutes for the Joint Workshop between the Planning Commission and Design Review Board meeting of September 15, 2008.**

Recommendation:

1. Approve the minutes for the Joint Workshop between the Planning Commission and Design Review Board for the special meeting of September 15, 2008.

MOTION: DRB Member Branch moved, seconded by DRB Member Smith and carried by the following voice vote to approve the minutes for the Joint Workshop between the Planning Commission and Design Review Board for the special meeting of September 15, 2008, as amended.

DRB VOTE: AYES: Members Branch, Brown, Messner, and Wignot.

NOES: None

ABSENT: Member Smith.

ABSTAIN: Members Herrera and Schneider.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Easton, Knight and Solomon.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Daniels and Kavanagh.

### **B. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

#### **B-1. Building Intensity Standards in the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan**

Recommendation:

1. That the Planning Commission and Design Review Board continue their discussion on building intensity standards at the September 15, 2008 public workshop, take public input and make a recommendation to the City Council.

Staff speakers:

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller

Advance Planner Anne Wells

Contract Planner Pat Saley

Contract Planner Pat Saley presented and discussed a PowerPoint document entitled "City of Goleta, Continued Public Workshop, Building Intensity Standards, Planning Commission & Design Review Board, October 20, 2008". She thanked Assistant Planner Margaret Duncan and Senior Planner Dan Nemechek for their work that assisted in the preparation of the report.

Commissioner Easton stated that based on the City Attorney's memo of May 7, 2008, he believes that building intensity standards need to be included in the General Plan. He suggested that the Building Structure Height standards should be retained in the General Plan and that it would seem appropriate for the other standards to be considered at the workshop and a recommendation made to the City Council.

Current Planning Manager Patricia Miller stated that staff has provided all information possible with regard to the discussion of building intensity standards and that it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission and DRB Members to provide their recommendations.

### Speakers

1. **Barbara Massey**, Goleta, spoke in support of the building intensity standards and FARs that are in the General Plan, stating that she believes the DRB and Planning Commission should have strong standards to guide their decision-making. She expressed the following concerns: a) Regarding the standards in the Zoning Ordinance, almost every project currently in the planning process, or recently approved, has requested modifications to the setbacks and parking; b) The definition for a "good cause finding" needs to be better clarified; c) The comparable cities listed in the packet for the September 15, 2008, workshop are not very similar to Goleta; d) She believes there should have been more public outreach with regard to the workshops as well as televising or video-taping of the workshops for later viewing; e) The proposed changes combined with the upcoming General Plan Amendments would provide the City with worse standards than under the County's jurisdiction; f) Developers may view removing the standards as allowing more flexibility than under the current General Plan; and g) She believes the City Attorney should attend a meeting to address the issue with regard to building intensities in the General Plan for clarification.
2. **Connie Hannah**, speaking for the League of Women Voters, commented: 1) The Planning Commission is encouraged to consider conceptual review in the early stages because it can save the developer a great amount of money and the suggestions can help make a better project; 2) Expressed concern that there will be almost no specific requirements in the General Plan regarding residential development, stating that unexpected problems often occur, especially when projects are incompatible with the neighborhood; 3) One of the reasons the League supported the original General Plan was the specific standards regarding building intensity, and thought the City might be able to avoid the problem observed at other Planning Commissions of not having strict enough standards to prevent oversized buildings; 4) While some standards would be included in the Zoning Ordinance, it could be changed too easily; and 5) Expressed concern that drastic

changes are being made, stating that help will be needed to design new standards that will adequately protect our quality of life.

