COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
701 OCEAN STREET, 4TH FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123
TOM BURNS, PLANNING DIRECTOR

October 11, 2007

AGENDA DATE: October 24, 2007
Item #: 9
Time: After 9 AM

Planning Commission
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REFORMS OF COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS FOR SMALL-SCALE RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

Members of the Commission:

The matter before your Commission is the consideration of amendments to the regulatory framework for small-scale residential projects, including additions, accessory structures, and second units, as well as minor projects in the Coastal Zone.

Background

Small-scale residential projects such as additions to existing homes, accessory structures, second units and small-scale residential projects in the Coastal Zone constitute the majority of applications to the Santa Cruz County Planning Department. Many of the regulations in the County Code governing such projects are outdated, including regulations that are overly restrictive or require high levels of review for simple non-controversial projects, resulting in a planning process that is unnecessarily restrictive, expensive and time consuming for applicants. As a result, the potential applicants are frustrated by the costs, time delays and process. Such situations lead the public to question the value of the County's land use regulations and reflect poorly on the County in general. Additionally, such frustration can lead to property owners proceeding with the work outside of the permit process.

With these concerns in mind, and afler extensive internal staff discussions, and years of feedback from applicants using the current system, planning staff identified a number of areas that needed to be addressed to reform the process for small-scale residential projects. Focusing on regulations for accessory structures, additions, second units, and minor residential projects in the Coastal Zone, staff developed a set of regulatory reforms to allow greater project flexibility, reduce the scope of the regulations, reduce the level of discretionary review required to an appropriate level, clarify regulations, and make them easier to enforce. At the same time, staff focused on developing reforms that would continue to protect important community values and resources such as the environment and the quality of neighborhoods.

At a study session on June **19,** 2007, staff presented the residential regulatory reform proposals to the Board of Supervisors. The Board discussed staffs proposals, provided

additional direction for further staff analysis on several items, and directed staff to return in August to further consider the proposed reforms. On August 28th, 2007, staff presented to the Board a set of modified proposals that addressed the concerns raised during the June study session. The Board approved "in concept" the modified regulatory reform package, and directed staff to develop ordinance amendments to implement the proposals. The details of the proposed reforms are presented in table form in Exhibits C and D, and in the ordinance amendment (Exhibit B). Following is a discussion of the goals of the proposed reforms, and a brief summary of the proposed amendments.

Discussion

Accessory Structure Regulations

Much of the current regulatory framework for accessory structures (including detached workshops, art studios, and garages) was created with the intention of discouraging future illegal conversion of such structures into separately rented dwelling units. Such regulatory restrictions have resulted in accessory structures with limited functionality. For example, a home office may not be constructed with a toilet, nor may it have built-in heat unless the owner lives on the property. A non-habitable accessory structure, such as a workshop, may have insulation or sheetrock but not both. Though it is desirable to have greater flexibility and a less onerous planning process for new accessory structures, at the same time the regulations should still be enforceable and should not encourage a wholesale conversion of accessory structures into illegal separately rented accessory dwelling units.

With these concerns in mind, staff has revised existing regulations to allow more features in accessory structures that are most often requested by property owners, and to provide clear distinctions among the features allowed in habitable and non-habitable accessory structures and in second units. The primary changes to current regulations, as summarized in the table below, is to allow toilets in all habitable accessory structures, to require built-in heating in habitable accessory structures consistent with building code requirements, and to allow non-habitable accessory structures to have both insulation and sheetrock.

Summary of Proposed Accessory Structure and Second Unit Features

Features	Non-Habitable[1]	Habitable	Second Units
Sink	Allowed	Allowed	Required
Insulation & Sheetrock	Allowed	Required	Required
Toilet	Not allowed[2]	Allowed	Required
Built-in Heating	Not Allowed	Required	Required
Shower/Bath	Not allowed	Not allowed	Required
Kitchen	Not allowed	Not allowed	Required

[1] Pool cabanas would continue to allow toilets and showers, but would be limited in size and must be associated with a pool on the property.
[2] Toilets could be allowed in non-habitable structures under limited circumstances with a Level IV approval.

Focusing on built-in physical features to distinguish among structure types allows more flexibility for the current and future use of the structure. For example, once an owner builds a habitable accessory structure, the current or future owner may use the structure for an office, workshop or detached bedroom without fear of using the structure illegally. At the same time, such a regulatory framework is enforceable: Code compliance staff would be looking at the physical features of the unit such as bathrooms, toilets or built-in heating to determine whether the structure was legal, rather than trying to uncover evidence that someone was sleeping in the unit.

Additional changes proposed to accessory structure regulations include increasing the size allowed for non-habitable accessory structures on lots greater than **1** acre from 1,000 square feet to 1,500 square feet, and lowering the review level required for accessory structures that exceed the size restrictions from a Level V discretionary review to a Level IV discretionary review. In addition, the accessory structure regulations have been consolidated into one location and reformatted for ease of use (See Exhibit C for a summary of the proposed changes, and Exhibit B for the ordinance amendment to implement the proposed changes.)

Changes to Regulations Related to Second Units

The County's Housing Element calls for the County to encourage the construction of second units, yet there remain significant barriers to second unit construction. Staff is suggesting the following changes to enhance use of second units as a key source of rental housing:

- Deleting the affordability requirements and occupancy restrictions for renters of second units, allowing units to be rented at market rate to any household without oversight by the County, but ensuring oversight by the homeowner by retaining the requirement for the owner to reside on the property.

- Lowering the level of review for second units exceeding 17 feet in height in the urban areas from Level V (ZA hearing) to Level IV (public notice, which can lead to ZA hearing).

- Eliminating the current annual limit of five second unit permits per year within the Live Oak Planning Area.

Non-Conforming Structures

The majority of structures in the County are non-conforming, resulting in substantial limitations on what owners can do to maintain or improve their property. While more comprehensive changes to the non-conforming regulations are envisioned for a future round of policy changes, there are two areas that staff believes should be addressed at this time, as part of the residential changes:

- Allowing, without a discretionary permit, all conforming additions to non-conforming structures.

- Eliminating the Level V (ZA hearing) discretionary permit required for routine maintenance and repairs to structures that exceed the height limit by more than five feet, and instead allow such work to be performed with a building permit.

