

Helen Gannon

Subject: RE: Goleta Draft Zoning Ordinance dated November 2015 - Accessory Structures

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Alker [mailto:ken@impulse.net]

Sent: Friday, June 03, 2016 3:00 PM

To: Anne Wells

Subject: Goleta Draft Zoning Ordinance dated November 2015 - Accessory Structures

Anne,

Please find attached a letter from me dated 6/2/2016 regarding Accessory Structures with respect to the November 2015 Draft Zoning Ordinance.

Please write back and let me know the attachment came through.

Thank you!

Ken Alker

(805) 685-2030

Ken Alker
290 Winchester Canyon Road
Goleta, CA 93117
(805) 685-2030
ken@impulse.net
June 2, 2016

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

Anne Wells
City of Goleta Planning Manager
130 Cremona Drive
Goleta, CA 93117

Dear Anne,

The DRAFT Goleta Zoning Ordinance dated November 2015, section 17.25.020 "Accessory Structures" Paragraph "B. 1." states, "An accessory structure may be constructed on a lot on which there is a permitted main building to which the accessory building is related." In Agricultural zone districts, accessory structures should be allowed even when there is no main building.

Paragraph "B. 2." states, "Where two contiguous immediately adjoining residential lots are under the same ownership, and one lot contains a single-unit dwelling, an accessory structure may be permitted on the adjoining vacant lot ... The owner must sign a statement, which will, at a minimum, require that any on-site improvements be removed should either of the lots be sold separately." This statement is ambiguous. It should specify that the on-site improvement that must be removed is the accessory structure on the adjoining lot, but that removal will not be required if a single-unit dwelling has since been constructed on said adjoining lot.

Paragraph "D. 1. b." regarding Residential Districts, states that "Accessory Structures must be setback a minimum of three feet from interior side and rear property lines." Table 17.07.30 states that Residential Districts have interior-side (this is hyphenated in paragraph "D. 1. b." but not in table 17.07.30) and rear property setbacks which are all greater than three feet. Further, current zoning Section 35-267 "Accessory Structures", paragraph 4 states, "An accessory structure may be located in the required rear yard setback provided that it is located no closer than five (5) feet to the principal structure and that it occupies no more than forty (40) percent of the required rear yard, and that it does not exceed a height of twelve (12) feet." The current zoning paragraph seems reasonable; I suggest this language is used instead of the language in the draft Ordinance paragraph "D. 1. b." in order to clear up the conflicting requirements.

Paragraph "E." limits the height of Accessory Structures in Residential Districts to 12 feet except on Parcels greater than 10,000 square feet, in which case they may be up to 16 feet, and additional height up to that of the main building may be allowed if it matches the main building. I categorically disagree with this limitation. I believe the maximum height should conform to the height requirements of the zoning district in which the structure is built, and that there should not be extra restrictions on Accessory Structures built in residential districts. I have every intention of building a barn and/or a garage that will be greater than 16 feet in height, and taller than my main building. It is absolutely impractical to build what I have desired to build since purchasing my property with such height

restrictions. Nearly every one of my neighbors has a barn, and they are all MUCH taller than the draft limitations would allow. One of my neighbors has an artist studio atop their barn, which would never work at 16 feet, and is nearly twice as tall as their main building, and it looks great. In fact, this paragraph seems to be trying to create a situation where no one can build barns or even two story structures on their property. I believe this is completely unfair and unreasonable. I hope this was just an oversight. Currently, the DR zoning district allows for thirty-five (35) foot buildings and structures. At the very least, this limitation should be eliminated for any land that is in a DR zoning district under the current ordinance. Since some (or all) of the DR zoned properties are proposed to be rezoned into the RS zoning district, applying these limitations would cause land owners in the DR zoning district to lose their option to build reasonably tall structures. That said, I still believe the requirement should be dropped entirely. This by far the most disturbing restriction I have found in the draft Ordinance thus far. Please give this your utmost attention; it is of very great concern to me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ken Alker".

Ken Alker

Helen Gannon

Subject: RE: Follow up on child care language

From: Monahan, Eileen [<mailto:emonahan@First5SBC.org>]

Sent: Monday, June 06, 2016 4:32 PM

To: Anne Wells

Subject: RE: Follow up on child care language

Hi, Anne – attached are my recommendations/input regarding the proposed zoning ordinances related to child care. They are somewhat cryptic, so if you would like more information, or have questions, please let me know and I will make myself available.

Again, thank you for allowing me the time to respond.