3. **Craig Zimmerman**, representing The Towbes Group, recommended retaining the current Minimum Permitted Density of 15 units per acre in the R-MD category in Table 2-1 to qualify for the RHNA allocation and for certification of the Housing Element. He stated that attorney Peter Brown advised that in order for the Housing Element to be certified by the State, the absolute Minimum Permitted Density in the R-MD zone must be 15 units per acre. He recommended that the building heights in the General Plan match the heights in the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that it seems somewhat random to change the building heights to match the General Plan when the City's development is being rounded out within its urban limits. He offered support and participation if there is a study to be done with regard to whether building heights are too high or if changes are needed.
4. **Margaret Connell**, Goleta, recommended retaining the current Minimum Permitted Density of 15 units per acre in the R-MD category in Table 2-1, stating that it would be compatible with efforts to try to provide affordable housing on those sites. She recommended that open space standards not be removed from the General Plan, stating that there needs to be more standards that are definitive. Otherwise, she believes there may not be a way to determine how much lot coverage there will be by just using density standards.
5. **Peter Koetting**, Westar Associates, recommended retaining the current Minimum Permitted Density of 15 units per acre in the R-MD category in Table 2-. He stated that certification of the Housing Element is critical to the City and its growth. He also commented: 1) The Maximum Structure Height in the C-C zone, in Table 2-2, should be changed to 35 feet to be consistent with the corresponding commercial zones in the Zoning Ordinance. The 25-foot Maximum Structure Height standard restricts mixed-use development in commercial projects which could have heights from 30 to 40 feet, with parapets. 2) He requested clarification with regard to the Staff Recommendations on page 7 of the staff report, regarding recommendations #1.c.2 and #1.c.3 because he believes that lowering the height standards would be moving in the wrong direction; 3) Taller screening is now being required on rooftops for improved air conditioning and refrigeration units, although fewer equipment units are needed; 4) Currently, new commercial buildings typically have a smaller footprint, with mezzanines, so there is more open space around the building; 5) A low ceiling in a retail building creates an undesirable feeling for the occupants; 6) He provided the following examples of typical heights for current commercial building types: a) small retail shop buildings = 25' to 28' height, before architectural elements; b) new grocery stores (50,000 to 60,000 sf in size) = 28' to 34' parapets, excluding architectural elements; c) drug stores = 29' to 36' height; d) mid-box buildings (30,000 to 50,000 sf in size) = 32' to 38' height; and e) large box buildings = 32' to 40' height, depending on whether mezzanines are used. He requested clarification regarding when the applicant would be notified whether the "good cause finding" is acceptable because there may be problems when the project architect is notified late in the review process.

RECESS HELD FROM 6:50 P.M. TO 7:00 P.M.

Pat Saley, Contract Planner, presented slides #19-22 of the PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff recommendations.

Table 2-1 Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories:

Commissioner Easton requested the maker of the following motion include retaining the Maximum Open Space Ratio in Table 2-1. DRB Member Brown, who made the initial motion, did not accept Commissioner Easton's request.

MOTION: DRB Member Brown moved, seconded by Commissioner Solomon, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-1, Allowable Uses and Standards for Residential Use Categories, as follows: a) retain Maximum Permitted Density and Minimum Permitted Density as recommended standards; b) retain the Maximum Structure Heights and Maximum Lot Coverage as recommended standards (thereby changing the staff recommendation to remove these items); c) remove Maximum Floor Area Ratios (FAR), Minimum Open Space Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size standards; d) retain the 15 units/acre Minimum Permitted Density standard in the R-MD Residential Use Category (thereby changing the staff recommendation to change from 15 units/acre to 10 units/acre); and e) reduce the Maximum Building Heights (Inland) for R-1/E-1 and R-2 zones in the Zoning Ordinance from 35 feet to 25 feet, increase the Maximum Lot Coverage from 0.30 to 0.40 for the DR-25 and DR-30 zones, and add the "good cause finding" in the Zoning Ordinance for consistency with the General Plan.

The motion carried by the following voice vote.

DRB VOTE: AYES: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, and Wignot.

NOES: Member Schneider.

ABSENT: Member Smith.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Easton, and Solomon.

NOES: Commissioner Knight.

ABSENT: Commissioner Daniels and Kavanagh.

DRB Member Schneider commented that he has a concern with regard to including the standards for heights for Maximum Structure Heights that are being proposed in the General Plan. For example, he stated that the height standards may not allow flexibility for a good architectural solution for a project from a design standpoint.

Commissioner Knight commented that he is not comfortable with including the recommended Maximum Structure Height standards.

Table 2-2 Allowable Uses and Standards for Commercial Use Categories: (excluding Old Town)

Commissioner Solomon commented that it would not seem appropriate to constrain a retail space with requirements that would restrict the project to a lower volume.

Commissioner Knight stated that it would seem that the 35-foot recommended standard for Maximum Structure Height would be appropriate in the C-C designation where there is intent to develop commercial areas.

DRB Member Wignot commented that he would prefer mixed-use developments that have lower heights. For an example, he referred to a project on Linden Avenue in Carpinteria with the commercial use on the ground floor and residential use on the second story.