Coastal Reuulations

The County's coastal regulations present a number of challenges to homeowners wishing to do some relatively routine activities. As a result, staff is proposing:

- Allowing coastal exclusions for demolition of structures in rural portions of the Coastal Zone without coastal permits.

- Simplifying the coastal permit requirements for small residential additions and related grading activities.

- Exempting most solar energy systems from Level V (ZA hearing) coastal permits to be consistent with State law.

Other Chanues

In addition to the four broad areas discussed above, staff is proposing amendments to the current regulations with several additional proposals that we believe unnecessarily create barriers to routine residential land uses:

- Eliminating the requirement for a discretionary permit for use of an existing right-of-way that is less than **40** feet in width.

- Eliminating the requirement for Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission (APAC) review of agricultural buffer issues in instances where small-scale residential additions or new accessory structures do not further encroach into the agricultural buffer setback than the existing residence.

- Allowing six foot fences in front yards of flag lots without requiring an over height fence permit.

- Providing consistency between the building and zoning codes by eliminating setbacks between water tanks currently required by the zoning ordinance.

- Allowing, in limited situations, the installation of electrical service for certain accessory uses or on vacant properties.

Related Code Enforcement Issues

In addition to providing more logical and enforceable physical features to distinguish between various accessory structures, we are proposing the development of a proactive inspection program for some accessory structures that are constructed under the new rules to ensure that legitimate accessory structures and uses are not converted into illegal dwelling units. A key element needed to support some of the proposed changes is an effective program for

proactively enforcing the various deed restrictions that are routinely recorded as part of the permit process for certain applications. The existing declaration can be amended to provide the express authority to make compliance inspections, even in the absence of a code compliance complaint. Staff resources would need to be augmented to allow for targeted periodic site inspections. As directed by the Board, staff is working with the County Administrative Office to consider such a position in our FY 2008-09 budget for the Planning Department.

Consistency with Coastal Regulations

The proposed changes are consistent with the Coastal Act and with the Local Coastal Program. The proposed reforms will not impede coastal access, will not allow further impingements on the coastal viewshed, and will not threaten agricultural land.

The proposal to reduce the level of review required for minor development in the Coastal Zone from a Level V discretionary review (public hearing) to a Level IV review (public noticing) is consistent with Section 30624.9 of the Public Resources Code, which allows minor development to be approved without holding a public hearing. Minor development is defined as development that is consistent with the Local Coastal Program, requires no discretionary permit other than the Coastal Permit, and does not have an adverse effect on resources. Under such definitions, demolition outside the appealable jurisdiction, additions to existing homes, and minor grading would all be considered as minor development.

Future Actions

At the Board of Supervisor's hearing on August 28th, the Board directed staff to proceed with several actions related to the proposed reforms. These include coordinating with other reviewing departments and agencies to streamline the building permit review process for small-scale residential projects, and reporting back to the Board within one year *of* the effective date of the amendments on changes in permit activity related to the regulatory changes for accessory structures and second units. The Board also directed staff to develop a proposal for a program to assist property owners in the construction of second units. Such units would then be deed restricted to be affordable.

Additionally, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to proceed with developing future regulatory reform packages. These reforms will be before your Commission and the Board in future phases, as follows:

- Small-scale commercial issues, particularly streamlining processes for tenant turnover and reuse of existing commercial buildings; and
- Non-conforming building and use issues – both for residential and commercial activities.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The regulatory reform proposals for small-scale residential projects discussed in the report and approved "in concept" by the Board of Supervisors should provide greater flexibility and a more streamlined planning process for property owners, while providing sufficient opportunities for public participation in the planning process, limiting opportunities for illegal conversion of

structures to dwelling units, and protecting neighborhood character, public health and safety, and the environment.

It is therefore RECOMMENDED that your Commission take the following actions:

1. Conduct a public hearing on the proposed Ordinance amendments;

2. Adopt the Resolution (Exhibit **A)** recommending adoption of the proposed ordinance and certification of the CEQA Notice of Exemption to the Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,

Annie Murphy
Planner II

Glenda Hill, AICP
Principal Planner

Exhibit A – Resolution
Attachment 1 to Exhibit A – Strikeout copy of proposed Ordinance revisions
Exhibit B – Clean Copy of the Ordinance
Exhibit C - Table of Existing and Proposed Requirements for Accessory Structures
Exhibit D – Table of Summary of Proposed Regulatory Reforms
Exhibit E - CEQA Notice of Exemption
Exhibit F - Letter of the Planning Director to the Board of Supervisors

cc: County Counsel
Board of Realtors – Phil Tedesco
Coastal Commission

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. _____

On the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner
the following is adopted:

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING TO THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS 13.10, 13.20, AND 16.50 OF THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY CODE TO SIMPLIFY REGULATIONS FOR SMALL-SCALE RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES.

WHEREAS, small-scale residential projects such as additions to existing homes, accessory structures, and second units constitute the majority of applications to the Santa Cruz County Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, many of the regulations in the County Code governing such projects are outdated, including regulations that are overly restrictive or require high levels of review for simple non-controversial projects, resulting in a planning process that is unnecessarily restrictive, expensive and time consuming for applicants; and

WHEREAS, on June 19, 2007 the Board of Supervisors conducted a study session to consider amending the Santa Cruz County Code to simplify the planning process for small-scale residential projects while continuing to protect important community values and resources; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors on August 28th 2007 approved "in concept" a package of ordinance amendments to Chapters 13.10, 13.20, and 16.50 of the Santa Cruz County Code simplifying the regulatory process for such projects; and

WHEREAS, on October 24, 2007, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the amendments *to* Chapters 13.10, 13.20, and 16.50 of the Santa Cruz County Code to simplify regulations for small-scale residential structures; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission finds that the ordinance amendments will be consistent with the policies of the General Plan, the Local Coastal Program, and the California Coastal Act; and

WHEREAS, the ordinance amendments have been found *to* be categorically exempt from further review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

EXHIBIT A

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED, that the Planning Commission recommends that the ordinance amendments to Chapters 13.10. 13.20. and 16.50 of the Santa Cruz County Code (Attachment 1 to Exhibit A), and the Notice of Exemption, incorporated by reference, **be** approved by the Board of Supervisors.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the County of Santa Cruz, State of California, this _____ day **of** _____,2007 by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

