

April 7, 2019

To Members of the Planning Commission:

Jennifer R. Smith, Chair

Robert K. Miller, Vice Chair

Ed Fuller, Commissioner

Katie Maynard, Commissioner

Bill Shelor, Commissioner

I have a problem with the proposed Zoning Ordinance relating to parking of RVs and trailers on residential property.

Here is the relevant text from the current proposed Zoning Ordinance:

Trailers and Recreational Vehicle Parking/Storage.

Trailers and recreational vehicles may be parked/stored in any setback area, subject to the following provisions:

- a. The trailer or recreational vehicle must not project into the public right-of-way at any time.
- b. The trailer or recreational vehicle must be operable and have a current year's registration for operation on public streets.
- c. The trailer or recreational vehicle must not be occupied for living purposes.
- d. The trailer or recreational vehicle must be parked on a paved or gravel surface.
- e. Access is provided via a City-approved driveway approach along the street frontage.
- f. The trailer or recreational vehicle may only be parked or stored within the front setback where there is no existing driveway or other access to another portion of the property that can accommodate the trailer or recreational vehicle.

I want to focus on provisions (d) and (e).

I would first like to note that in the Ellwood area there are roughly 1 to 3 RV pads per block already installed. The majority of these pads meet Provision (d), but not (e) -- they "jump the curb" instead of using the property's driveway.

I would also like to remind the Commission that RVs and travel trailers, even when used extensively for trips, do not often make the journey between the street and parking pad. Unlike cars which go in and out of a driveway almost daily, RVs and trailers tend to be away from home for days or weeks at a time. Thus most RVs make the journey between the street and parking area at most only several times a month.

My first question is why "jumping the curb" is disallowed for RVs and trailers in light of the fact that they so seldom need to do so.

My second question is how you intend to handle all the property owners that already have pads that meet provision (d), but not (e). They have already installed proper parking, often at significant expense, that was code-compliant at the time of installation. These owners typically also use temporary removable ramps to ease the shock to their RVs and/or trailers, which has the salutary effect of also lessening the pounding on the pavement and curb as the RV jumps the curb.

If you wish to claim that "jumping the curb" causes rapid deterioration of either streets or curbs, I would like to see documentation of cases where this has occurred in Goleta. I walk and ride through many Goleta neighborhoods and have seen many deteriorated streets, but the deterioration I've seen is due to other factors, including tree roots, heavy traffic, and delayed maintenance.

If you wish to claim that the RV or trailer would be entering the street from an unexpected location, be advised that most already-existing pads are either adjacent to the property's driveway or the neighbor's driveway, but due to the turning radius of the vehicle it is not accessible from a driveway.

On a separate note, I have a question about Provision (f): it states "... other access to another portion of the property that can accommodate the trailer or recreational vehicle." However, Provision (e) is quite adamant that "Access is provided via a City-approved driveway approach along the street frontage." So what other access do you have in mind?

Thank you for your time and attention,

Dana Trout
339 Coronado Drive