

Hi Ann

I think we need to approach the issue of RV and trailer parking as being part of the issue of vehicle parking in general.

Also, one of the reasons the issue of RV and trailer parking is such a hot button is because far too much is covered by the terms. The people who hate RVs and trailers often have in mind those that range from large to behemoth, while those owners of much smaller RVs and trailers which attract no attention at all become ensnared in the draconian proposals.

Add to this that some parts of the City, such as where I live, about 50% of the properties have an RV or trailer of some description, many of which are about the size of a passenger vehicle. In fact, a significant number are indistinguishable from a passenger vehicle except for the seam on the rooftop that shows it is a "pop-top" camper.

Many settled in Goleta precisely because it was much more lightly regulated than elsewhere -- I certainly did. If I wanted all the rules of a HOA I would have chosen such a community, but I don't and I didn't. It's not only old-timers like me that value the light regulation and have some sort of trailer or RV -- many of my neighbors who have moved here in the last few years also own them. Perhaps Goleta should consider the fact that different neighborhoods have different tastes and needs.

Even though I am in favor for letting RVs and trailers remain I do agree that there are limits:

1. There is such a thing as too large -- but that goes for other vehicles as well. I am no fan of quad-cab long-bed pickups. My thought is if a vehicle cannot fit in the driveway without encroaching on the sidewalk it doesn't belong here.
2. Dead storage should be discouraged. A trailer or RV or any other vehicle is fine as long as it actually gets used for travel from time to time.
3. Moldering decay should also be discouraged, but we do not currently do that for houses or yards so it is premature to do that for only RVs and trailers. I think the requirement that the vehicles actually be used for travel will largely alleviate the problem.

Yet another issue is that the City has approved the repurposing of many properties that were used for long-term parking; currently there is only one such facility in the City and it is full. It is also my understanding that the City would be very happy to have that facility be repurposed.

In order to solve these problems I propose we change our thinking.

1. Parking is an issue, regardless of what we call a vehicle. To that end let's drop the terminology of RV and trailer and just look at the issue of where to put the vehicles.
2. The current NZO snatches up many smaller vehicles, such as tent trailers, motorcycle trailers, even bike trailers, and tries to treat them the same as 40-foot diesel pushers. They aren't the same, they don't have the same impact, and many times are ferreted away in garages or back yards completely out of sight. Because they are so low neighbors don't see them over the fence -- they are pretty much invisible. I believe they should be regulated only as any other potential impediment (scaffolding, ladders, etc.) would be.
3. Then there are those vehicles that are larger but small enough to fit in standard covered parking -- just like a standard passenger vehicle. I contend they should be treated like a standard passenger vehicle.
4. For those vehicles that are larger still, but smaller than an "accessory structure", why not treat them like an accessory structure, with the same limits on area, height, and setbacks?

5. Even larger vehicles are already owned and parked on many properties. It is certainly unfair to suddenly regulate them off the property without somehow providing an appropriate place for them to be stored.

So here's my proposal---

Vehicle On-Property Parking

If the vehicle (including RVs and trailers) is no larger than a standard passenger vehicle (no more than 18 feet long, 7 feet 6 inches wide, 7 feet 6 inches tall), it is treated as a standard vehicle in terms of parking, both on and off the property. That means it may be parked on the street as well as in the driveway or covered parking area. If parked on the street it must obey all the parking rules, including moving for street cleaning as well as the 72-hour maximum parking time.

If the owner wishes the vehicle be treated differently than a standard vehicle, or if the vehicle is larger than a standard passenger vehicle, it may be placed anywhere on the property with the following restrictions:

1. It must comply with the size and location requirements of an "accessory structure" as described in 17.24.020 Accessory Structures.
2. It must be parked on a gravel or paved surface.
3. It must be removed from the property for at least 14 days every trailing 18 months. The days do not have to be contiguous.
4. It must have access to the street.

If the vehicle exceeds the limitations imposed by Accessory Structures, or there is no suitable accessory structure-like location with access to the street, the owner may purchase a City permit to allow front yard parking, but with the following restrictions:

1. The vehicle must be parked perpendicular to the street and fit entirely within the front yard without obstructing the sidewalk.
2. For fire and other first-responder safety the vehicle may not block side yard access.
3. The vehicle must be removed from the property for at least 14 days every trailing 18 months. The days do not have to be contiguous.

The permit fee is based on vehicle volume. Initially the price of the permit is \$0.03 per cubic foot. For example, the fee for a vehicle which is 19 feet long, 7 feet 6 inches wide, and 10 feet tall will be \$42.75 per month.

Once the City of Goleta has approved suitable storage lot(s) for occasional-use vehicles, and spaces at such lots are available, the City permit fee will increase by 10% per month. Once the lot(s) fill up the permit fee will cease increasing until such time as space becomes available for a period of more than 30 days in existing or new lots within the City of Goleta.