_____

Chairperson **of** the Planning Commission

ATTEST:

_____
Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

County Counsel

DISTRIBUTION: County Counsel
Planning Department

EXHIBIT A

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY CODE CHAPTERS 13.10, 13.20 AND 16.50 REGARDING REGULATIONS FOR SMALL-SCALE RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz ordains as follows:

SECTION I

Subsection (b) of Section 13.10.265 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) The structural enlargement, extension, reconstruction, or alteration which conforms to the site development standards of the district in which the structure is located may be made to a nonconforming structure upon issuance of only those building permits and/or development permits required by other Sections of the County Code if the property's use is made to conform to the uses allowed in the district and provided that the structure is not significantly nonconforming as defined in this Section~~, and further provided that where the floor area of an addition exceeds 800 square feet net, a Level IV Use Approval shall be required~~

SECTION II

Subsection (k) of Section 13.10.265 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(k) For the purposes of this section, a structure is significantly nonconforming if it is any of the following:

1. Located within five feet of a vehicular right-of-way;
2. Located across a property line;
3. Located within five feet of another structure on a separate parcel; or
4. Located within five feet of a planned future public right-of-way improvement (i.e. an adopted plan line)~~; or,~~
~~5. Exceeds the allowable height limited by more than 5 feet.~~

SECTION III

Section 13.10.312(b), Uses in agricultural districts, Allowed Uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Habitable accessory structure, 640 square feet or less subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.611" to read as follows:

Habitable accessory structure when incidental to a residential use and not *for* agricultural	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

purposes, ~~640 square feet or less~~ subject **to** the provisions of Section 13.10.611

SECTION IV

Section 13.10.312(b), Uses in agricultural districts, Allowed Uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by repealing the category "Habitable accessory structures greater than 640 feet, subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.611 (see farm outbuildings).

~~Habitable accessory structures greater than 640 feet, subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.611 (see farm outbuildings)~~ ~~5 5 a~~

SECTION V

Section 13.10.312(b), Uses in agricultural districts, Allowed Uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Non-habitable accessory structure when incidental to a residential use and not for agricultural purposes" to read as follows:

Non-habitable accessory structure when incidental to a residential use and not for agricultural purposes (subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.611 and 13.10.313(a)).	BP/4 BP/4 BP/4
~~Total area of 500 square feet or less~~	~~BP2 BP2 BP2~~
~~Total area of 501 to 1,000 square feet~~	~~BP3 BP3 BP3~~
~~Total area of more than 1,000 square feet~~	~~3 3 3~~

SECTION VI

Section 13.10.322(b), Uses in residential districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended **by** revising the category "Accessory structures and uses, including:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures and uses, including:	
One Accessory structure, habitable (subject to Sections 13.10.611 and 13.10.323 ~~installation of certain plumbing fixtures may require Level 4 approval)~~	BP/4 BP/4 BP/4 BP/4 BP/4
~~Total area of 640 square feet or less~~	

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

~~and not to exceed 1-story and 17 feet in height~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~
~~Total area of more than 640 square feet or exceeding 1-story or 17 feet in height~~	~~5~~	~~5~~	~~5~~	~~5~~	~~5~~
Accessory structures, non-habitable ~~outside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line (~~subject to Sections 13.10.611 and 13.10.323~~;installation of certain plumbing fixtures may require~~ comprised of:					
Animal enclosures: barns, stables, paddocks, hutches and coops (subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.641 Stables and Paddocks; .643 Animal Keeping in the RA Zone; .644 Family Animal Raising; .645 bird and small animal raising; ,646 Turkey Raising: these provisions require Level 5 in some cases).	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4	--	--
~~When total area of the structure is:~~					
~~1,000 square feet or less~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~		
~~more than 1,000 square feet~~	~~BP3~~	~~5~~	~~5~~		
Carports, detached; garages, detached; garden structures; storage sheds (subject ~~for~~ to Sections 13.10.611 and 13.10.323~~, installation of certain plumbing fixtures may require Level 4 approval) when total area of structure is:~~	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4
~~1,000 square feet or less~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~	~~BP3~~
~~Accessory structures, non-habitable. inside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line (subject to Section 13.10.611 and 13.10.323; installation of certain plumbing fixtures may~~					

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

require Level 4 approval) comprise of:

Animal enclosures: barns, stables paddocks, hutches and coops (subject to the provisions of Sections 13.10.641 Stables and Paddocks; .643 Animal Keeping in the RA Zone; .644 Family Animal Raising; .645 bird and small animal raising; .646 Turkey Raising: these provisions require Level 5 in some cases).

When total area of the structure is:

1,000 square feet or less	BP3	3	3		
more than 1,000 square feet	5	5	5		
Carports, detached; garages, detached; garden structures; storage sheds (subject for Sections 13.10.611 and .323, installation of certain plumbing fixtures may require Level 4 approval) when total area of structure is:					
640 square feet or less	BP3	BP3	BP3	BP3	BP3
more than 640 square feet	5	5	5	5	5
Air strips (see Section 13.10.700-A definition)	7	7	--	--	--
Parking, including:					
Parking, on-site, for principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.550 et seq.)	BP2	BP2	BP2	BP2	BP2
Parking, on-site, for non-principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.580 et seq.)	4	4	4	4	4
Recycling collection facilities in association with a permitted community or public facility, subject to Section 13.10.658, including:					
reverse vending machines	BP1	BP1	BP1	BP1	BP1

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

small collection facilities	3	3	3	3	3
Signs, including:					
Signs for non-principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.580, et seq.)	4	4	4	4	4
Signs for principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.580, et seq.)	P	P	P	P	P
Storage tanks, water or gas, for use of persons residing on site					
less than 5,000 gallons	BP2	BP2	BP2	--	--
more than 5,000 gallons	BP3	BP3	BP3	--	--
Swimming pools, private and accessory equipment	BP3	BP3	BP3	--	--

SECTION VII

Subsection 13.10.323(e)6(b) of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(B) Side and Rear Yards.

i. An accessory structure which is attached to the main building shall be considered a part thereof, and shall be required to have the same setbacks as the main structure;

ii. A detached accessory structure which is located entirely within the required rear yard and which is smaller than one hundred twenty (120) square feet in size and ten (10) feet or less in height may be constructed to within three feet of the side and rear property lines;

iii. Garden trellises, garden statuary, birdbaths, freestanding barbeques, play equipment, swimming pool equipment, freestanding air conditioners, heat pumps and similar HVAC equipment and ground-mounted solar systems, if not exceeding six (6) feet in height, are not required to maintain side and rear yard setbacks and are excluded in the calculation of allowable lot coverage.

