

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE
Open House #1
4:00 pm to 7:00 pm, Wednesday, January 27th
Summary of Comments Provided by the Public

Process and Formatting

- Projects that are pending or recently changed should be indicated on zoning map (especially where a General Plan Amendment (GPA) is requested)
- Process is going too fast. Public doesn't have time to understand all of the issues and have meaningful public dialogue about big issues that affect the community. Slow down
- Make all public comments available online; redact personal information on letters
- City should consider focused workshops or a stakeholder/group meeting that can assist in final draft version. Public doesn't know the difference between old and new code.
- Document is confusing to the average citizen. Not user friendly.

Part II – Base Zoning Districts

Residential Districts

- Concerned that Design Residential (DR) is replaced with less restrictive regulations (Single Family Residential (RS))
- Could add the DR regulations into the RS “Additional Regulations” in Table 17.07.020
- Proposed setbacks for residences abutting open space/ public recreation areas are too small and language (like it may be 15') is too vague to protect this vanishing resource.
- What are the open space requirements for Planned Residential (RP)?
- Group residential and Single Room Occupancy (SRO)'s should be allowed in RS districts. As written, appears that a group cannot share a house in RS district.
- Page II-6(reduced setbacks): zero setback- should not be allowed
- Appears that RS-7 exceeds (7,000 square lots) max density of 5 units/acre (should be 6.22 units/acre to meet 7,000 square lots regulations.)
- Mobile Home Parks- If a park owner wants to sell a park, would the residents be notified? If so, how much advanced notice?
- If a mobile home park owner wants to redevelop a park to be apartments, condos or something else, what steps would they go through at the city, and how easy or hard would it be to redevelop?

Other Districts

- Has there been any consideration to liability and maintenance responsibilities for the proposed required street facing open space/setback? See Figure 17.08.030(B)
- Sustainable Living Research Initiative (SLRI) – Make available in all zones (currently only allowed in Agriculture District (AG) with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
- Community assemblies should be allowed in Industrial districts

Part IV – Regulations Applying to Multiple Districts

Chapter 17.25 General Site Regulations

- Add setback lines to Figure 17.25.040
- Patio Illustration on Figure 17.25.040?
- In outdoor storage section (17.25.100) include a regulation to limit time for temporary "PODs", also should not be allowed in front yard parking spaces; and allowed only beyond 72 hours with active building permit.

- In 17.25.110(D)(1), Recycling and Green Waste storage areas roof structures should not be applicable to single family residences.
- 6' high fencing in front yard setback is not attractive, especially right against the sidewalk. Too tall, consider plant standards to soften fencing if close to front property line.
- Consult with Fire Dept. re: accessory structures in the side yard setbacks. Why are they allowed in interior side yard setbacks?
- Why can decks and porches only project 8' in rear yard?
- Clarify how Vision Triangle is necessary for residential driveways - diagram needs clarification
- Not needed for residential driveways
- For Vision triangles along driveways, clarify if it also includes parkway/sidewalks or not.
- Review section 17.25.110 for applicable single family home standards. Proposed will make most street legal non-conforming

Chapter 17.35 Landscaping

- Clarify if landscaping mounds are a requirement? See section 17.35.040(B)
- Why not have a registered Arborist or others who are qualified. Section 17.35.060
- Textured appearance? What does that mean? 17.35.060 (1)
- 17.35.070 (A). What about if that area is in a riparian area. "But..."
- (C) Any trees? Native or non-native?
- Need flexibility to deal with climate change
- 17.35.080 (A2) - Survival rate of planting?

Chapter 17.38 Oil and Gas Facilities

- Shadow construction (pipelines)- remove "where practical"

Chapter 17.39 Parking and Loading

- In residential garage conversion section 17.39.030(F)(1), why is there the 1960 cutoff date? In 17.39.030 F2, for the "covered off-street parking space", it is not clear whether it means just enclosed garage spaces or carports. In 17.39.030(F)(3), the 10' wide x 30' deep dimension seems random, considering most garages are about 20' x 20' or 400 sq. ft. Consider maximum square footage?
- For Table 17.39.040 (A2) - required parking for single-unit dwelling must be within a garage. It is not clear for garage conversions, if it has to be in a garage because the draft states "covered off-street parking" in 17.39.030(F)(2) (Garage Conversion), which also includes carports.
- Canopy coverage goal in parking lot under 17.39.100(M) requiring 50% shading is not realistic. Can we actually achieve this? With appropriate type of trees?
- Need flexibility in root space in relation to trees in parking lots (17.39.100 (O)(6)) and in any hardscaped areas.
- Increase foliage clearance from 8' to 14' at 17.39.100(O)(9) because of situations like Recreational Vehicles (RVs) and taller vehicles parking adjacent. This will affect root space needed.
- Would prefer RVs be able to park in front yard. Setback then have 6' fence/gate walling off from property line.
- Consider allowing RV parking in front yard setback (no screening). As long as it's not blocking the sidewalk.
- Existing RV parking sites full/ wait lists. If residential property can't meet the RV regulations, can there be viable alternatives for RV storage in other places of city?
- Like that RVs are not allowed on street.
- RV storage within side entry garage configurations, look at post it (?)
- Cross reference screening regulations for RV to fencing regulations and vice versa.
- In Section 17.39.070(A)(3)(a), consider "and" rather than "or"

- Are carports prohibited/allowed elsewhere in proposed code for Single Family zones?
- See San Ramon, Fullerton, Paso Robles for RV policies. Consider regulations grandfathering existing (licenses).
- Question re: Allowing RVs in side yard (above fence 6' high and how it affects adjacent properties- where RVs loom over property line).

Chapter 17.21 Signs

- Should be specific sign standards for Old Town District (OT) based on the Old Town Heritage District Design Guidelines

Chapter 17.42 Standards for Specific Uses and Activities

- Community Assembly- There should be no time restrictions.
- SLRI language needs to be updated and strengthened. Better defined allowed flexibility in zoning. Better defined monitoring and enforcement mechanisms.
- Limit large dogs to 3.

Part V – Administration and Permits

- Too many projects go to Zoning Administrator (ZA).
- What projects go to Planning Commission (PC) besides CUPs?
- Performance standards/review criteria for ZA decision making.
- Does ZA have discretionary decision-making and if so over what kind of projects?
- Better define ZA authority/review.
- Too much decision making-making power, particularly in regard to individual parcels, is left to the discretion of ZA. Many ZA decisions should be able to be appealed to the PC.
- Director and ZA should not be one person. Too much power to only one person. As I stated before power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely.
- Empower the ZA staff to make decisions for reasonable appropriate projects. PC is very expensive and burdensome and unpredictable for smaller scale projects.
- Assembly Bill 1866- 2nd units cannot be discretionary design review?
- In reference to p.10 of the accompanying Numeric Standards Table: Why has affordable housing overlay regulation been removed? It is now not included. Isn't it a state requirement? [In reference to Coastal Development Permits]

Part VI – General Terms

- RV definition in Part VI, there are many different types of vehicles that may fit under the definition
- Definition of “protective tree” and “tree” needed especially in respect to Section 17.35.070(C).
- Definition of Native Vegetation, needed especially in respect to Section 17.35.080(A)(l). There are definitions based on scale regarding state scale or watershed scale. (Source of genetic material-broader or more narrow source).
- Why remove water bodies from common open space description?

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.