MOTION: Commissioner Knight moved, seconded by DRB Member Brown, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-2, Allowable Uses and Standards for Commercial Use Categories, (with the exception of the C-OT, Old Town. category to be considered with a separate motion), as follows: a) retain Maximum Residential Density, Maximum Structure Heights and Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio, as recommended standards; b) remove Maximum FAR, Minimum Open Space Ratio and Minimum Lot Size standards; c) add 0.40 for the Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio recommended standard in the C-I (Intersection) designation for consistency with the Zoning Ordinance; and d) change the staff recommendation for the Maximum Structure Heights recommended standard from 25 feet to 35 feet in the C-C (Community Commercial) designation in the General Plan for consistency with the Zoning Ordinance.

The motion carried by the following voice vote.

DRB VOTE: AYES: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, and Wignot.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Smith.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Easton, Knight, and Solomon.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Daniels and Kavanagh.

Table 2-2 Allowable Uses and Standards for Commercial Use Categories: (Old Town)

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved, seconded by Commissioner Knight, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-2, Allowable Uses and Standards for Commercial Use Categories, with regard to the C-OT, Old Town Commercial Land Use Category; as follows: a) retain the Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio and Maximum Residential Density as recommended standards; b) remove the Maximum FAR, Minimum Open Space Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size standards; c) amend the Maximum Building Height in Old Town from 35 feet to 30 feet for commercial uses in OT-R/LC Zone in the Zoning Code for consistency; and d) add a note in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance that the Zoning Ordinance update should include Form-Based Code for Old Town, to be developed.

DRB Member Schneider recommended adding a footnote that indicates currently there are problematic issues in Old Town that need to be addressed, which include problems with the R-2 zone and the C-OT category; therefore, guidance regarding density will need to be determined when the Form-Base Codes are developed.

DRB Member Brown agreed with DRB Member Schneider's recommendation and stated that currently a project with a Maximum Residential Density of 20 units per acres is probably not possible in Old Town.

Commissioner Easton expressed concern with regard to finding space for infrastructure to support this type of density and noted that parking is currently a serious problem in Old Town. He believes that the Form-Based Code should apply for the whole area of Old Town, coterminous with the Redevelopment Area.

#### AMENDED

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved, seconded by Commissioner Knight, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-2, Allowable Uses and Standards for Commercial Use Categories, with regard to the C-OT, Old Town Commercial Land Use Category; as follows: a) retain the Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio, and retain Maximum Residential Density with a change to the staff recommendation by replacing the density of 20/acre in the C-OT category with TBD (note that there are problems in Old Town that need to be addressed; therefore, guidance will be determined when the Form-Based Code is developed); b) remove the Maximum FAR, Minimum Open Space Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size; c) amend the Maximum Building Height in Old Town from 35 feet to 30 feet for commercial uses in OT-R/LC Zone in the Zoning Code for consistency; and d) note that the Zoning Ordinance update should include Form-Based Code for Old Town.

The motion carried by the following voice vote.

DRB VOTE: AYES: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider and Wignot.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Smith.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Easton, Knight and Solomon.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Daniels and Kavanagh.

#### Table 2-3 Allowable Uses and Standards for Office and Industrial Use Categories:

MOTION: DRB Member Brown moved, seconded by DRB Member Wignot, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-3 Allowable Uses and Standards for Office and Industrial Land Uses, as follows: a) retain, as recommended standards, Maximum Residential Density, Maximum Structure Heights, and Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio as recommended standards; b) remove Maximum FAR, Maximum FAR for Hotels; Minimum Open Space/Landscaping Ratio,

and Minimum Lot Size; and c) amend the Maximum Building Height in the M-1 zone in the Zoning Ordinance from 45 feet to 35 feet for consistency with the General Plan.

DRB Member Schneider requested that the motion be amended to increase the Maximum Structure Height from 35 feet to 40 feet for mixed-use projects which would allow an extra five feet to be able to add some architectural elements. While 35 feet would work, he believes it should be very rare to use the “good cause finding” to allow additional height.

DRB Member Wignot withdrew his second to the above motion, stating that he could support increasing the recommended standard for Maximum Structure Heights for commercial use if more space is needed on the ground floor, but the additional height may not be needed for office use.