SECTION VIII

Subsection 13.10.323(e)6(C) of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(C) Separation. The minimum distance between any two detached structures shall be ten (10) feet with the following exceptions:

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

i. Eeaves, chimneys, cantilevered, uncovered, unenclosed balconies, porches, decks and uncovered, unenclosed stairways and landings may encroach three feet into the required ten (10) separation.;

ii. No separation is required between water tanks located on the same parcel;

iii. No separation is required between aarden trellises, garden statuary, birdbaths. freestanding barbeques. plav equipment. swimming *pool* esuipment. freestanding air conditioners, heat pumps and similar HVAC equipment and around-mounted solar systems and other structures located on the same parcel.

SECTION IX

Section 13.10.332(b), Uses in commercial districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, non-habitable, not including warehouses (subject to Section 13.10.611)" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, non-habitable, not including warehouses ~~(subject to Section 13.10.611)~~					
Less than 500 sq. fl.	*3*	*3*	*3*	*3*	*3*
500 – 2,000 sq. ft.	**4**	**4**	**4**	4	**4**
Greater than 2,000 sq. fl	5	5	**5**	**5**	5

SECTION X

Section 13.10.342(b), Uses in industrial districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, non-habitable, subject to Section 13.10.611, including:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, non-habitable, ~~subject to Section 13.10.611,~~ including:			
Outdoor storage, incidental, screened from public streets	4/5/6*	4/5/6*	4/5/6*
Parking, on-site, developed in accordance with Sections 13.10.550 et seq.			
Signs in accordance with Section 13.10.581			
Storage, incidental, or non-hazardous materials within an enclosed structure.			

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT

SECTION XI

Section 13.10.342(b), Uses in industrial districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, habitable, subject to Section 13.10.611, including:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, habitable, ~~subject to Section 13.10.611~~, including:	4	4	4
Watchman's living quarters, one, located on the same site and incidental to an allowed use			

SECTION XII

Section 13.10.352(b), Uses in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space zone district, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, pursuant to a Master Site Plan according to Section 13.10.355, such as:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, pursuant to a Master Site Plan according to Section 13.10.355, such as:	4AP
Accessory structures, non-habitable ~~(subject to Section 13.10.611)~~	
Parking, on-site, for an allowed use, in accordance with Section 13.10.550 et seq.	
Signs, in accordance with Section 13.10.582	

SECTION XIII

Section 13.10.521 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) Right-of-way Access. A parcel, newly created by a tentative map or conditional certificate of compliance, may not be used as a building site unless it has its principal frontage on a public street or on a private right-of-way at least 40 feet wide, ~~or if it is located on a private right-of-way less than 40 feet in width and developed properties are located beyond the property on the same right-of way,~~ nor may a new vehicular right-of-way be created less than 40-feet in width ~~or~~ unless a Level ~~III~~ V Use Approval is obtained for principal frontage and access on a narrower right-of-way. For any project requiring a subdivision or minor land division tentative map approval, or a conditional certificate of compliance, use of streets not meeting the minimum County standard shall require approval of a roadway exception processed pursuant to Section 15.10.050(f). ~~Streets improved and used as a street prior to July 1962 are exempt from this provision.~~

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT 1

SECTION XIV

Subsection (c)(2) of Section 13.10.525 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Except as specified in Sections 13.10.525(c)(3), and 16.50.095, no fence andlor retaining wall shall exceed six feet in height if located within a required side or rear yard not abutting on a street, and no fence, hedge, andlor retaining wall shall exceed three feet in height if located in a front yard abutting a street or other yard abutting a street, except that heights up to six feet may be allowed by a Level III Development Permit approval, and heights greater than six feet may be allowed by a Level V Development Permit Approval. (See Section 12.10.070(b) for building permit requirements.)

SECTION XV

Section 13.10.611 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) Purpose. It is the purpose of this Section to provide for the orderly regulation of residential accessory structures allowed as a use in any zone district, to insure that accessory structures are subordinate and incidental to the main structure or main use of the land, and to provide notice to future and current property owners that illegal conversion of any accessory structure is subject to civil penalties.

(b) Application Requirements.
(1) The proposed use of the structure shall be identified.
(2) Applications for habitable accessory structures and non-habitable accessow structures shall be processed as specified in ~~the use chart for appropriate zone district~~ Tables One and Two of this Section.

(c) Restriction on Accessory Structures.
(1) Any accessory structure shall be clearly appurtenant, subordinate and incidental to the main structure or main use of the land as specified in the purposes of the appropriate zone district.~~, with the exception that a non-habitable accessory structure not exceeding 12 feet in height or 600 square feet in size shall be allowed in the absence of a main structure or main use of the land.~~
(2) Regulations on amenities for accessory structures on parcels with a main residence are as indicated in Table One:

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT

Section 13.10.611(c)(2)
TABLE ONE
AMENITIES REGULATIONS

AMENITY	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE
SINK	Allowed	Allowed
TOILET	Pool cabanas: Allowed All other uses: Not allowed unless a Level IV use approval is obtained	Allowed
SHOWER AND/OR BATHTUB	Pool cabanas: Allowed All other uses: Not allowed	Not allowed
WASHER/ DRYER AND WATER HEATER	Allowed	Allowed
INSULATION/ SHEET ROCK OR OTHER FINISHED WALL COVERING	Both allowed	Both required
BUILT IN HEATING/COOLING	Not allowed	Heating: Required Cooling: Allowed
KITCHEN FACILITIES, EXCLUDING SINK, AS DEFINED IN 13.10.700-K	Not allowed	Not allowed
ELECTRICAL SERVICE MAXIMUM	100A/220V/single phase maximum unless a Level IV use approval is obtained	100A/220V/single phase maximum unless a Level IV use approval is obtained
SEPARATE ELECTRIC METER	Not allowed unless a Level IV use approval is obtained	Not allowed unless a Level IV use approval is obtained
USE FOR SLEEPING PURPOSES	Not allowed	Allowed
RENT, **LET** OR **LEASE** AS AN INDEPENDENT DWELLING UNIT	Not allowed	Not allowed

