

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE
Open House #2
9:00 pm to 4:00 pm, Saturday, February 27th
Summary of Comments Provided by the Public

General Feedback

- Use radio for public service announcement (PSA), Radio Bronco for better outreach to Spanish speakers for next open house and workshops
- Conduct an interview with planning staff and Radio Bronco with interpreter
- Channel 17 news and show for outreach to Spanish speakers (Sylvia Uribe can alert public and/or interview)
- Where is the transparency that is being asked by the Citizen's Planning Association? Where are the comments submitted by the public for the public review? It should be easily accessible and found on Goletazoning.com
- Advertising: Call all residents, send direct mailers/alerts informing of this update. Did not know zoning ordinance was being updated; only heard about workshop through neighbor and newspaper article. Property owners mentioned they did not receive a notice regarding a new zoning ordinance. Should receive notice sent to their home address.

Part II – Base Zoning Districts

Residential Districts

- How does someone get an exception to the height requirement of 2 stories in the Residential Single Family (RS) zone?
- Table 17.07.030: The building height limit of 25' is too low for a 2 story with pitched roof – many homes in my tract would be non-conforming – 30 feet would be adequate
- Affordable housing is a priority
- Regulate short-term rentals so they don't replace hotel occupancy
- If the regulations allow short-term rentals, affordable housing will be lost. Carefully regulate short-term rentals.
- Disagree with proposed review and restriction on second story additions.
- Disagree with the City controlling the color an owner may paint his/her new home.
- Zoning should not allow daycare in homes when there are other businesses
- There should be a safe ratio for childcare supervision of the number of adults to children
- Limit the number of children that can be cared for at any time in a home daycare
- Limit the number of people per square foot in single family residences
- For outside staircases proposed to access second story, they should be oriented/sited in a way that does not infringe upon neighbor's privacy, especially if they enable looking into living areas

Open Space and Agricultural Districts

- Ensure urban boundary line does not encroach into open space or Agriculture (AG)

Industrial Districts

- Support onsite residential for workers in Industrial zone.

Part III – Overlay Districts

- Consider short-term rental overlay for certain districts
- Carefully regulate short term rentals to ensure they don't displace affordable housing

Part IV – Regulations Applying to Multiple Districts

Section 17.25.160 Solar Installations

- Support solar and require new construction to include solar.
- Provide incentives for solar

Section 17.25.210 Visibility at Intersections and Driveways

- Where did the dimensions for figures 17.25.210(A) and 17.25.210(B) come from?

Chapter 17.29 Inclusionary Housing Program

- Encourage construction of affordable housing over collection of in-lieu payment

Chapter 17.35 Landscape Plans

- Landscaping requirements for new or existing properties/residences?
- Concern over language regarding landscape projects requiring permits (what kind of permits?) under draft Chapter 17.35 and State Water Efficiency Ordinance

Chapter 17.39 Parking and Loading

- Gardener/construction fleet parking in neighborhoods at night needs to be disallowed
- Require tenant parking on-site
- Disallow public right-of-way parking for tenants
- The site layout for residential parking, for 2nd units must be sufficient to support additional parking.

Section 17.39.070 Location of Required Parking

- RV parking should be permitted – regulations to be kept as they are. It's ok if street parking isn't allowed.
- The proposed limitation is unreasonable
- RV's are consistent with character of Goleta; Goleta is not Montecito
- No ex-post-facto laws (part of Constitution)
- Don't punish a few RV owners due to a few complaints
- As written now, the RV parking regulations are completely infeasible and unreasonable
- Some RV's have been sitting for many years. This is a problem but can be address through licensing
- RV parking in the front driveway is already a common practice
- Check regulations for micro-mini RVs. Remove height requirement for these in the oversized vehicle requirements
- It is ok to regulate people living in RVs
- How do these regulations apply to a pick-up camper?
- Clarify applicability to work trailer. These should be treated the same as an RV
- RV's should be ok for temporary visitors
- Correctly enforce current RV parking regulations
- Where did the RV Regulations come from originally?
- Please define RV and/or "travel vehicle"
- RV parking is not a public nuisance per the 'public nuisance' definition
- The proposed regulations are not consistent with four-way Rotary test (1. Is it the Truth? 2. Is it Fair to all concerned? 3. Will it build Goodwill and Better Friendships? 4. Will it be Beneficial to all concerned?)

- How do these regulations fit in with ADA laws for people with disabilities being able to access their RVs?
- Safety hazard potential with electrical cords from garage/house to RV
- Planning Commission should wait until they hear from entire public before making a decision
- Wish there was more noticing and awareness for RV regulations in the first place, was not aware until the newspaper wrote about it
- How many RVs are in the City; how many will be impacted?