#### AMENDED

MOTION: DRB Member Brown moved, seconded by DRB Member Branch, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-3 Allowable Uses and Standards for Office and Industrial Land Uses, that include: a) retain, as recommended standards, Maximum Residential Density, Maximum Structure Heights, and Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio as recommended standards; b) remove Maximum FAR, Maximum FAR for Hotels, Minimum Open Space/Landscaping Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size; c) amend the Maximum Building Height in the M-1 zone in the Zoning Ordinance from 45 feet to 35 feet for consistency with the General Plan; and d) with a change to the staff recommendation that would retain the Maximum Structure Height of 35 feet in the I-OI category when a project is all office use and raise the Maximum Structure Height to 40 feet when the project is mixed-use.

Motion carried by the following voice vote.

DRB VOTE: AYES: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, and Schneider.

NOES: Members Messner and Wignot.

ABSENT: Member Smith.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Easton, Knight and Solomon.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Daniels and Kavanagh.

#### Table 2-4 Allowable Uses and Standards for Other Land Use Categories:

MOTION: Commissioner Easton moved, seconded by Commissioner Knight, to recommend to the City Council the staff recommended amendments to Table 2-4 Allowable Uses and Standards for Other Land Use Categories, as follows: a) retain Maximum Structure Heights and Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio as recommended standards; b) remove Maximum Permitted Density (units/Acres), Maximum FAR, Minimum Open Space Ratio, and Minimum Lot Size standards; c) add the Maximum Structure Heights recommended standards of 25 feet and Maximum Lot Coverage recommended standards of 0.20 to the OS-PR and OS-AR categories; d)



add the Maximum Structure Height recommend standard of 35 feet to the P-S category; e) with a change to the staff recommendation that would replace 35 feet with 25 feet for the Maximum Structure Height recommended standard in the AG category; and f) amend the corresponding Zoning Ordinance standards by reducing the Maximum Building Height in the AG zone from 35 feet to 25 feet; and by reducing the Maximum Building Height from 45 feet to 35 feet in the PU zone, for consistency with the General Plan.

The motion carried by the following vote:

DRB VOTE: AYES: Members Branch, Brown, Herrera, Messner, Schneider, and Wignot.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Member Smith.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE:

AYES: Commissioners Easton, Knight and Solomon.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Commissioners Daniels and Kavanagh.

Pat Saley, Contract Planner, reviewed the items listed by staff as Other Recommendations that include: a) Zoning Ordinance Update – Consider: revising definitions and Form-Based Code for Old Town; and b) Provide Conceptual Review Process: Prior to formal submittal of application, and consider Planning Commission and/or DRB review depending on specifics of the proposed project. She stated that staff will expand the definitions of the “good cause finding” and significant community benefit, with examples, prior to the City Council review.

DRB Member Brown commented that there needs to be some standards with regard to the description of a significant community benefit because the public needs to know what it means.

DRB Member Wignot commented: a) specific examples of significant community benefits would be useful to provide guidance; and b) suggested examples of benefits would include residence facilities for senior citizens, and recreation facilities that are privately owned but could be used by the entire community.

Commissioner Easton suggested that staff provide an outline of a recommended process for early Conceptual review to be used as a draft for further discussion.

The following recommendations were made regarding an early Conceptual review process:

1. DRB Member Brown believes it would be important for both the Planning Commission and DRB to participate in an early Conceptual review.
2. DRB Member Wignot recalled there was discussion with regard to having a committee with a couple of members from both the DRB and Planning Commission.
3. Commissioner Easton noted there may be some difficulties at the Planning Commission level when initially reviewing a project that previously received favorable Conceptual review by another board.

4. Commissioner Knight believes that the Planning Commission should participate in every project with regard to Conceptual review, and that the Conceptual review should focus on concepts rather than polished projects that appear to be finished.

Pat Saley, Contract Planner, clarified for the record that the Conceptual review process is not an official approval of a project.

DRB Member Wignot commented: a) he has noticed throughout the City that there are some very abrupt transitions between some properties; for example, from a nicely landscaped area to chain link fences; and b) suggested consideration be given to softening the buffer on both sides of a property line, where there is an opportunity, which he believes would make for a more aesthetically pleasing community.

Commissioner Easton suggested that it may be appropriate to consider adding urban design to the parameters for DRB review.

Contract Planner Pat Saley thanked everyone for their participation in the workshops.

**C. ADJOURNMENT: 8:30 P.M.**

Prepared by Linda Gregory, Recording Clerk.

**GOLETA PLANNING COMMISSION/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD JOINT WORKSHOPS**

Attachment: Planning Commission-Design Review Board, General Plan Amendments (Track 2.5) Land Use Element Tables 2-1 through 2-4 Building Intensity Standards – Recommendations to City Council, October 20, 2008.