(3) Regulations **for** level of review, **size.** number of stories and locational restrictions for accessory structures are as indicated **in** Table **Two:**

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

Section 13.10.611(c)(3)
TABLE TWO
LEVEL OF REVIEW, SIZE. HEIGHT, NUMBER OF STORIES AND LOCATIONAL REGULA' ONS

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE
E, STORY AND GHT STRICTIONS AND RMIT REQUIRED	Within the Urban Services Line (USL) Building Permit only for up to 640 square foot size, 2 story and 28-foot height. Outside the USL: Building Permit only for up to 1,000 square foot size, 3 story and 28-foot height on lots less than one acre in size; Building Permit only for up to 1,500 square foot size, 3-story and 28-foot height on lots one acre or greater in size.	Within the Urban Services Line (USL): Building Permit only for p to 640 sauare foot size, 1 tory and 17-foot heiqht.)utside the USL: Building 'ermit only for up to 640 quare foot size, 3 storv and 8-foot heiaht.
RMIT REQUIRED :XCEEDS E. STORY OR GHT STRICTIONS	Level IV use approval	evel IV use approval
WBER OF ACCESSORY RUCTURES .OWED	No limit, if in compliance with the site requiations of the zone district .	)ne with Building Permit only. Maximum of two with Level IV se approval.
CATIONAL STRICTIONS	None, if in compliance with the site regulations of the zone district	i addition to the site egulations of the zone district. hall be no more than 100 feet 'om the main residence, ccessed by a separate riveway or right-of-way nor onstructed on a slope greater nan 30%. unless a Level IV se approval is obtained.

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

(4) Regulations for accessow structures on parcels with no main residence are as follows:

i. A habitable accessory structure is not allowed;

ii. One non-habitable accessory structure not exceeding 12 feet in height or 600 square feet in size is allowed. No electricity or plumbing other than hose bibs is allowed unless a Level IV approval is obtained.

(6)(5) No accessory structure shall be mechanically heated, cooled, humidified or dehumidified unless the structure or the conditioned portion thereof meets the energy conservation standards of the California ~~Administrative~~ Energy Code, Title 24, adopted by Chapter ~~12.20~~ 12.10 of this Code.

(8)(6) Any building permit for the construction of or conversion to an independent dwelling unit shall require an allocation for one housing unit as provided in Section 12.02.030 and shall comply with the dwelling density allowed for the zone district in which the parcel is located, except as provided by 13.10.681.

~~(2) No habitable and no non-habitable accessory structure shall have an electrical meter separately from the main dwelling, and no accessory structure may have electricity in the absence of a main dwelling, except as may be approved pursuant to the use charts for the zone district or a Level V use approval.~~

~~(3) Plumbing and electrical equipment appropriate to the use of the structure may be installed, with the following exceptions:~~

~~i. No electrical service exceeding 110A/220V/single phase may be installed to an accessory structure incidental to a residential use unless a Level V approval is obtained;~~

~~ii. No accessory structure shall have a toilet installed. An exception may be granted to allow a toilet and appropriately sized drain lines, subject to a Level IV use approval, for structures smaller than those defined as habitable under the State Building Code (less than 70 square feet), or where required under the particular circumstance, for example, facilities required for employees;~~

~~iii. An accessory structure shall not have any waste lines installed which are larger than one one-half inches in size. An exception to allow two inch drain lines may be granted, subject to Level IV use approval, when more than one plumbing fixture is needed in the structure, including, for example, a washer and an utility sink in a garage.~~

~~(4) No habitable accessory structure incidental to a residential use shall be located more than 100 feet from the main dwelling, or be accessed by a separate driveway or right-of-way, or be constructed on a slope greater than 30% unless a Level V Use Approval is obtained. furthermore, a guest house can only be constructed and occupied on property where the property owner is a resident of the main structure.~~

EXHIBIT A - ATTACHMENT 1

~~(5) The number of habitable accessory structure shall be limited to one per parcel unless a Level V use approval is obtained.~~

~~(7) An accessory structure shall not have a kitchen or food preparation facilities and shall not be rented, let or leased as an independent dwelling unit.~~

(d) Restrictions on Electrical Service for Residential Accessory Uses Other than Structures or on Vacant Residential Parcels

1. A 60-amp maximum service for well use is allowed.
2. A 60-amp maximum service for irrigation systems, lighting systems, electric gates and similar appropriate incidental residential uses (not involving a structure) on vacant or developed parcels may be authorized by the Planning Director or designee.
3. Amperages greater than 60-amp require a Level IV use approval.
4. An agreement. as described in Subsection 13.10.681(e), is required to be recorded prior to issuance of an electric permit application.

~~(d)~~ (e) Required Conditions.

~~1.~~ Any building or development permit issued for the construction or renovation of a non-habitable accessory structure shall include a condition requiring an agreement not to convert the structure into a dwelling unit or into any structure for human habitation in violation of this Code~~, and a~~Any building or development permit issued for the construction, conversion to or renovation of a habitable accessory structure shall include a condition requiring an agreement not to convert the structure into a dwelling unit or into any other independent habitable structure in violation of this Code. Any electric permit or development permit issued for electrical service for a residential accessow use other than a structure or on a vacant residential parcel, as allowed in Subsection 13.10.681(d), shall include a condition requiring an aureement not *to* use the electrical service for other uses or structures than that authorized by the electric permit or development permit. Each agreement required by this subsection shall provide the recovery by the County of reasonable attorney fees and costs in bringing any legal action to enforce the agreement together with recovery of any rents collected for the illegal structure or, in the alternative, for the recovery of the reasonable rental value of the illegally converted structure or, in the alternative, for the recovery of the reasonable rental value of an illegally converted structure from the date of construction. The amount of any recovery of rents or of the reasonable rental value of an illegally converted structure shall be deposited in the County's Affordable Housing Fund. The agreement shall provide for periodic condition compliance inspections by Planning Department staff. The agreement shall be written so as to be binding on future owners of the property, include a reference to the deed under which the property was acquired by the present owner, and shall be filed with the County Recorder. Proof that the agreement has been recorded shall be furnished

EXHIBIT 4
ATTACHMENT 1

to the County prior *to* the granting of any building permit permitting construction on the property.