Best,
Eileen

Eileen Monahan
ECE Manager
First 5 Santa Barbara County
Santa Barbara, Ca 93101
(805) 560-1038
emonah@countyofsb.org



"Play is essential to the social, emotional, cognitive, and physical well-being of children beginning in early childhood. For children who are under resourced to reach their highest potential, it is essential that parents, educators, and pediatricians recognize the importance of lifelong benefits that children gain from play." ~ Statement from the American Academy of Pediatrics~



City of Goleta Zoning Ordinance Updates

Input on child care ordinances

Eileen Monahan, ECE Manager, First 5 Santa Barbara County
emonahan@First5SBC.org (805) 451-8720
June 6, 2016

After review of the proposed ordinances, and meeting with City Planning staff, the following are my recommendations for changes to the November 2015 ordinances pertaining to child care. I appreciate the opportunity to provide input, and am available for any questions or discussions.

1. General:
 - a. Change all language about child care to “child care” and not “day care” or “nursery schools” to be consistent. Suggest “Child Care Facility” and “Family Child Care Home”
 - b. Ensure that all ordinances regarding family child care pertain only to the areas that can be regulated by the City: Parking, Spacing, Traffic, Noise.
2. Table 17.07.020 – Residential Districts:
 - a. Allow child care centers, in addition to family child care homes in residential areas. The CUP process will provide scrutiny of the appropriateness of a potential project in a particular neighborhood.
3. Table 17.12.020:
 - a. Allow child care centers, in addition to family child care homes in Open Space and Agricultural Districts.
4. Table 17.39.040 – Required On-site parking spaces:
 - a. Change requirements for child care centers (“Day Care Facilities”) to a formula that captures the activities of that use, and ties to actual use. Parking of cars is often prioritized over space for children to play. A typical formula is 1 space for every 2 staff and 1 space for every 10 children.
 - b. Allow for alternate parking options, such as a reduction in required spaces if the applicant creates designated pick up/drop off areas, and/or if applicant can show through a usage report that a different parking arrangement will work.
5. Section 17.42.130 – Family Day Care Homes – Large

- a. Use the Licensing section C as a heading that indicates requirements from the State of California, and include Residency and Outdoor Space under that to show that they are State requirements.
- b. Remove Screening Requirements – there are a variety of fences in place in neighborhoods, and the cost to replace a fence will be prohibitive to many potential family child care operators. Community Care Licensing will regulate and approve fencing.
- c. Expiration of Permit – although the intent on this ordinance is good (make space for other FCC), there is no mechanism or requirement for Family Child Care Providers to notify the City that they do not have enough children to warrant a permit (i.e. they are a Large FCC with a license to care for up to 12 children, but they only have 7, which is in the range for a Small FCC). There are many reasons why a Large FCC would not care for the maximum number of children for 180 consecutive days, including sickness and other issues that make it difficult for them to care for the maximum number of children for a period of time. This would be challenging to enforce.
- d. Review and Complaints sections – Remove these two sections. These sections draw special attention to family child care regarding complaints, and similar complaint processes are not included for other uses in residential areas. The State of California Community Care Licensing oversees and regulates child care and states the need for children to be in family neighborhoods. Neighbors can always contact the City if they have concerns about parking, spacing, traffic or noise. And if they have concerns about the care received by the children in the program, they can contact Community Care Licensing. Calling out family child care in particular can draw more attention and set up providers for constant complaints. (Note: hours of operation is not one of the 4 areas that the City regulates)

Helen Gannon

Subject: RE: Zoning ordinance

From: Goleta, CA [<mailto:webmaster@cityofgoleta.org>]

Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:41 PM

To: Anne Wells

Subject: Zoning ordinance

Hi Anne,

Been very busy. Wanted to know if I could submit some wording for consideration regarding trailers of any type being parked in a persons driveway or elsewhere on their property.

I was thinking along the lines of something which pointed out that all new development will go through a permit process which will delineate areas for parking recreational vehicles, boats on trailers, and all other vehicles on those premises or stored within the confines of the development as proposed.

Regarding existing housing throughout the city of Goleta, it has been the historical, customary, legal and habitual practice to park all manner of trailers in the driveways and side yards of single family homes. The newly proposed ordinance shall not change or alter, in any way, that practice. Many of our citizens purchased their homes specifically because of the advantage or opportunity presented by lack of any restrictions on the use of their land as they see fit. Any neighbor, or group thereof, who may have an objection to the parking of vehicles upon the property of one or more of their fellow Goletan's has had and still has the right to speak with that neighbor regarding their objection. If a plaintive neighbor cannot reach a satisfactory resolve through rational discussion, that neighbor still has the right to seek remedies under the law if they believe their property values, personal safety or aesthetic values are being compromised.

Many of us have boats on trailers, camping trailers, RV's and even trailers which carry the tools of our trades parked in our driveways and at other locations on our properties. We are very determined to preserve the right to continue to use our properties as we have been doing for over a half century in many cases.

Thanks for all your hard work and expertise. When will the next meeting occur which will consider this part of the newly proposed ordinance the City is drafting?

Site Visitor Name: Wes Herman

Site Visitor Email: rico004@cox.net