Location of RV Parking

- RVs should be able to be parked in driveway, as long as not parked on or blocking sidewalk.
- If the RV fits in the driveway (within the front setback) and does not hang over the sidewalk- it should be allowed
- Preferred spot to park is in driveway in front yard. (Four additional commenters shared this comment)
- Do not allow RV parking in front yard
- Requiring a small setback from sidewalk (1-2 feet) may be an ok requirement
- A setback from the sidewalk is not necessary
- RVs should be able to be parked in driveways and side yards with screening
- Allow RVs to park in the front yard setback only if have a DMV license
- Don't require screening on side setback
- Very few properties in Goleta have enough space in side yard to even fit an RV. (Comment shared by two additional commenters)
- See Paso Robles' RV regulations. They are allowed to park RV's in their driveway as long as it does not interfere with sidewalks.
- Should be able to be parked on the street
- Recreational vehicle (RV)- Allow one (boat, RV, trailer, etc.) to be parked in driveway
- RVs should be able to be parked on driveway, on street, on side yards, etc.
- Lot layout and development patterns in Goleta preclude the ability to meet the proposed RV parking
- RV's should be able to be parked wherever you can fit it

Purpose of RVs

- RVs are an important to quality of life (vacation, family time, emergency).
- Assist in emergency preparedness. (Comment shared by two additional commenters)
- Used for emergency supplies and in times of other emergency situations, including fires, earthquakes, etc.

Registration/ Licensing/Permitting

- RV's must have current DMV registration. (Comment shared by two additional commenters)
- Licensing for RV's would help address some issues (RVs abandoned, misused, occupied, aesthetically displeasing)
- As long as RVs have their DMV tags and are not in disrepair, there should not be RV parking regulations
- Don't require current licensing
- Require an annual permit to ensure vehicles are operable
- As long as RV and boats are licensed, street parking should be allowed
- RVs should be operable

Surface to be Parked On

- Must be on a driveway/paved area
- RVs (recreational vehicle, boat trailer) should be able to be parked on lawns – it doesn't matter the type of ground
- RVs should be parked on some sort of surfaced area, ex: decomposed granite
- In place of concrete, sand/dirt/gravel surfaces should be an acceptable surface to park RVs; cost is less than concrete.

Screening

- Do not require 6-foot fence for screening (Comment shared by an additional commenter). It will not hide the RV, so what is the point?
- 6-foot. high screening should be required
- Having to require a 6-foot fence to screen an RV is ridiculous and uglier than the RV itself, especially in the front yard
- Keep some requirements for screening to address aesthetics
- Acceptable screening shall include fencing, mobile landscaping (landscaping on wheels/pots), shrubbery, trees, etc.

Storage (On/Off-Site)

- Distinction between parking and storage
- Alternatives like modifying existing garage configuration is too costly and unrealistic, as well as people use their garages for storage.
- Storage is expensive, not feasible, it is over an hour away, can't park to load, etc.
- There are no RV storage facilities in the Greater Santa Barbara area. (Comment shared by an additional commenter)
- Those facilities don't allow maintenance of your RV – so where do you go for your maintenance if you can't park on your driveway?
- RVs are a high investment to property owners, so to have to put in additional resources for outside RV storage is tough

Grandfathering In

- In favor of grandfathering in, for those who already have RVs.
- Not supportive of grandfathering in existing RVs, would like to see RVs allowed now and in future on driveways.

Number Limitations

- There should only be one RV/boat/trailer/storage containers total parked in front driveway for permanent parking
- Allow one RV per home (registered, on an existing driveway, not occupied)

Chapter 17.41 Signs

- Check out International Sign Association (ISA) model ordinance for neutrality clause
- ISA did a lot of work on light study on EMC
- Commercial speech is as important as non-commercial
- Interior sign exemption should be based on distance from window, not if visible from the street or adjacent properties (Section 17.41.030(K))
- Surprised that cabinet signs are prohibited; sometimes it's not possible to do individual letters (Section 17.41.040(C))
- Allow like for like replacement of signs
- Sign section needs changes: 17.41.060(H) – prohibit changeable copy except gas prices; eliminate allowance for “sandwich” type signs

Section 17.42.050 Animal Keeping

- 17.42.050(C)(2)(c) Small animals. 25 ft. separation standard for small enclosures may be limiting based on distance between dwelling (ex: Santa Barbara shores tract, there is only 40 ft. between dwellings).

Section 17.42.180 Home Occupations

- Support prohibiting auto-services as home occupations

Part V – Administration and Permits

Section 17.52.060 Zoning Administrator

- Zoning Administrator (ZA) should have very limited decision making power. Public wants open hearing on changes.
- Allow ZA to approve minor modifications to sign standards (ex. Certain % increase in sign area)
- Too many specific uses are subject to an Administration Use Permit (AU) and they should have review by Planning Commission or City Council. Zoning Administrator should make only very minor decisions

Section 17.67.030 Enforcement Responsibilities

- Need enforcement of current non-permitted garage conversions
- Need code-enforcement to acknowledge and give replies to complaints; more follow-up with original complaints
- Noise – have quiet hours past 10pm, rather than midnight. Wish there was a way to enforce besides calling police
- Amplified music – there should be limits so it's not heard 2 miles away

Part VI – General Terms

- Intensity of use definition is too broad because “change in intensity of use” is considered development

Note: City staff will continue to reference and review all comments received by the public throughout the new zoning ordinance process. Information and comments will assist staff and consultants with the preparation of a Revised Draft for Planning Commission consideration in the coming months.