~~2. As a condition of approval, permit for accessory structures shall provide for inspection as follows:~~

~~i. The structure may be inspected for condition compliance twelve months after approval, and at any time thereafter at the discretion of the Planning Director. Construction of or conversion to an accessory structure pursuant to an approved permit shall entitle County employees or agents to enter and inspect the property for such compliance without warrant or other requirement for permission.~~

SECTION XVII

Subsection (c)(1) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa CNZ County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(1) Location. The second unit shall be located on a residentially-zoned parcel or on a parcel designated for residential use in the General Plan which contains no more than one existing detached, single-family dwelling. or where one detached single-family dwelling shall be constructed concurrently with the proposed second unit, or where more than one second unit is proposed to be constructed in conjunction with a Tentative Map Application. **A** second unit may be located on agriculturally-zoned land outside the Coastal Zone or on a parcel designated for agricultural use in the General Plan outside the Coastal Zone;

SECTION XVIII

Subsection (d)(4) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended *to* read as follows:

(4) Site Standards. All site standards of the zoning district in which the second unit is proposed shall be met. Within the Urban Services Line, second units exceeding seventeen **(17)** feet in height or one story may be constructed if a Level ~~V~~ IV Development Permit is obtained, pursuant to Chapter 18.10. of this code. Outside the Coastal Zone, on land zoned or designated agricultural, all setbacks of the agricultural zone districts shall be met and all second units must meet the buffering requirements of County Code Section 16.50.095(f), as determined by the Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission, if applicable.

SECTION XIX

Subsection (d)(5) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT 1

(5) Parking. Offstreet parking shall be provided to meet the requirements of Section 13.10.550 for the main dwelling and one additional ~~non-tandem~~ space for each bedroom in the second unit.

SECTION XX

Subsection (e) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(e) Occupancy Standards. The following occupancy standards shall be applied to every second unit and shall be conditions for any approval under this section:

(1) Occupancy Restrictions, The maximum occupancy of a second unit may not exceed that allowed by the State Uniform Housing **Code,** or other applicable state law, based on the unit size and number **of** bedrooms in the unit. ~~Rental or permanent occupancy of the second unit shall be restricted for the life of the unit to either:~~

~~(A) Households that meet the Income and Asset Guidelines established by the Board of Supervisors resolution for lower income households; or~~

~~(B) Senior households, where one household member is sixty-two (62) years of age or older, that meet the Income and Asset Guidelines requirements established by Board resolution for moderate or lower income households; or~~

~~(C) Persons sharing residency with the property owner and who are related by blood, marriage, or operation of law, or have evidence of a stable family relationship with the property owner.~~

(2) Owner Residency. The property owner shall permanently reside, as evidenced by a Homeowner's Property Tax Exemption **on** the parcel, in either the main dwelling or the second unit. The Planning Director may require a property owner with less than 50% ownership in a property to demonstrate a substantial financial interest in the property. ~~If the property owner resides in the second unit, either the property owner or the residents of the primary single family dwelling must meet the income or familial requirements of subsection (e)(1) of this section.~~

~~(3) Occupancy Status. Prior to final inspection approval of the unit, the property owner shall submit a statement to the administering agency, as defined in Subsection 17.10.020(a), indicating whether the second unit will be rented, occupied by family members, or left vacation. Whenever a change in occupancy occurs, the owner shall notify the administering agency, by registered or certified mail, that the occupancy has changed, and indicating the new status of the unit.~~

~~(4) Rent Levels. If rent is charged, the rent level for the second unit, or the for the main units, shall not exceed that established by the Section 8 Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HOUD) or its successor, or the rent level allowed for affordable rental units pursuant to Chapter 17.10 of the County Code, whichever is higher.~~

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT

~~(5) Certification Requirements. No person, including family members of the owner, shall rent or permanently occupy a second unit unless he/she has first obtained certification of his/her eligibility from the administering agency. The property owner must refer persons who wish to rent or permanently occupy the unit to the administering agency for certification, prior to occupancy. The administering agency may also charge a fee to the applicant for the certification process.~~

~~(6) Status Report. The owner shall report the occupancy status of the second unit, when requested by the administering agency, at least once every three years. This report shall include the status of the unit, the name of the current occupant(s) and the monthly rent charged, if applicable.~~

(3) Deed Restriction. Prior *to* the issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall provide *to* the Planning Department proof of recordation of a Declaration of Restrictions containing reference to the deed under which the property was acquired by the present owner and stating the following:

~~(A) The unit may be occupied or rented only under the conditions of the development permit and in accordance with this section and any amendments thereto.~~

(A) The property owner shall permanently reside, as evidenced by a Homeowner's Property Tax Exemption on the parcel. in either the main dwelling or the second unit.

(B) The Ddeclaration is binding upon all successors in interest;

(C) The Declaration shall include a provision for the recovery by the County of reasonable attorney fees and costs in bringing legal action to enforce the Declaration together with recovery of any rents collected during any occupancy not authorized by the terms of the agreement or, in the alternative, for the recovery of the reasonable value of the unauthorized occupancy.

SECTION XXI

Subsection (f) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(9 Permit Allocations. Each second unit may be exempt from the Residential Permit Allocation system of Chapter 12.02 of this Code. ~~However, due to public service deficiencies of roadway design and drainage within the Live Oak planning area, no more than five second units shall be approved within the Live Oak planning area in any calendar year.~~

SECTION XXII

Section 13.10.700-G of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by repealing the definition of "Guest House."

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT 1

~~Guest House. A subordinate habitable accessory structure as regulated by Section 13.10.611, the use of which is appropriate and customarily incidental to that of the main structure or use and contains space that is temperature-controlled for the provision of human occupancy, but has no kitchen facilities.~~

SECTION XXIII

Section 13.10.700-P of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by adding the definition of "Pool Cabana" to read as follows:

Pool Cabana. A small accessow structure used for bathing or changing purposes in conjunction with a swimming pool.

SECTION XXIV

The definition of "Habitable Accessory Structure" found in Section 13.10.700-H of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Habitable Accessory Structure. A detached, subordinate structure, the use of which is appropriate, subordinate and customarily incidental to that of the main structure or the main use of the land and which is located on the same site with the main structure or use and contains all of the required amenities and some or all of the allowed amenities shown in Subsection 13.10.611(c)(2)Table One for Habitable Accessory Structures. ~~space that is heated, cooled, humidified or dehumidified for the provision of human comfort; and/or insulated and finished in plasterboard; and/or which contains plumbing other than hose bibs. Exceptions: Such plumbing features appropriate to the use of the structure, such as a washer or water heater in a garage, a utility sink in a barn or workshop. An exception will not be granted for a full or half bath in any accessory structure.~~

SECTION XXV

The definition of "Non-Habitable Accessory Structure" found in Section 13.10.700-N of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Non-Habitable Accessory Structure. A detached subordinate structure, the use of which is appropriate, subordinate and customarily incidental to that of the main structure or the main use of the land and which is located on the same site with the main structure or use and contains some or all of the features and amenities shown in Subsection 13.10.611(c)(2)Table One for Non-Habitable Accessory Structures. ~~no plumbing other than hose bibs, except as provided by the definition of habitable accessory structure; no space that is heated, cooled, humidified or dehumidified for the provision of human comfort; nor insulation and finished walls.~~

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT 1

13.10.069 Solar energy system exemption.
(a) Any solar collector or other solar energy device whose primary purpose is to provide the collection, storage, and distribution of solar energy for space heating, space cooling, electric generation, or water heating is exempt.
(b) Any structural design feature of a building, whose primary purpose is to provide for the collection, storage, and distribution of solar energy for electricity generation, space heating or cooling, or for water heating is exempt.

SECTION XXVII

Chapter 13.20 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by adding Section 13.20.079 to read as follows:

13.20.079 Demolition on lands outside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line exclusion.
Demolition of structures on lands outside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line is excluded, except as follows:
(a) Projects located within any of the following areas:
(1) Between the sea and first through public road paralleling the sea, except in the areas shown on the map entitled "Residential Exclusion Zone: hereby adopted by reference and considered a part of this County Code; or
(2) Within three hundred (300) feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide line where there is no beach, or within three hundred (300) feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff, whichever is the greater distance; or
(3) On land subject to public trust: or
(4) On lots immediately adjacent to the inland extent of any beach, or the mean high tide line where there is no beach; or
(5) Within one hundred (100) feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream: or
(6) Within a biotic resource area as designated on the General Plan and Local Coastal Program Resources Maps; or
(7) Within a Special Community designated on the General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan maps.
(b) Any structure designated by the Board of Supervisors as an historic resource.

SECTION XXVIII

Subsection (a) of Section 13.20.100 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) Review Process. All regulations and procedures regarding Coastal Zone Approvals, including application, noticing, expiration, amendment, enforcement, and penalties, shall be taken in accordance with the provisions for Level V (Zoning Administrator) Approvals pursuant to Chapter 18.10 except for the

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT

(a) Review Process. All regulations and procedures regarding Coastal Zone Approvals, including application, noticing, expiration, amendment, enforcement, and penalties, shall be taken in accordance with the provisions for Level V (Zoning Administrator) Approvals pursuant to Chapter 18.10 except for the following categories of development which shall be taken in accordance with the provisions for Level IV (Public Notice) with the exception that any request from the public will trigger a Level V review:

(1) Residential additions and accessory structures greater than 500 square feet in size outside the appeal jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission;

(2) Grading of 100 cubic yards or greater volume, except that wading volumes meeting the criteria found in Section 16.20.040(a) shall be processed at Level VI.

Provision for challenges to determination of applicable process is contained in Section 13.20.085

SECTION **XXIX**

Subsection (b) 1 of Section 16.50.095 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

1) Provide and maintain a two hundred (200) foot buffer setback between Type **1,** Type 2 or Type 3 commercial agricultural land and non-agricultural uses involving habitable spaces including dwellings, habitable accessory structures and additions thereto; and commercial, industrial, recreational, or institutional structures, and their outdoor areas designed for public parking and intensive human use, except that if an existing legal dwelling already encroaches within the two hundred (200) foot buffer setback, proposed additions thereto, habitable accessory structures or private recreational facilities--none exceeding 1,000 square feet in size--shall be exempt from this subsection so long as they encroach no further than the existing dwelling into the buffer setback and an appropriate vegetative or other physical barrier. as determined necessary. either exists or is provided and maintained. For the purposes of this Section, outdoor areas designed for intensive human use shall be defined as surfaced ground areas or uncovered structures designed for a level of human use similar to that of a habitable structure. Examples are dining patios adjacent to restaurant buildings and private swimming pools. The two hundred (200) foot agricultural buffer setback shall incorporate vegetative or other physical barriers as determined necessary to minimize potential land use conflicts.

SECTION XXX

The first paragraph of Subsection (g) of Section 16.50.095 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

EXHIBIT A
ATTACHMENT 1

SECTION XXXI

This Ordinance shall take effect on the 31st day after the date of final passage outside the Coastal Zone and on the 31st day after the date of final passage or upon certification by the California Coastal Commission, whichever date is later, inside the Coastal Zone.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz this _____ day of _____, 2007, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS
NOES: SUPERVISORS
ABSENT: SUPERVISORS
ABSTAIN: SUPERVISORS

_____
CHAIRPERSON, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ATTEST: _____
Clerk of the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____
County Counsel

Copies to: Planning
County Counsel

EXHIBIT A

ATTACHMENT 1

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY CODE CHAPTERS 13.10, 13.20 AND 16.50 REGARDING REGULATIONS FOR SMALL-SCALE RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz ordains as follows:

SECTION I

Subsection (b) of Section 13.10.265 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(b) The structural enlargement, extension, reconstruction, or alteration which conforms to the site development standards of the district in which the structure is located may be made to a nonconforming structure upon issuance of only those building permits and/or development permits required by other Sections of the County Code if the property's use is made to conform to the uses allowed in the district and provided that the structure is not significantly nonconforming as defined in this Section.

SECTION II

Subsection **(k)** of Section 13.10.265 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(k) For the purposes of this section, a structure is significantly nonconforming if it is any of the following:

1. Located within five feet of a vehicular right-of-way;
2. Located across a property line;
3. Located within five feet of another structure on a separate parcel; or
4. Located within five feet of a planned future public right-of-way improvement (i.e. an adopted plan line).

SECTION III

Section 13.10.312(b), Uses in agricultural districts, Allowed Uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Habitable accessory structure, 640 square feet or less subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.611" to read as follows:

Habitable accessory structure when incidental to a residential use and not for agricultural purposes, subject to the	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4

EXHIBIT B

provisions of Section 13.10.611

SECTION IV

Section 13.10.312(b), Uses in agricultural districts, Allowed Uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by repealing the category "Habitable accessory structures greater than 640 feet, subject **to** the provisions of Section 13.10.611 (see farm outbuildings)."

SECTION V

Section 13.10.312(b), Uses in agricultural districts, Allowed Uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code **is** hereby amended by revising the category "Non-habitable accessory structure when incidental to a residential use and not for agricultural purposes" to read as follows:

Non-habitable accessory structure when incidental to a residential use and not for agricultural purposes (subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.611 and 13.10.313(a)).	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4

SECTION VI

Section 13.10.322(b), Uses in residential districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures and uses, including:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures and uses, including:					
One Accessory structure, habitable (subject to Sections 13.10.611 and 13.10.323)	BP/4	BPI4	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4
Accessory structures, non-habitable (subject to Sections13.10.611 and 13.10.323), comprised of:					
Animal enclosures: barns, stables, paddocks, hutches and coops (subject to the provisions of Section 13.10.641 Stables and Paddocks; .643 Animal Keeping in the RA Zone; .644 Family Animal Raising; .645 bird and small	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4	--	--

EXHIBIT B

these provisions require Level 5 in some cases).					
Carports, detached; garages, detached; garden structures; storage sheds (subject to Sections 13.10.611 and 13.10.323)	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4	BP/4
Air strips (see Section 13.10.700. definition)	7	7	--	--	--
Parking, including:					
Parking, on-site, for principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.550 et seq.)	BP2	BP2	BP2	BP2	BP2
Parking, on-site, for non-principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.580 et seq.)	4	4	4	4	4
Recycling collection facilities in association with a permitted community or public facility, subject to Section 13.10.658, including:					
reverse vending machines	BPI 3	BPI 3	BPI 3	BPI 3	BPI 3
small collection facilities					
Signs, including:					
Signs for non-principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.580, et seq.)	4	4	4	4	4
Signs for principal permitted uses (subject to Sections 13.10.580, et seq.)	P	P	P	P	P
Storage tanks, water or gas, for use of persons residing on site					
less than 5,000 gallons	BP2	BP2	BP2	--	--
more than 5,000 gallons	BP3	BP3	BP3	--	--
Swimming pools, private and accessory equipment	BP3	BP3	BP3	--	--

EXHIBIT B

SECTION VII

Subsection 13.10.323(e)6(b) of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(B) Side and Rear Yards.

i. An accessory structure which is attached to the main building shall be considered a part thereof, and shall be required to have the same setbacks as the main structure;

ii. A detached accessory structure which is located entirely within the required rear yard and which is smaller than one hundred twenty (120) square feet in size and ten (10) feet or less in height may be constructed to within three feet of the side and rear property lines;

iii. Garden trellises, garden statuary, birdbaths, freestanding barbeques, play equipment, swimming pool equipment, freestanding air conditioners, heat pumps and similar HVAC equipment and ground-mounted solar systems, if not exceeding six (6) feet in height, are not required to maintain side and rear yard setbacks and are excluded in the calculation of allowable lot coverage.

SECTION VIII

Subsection 13.10.323(e)6(C) of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(C) Separation. The minimum distance between any *two* detached structures shall be ten (10) feet with the following exceptions:

i. Eaves, chimneys, cantilevered, uncovered, unenclosed balconies, porches, decks and uncovered, unenclosed stairways and landings may encroach three feet into the required ten (10) separation;

ii. No separation is required between water tanks located on the same parcel;

iii. No separation is required between garden trellises, garden statuary, birdbaths, freestanding barbeques, play equipment, swimming pool equipment, freestanding air conditioners, heat pumps and similar HVAC equipment and ground-mounted solar systems and other structures located on the same parcel.

SECTION IX

Section 13.10.332(b), Uses in commercial districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, non-habitable, not including warehouses (subject to Section 13.10.611)" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, non-habitable, not

EXHIBIT B

Accessory structures, non-habitable, not including warehouses					
Less than 500 sq. ft.	3	3	3	3	3
500 – 2,000 sq. ft.	**4**	4	4	4	4
Greater than 2,000 sq. ft	5	5	**5**	5	5

SECTION **X**

Section 13.10.342(b), Uses in industrial districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, non-habitable, subject to Section 13.10.611, including:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, non-habitable, including:			
Outdoor storage, incidental, screened from public streets	4/5/6*	4/5/6*	4/5/6*
Parking, on-site, developed in accordance with Sections 13.10.550 et seq.			
Signs in accordance with Section 13.10.581			
Storage, incidental, or non-hazardous materials within an enclosed structure.			

SECTION XI

Section 13.10.342(b), Uses in industrial districts, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended **by** revising the category "Accessory structures, habitable, subject to Section 13.10.611, including:" to read as follows:

Accessory structures, habitable, including:	4	**4**	4
Watchman's living quarters, one, located on the same site and incidental to an allowed use			

SECTION XII

Section 13.10.352(b), Uses in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space zone district, Allowed uses, of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by revising the category "Accessory structures, pursuant to a Master Site Plan according to Section 13.10.355, such as:" to read as follows:

EXHIBIT B

according to Section 13.10.355, such as:

Accessory structures, non-habitable
Parking, on-site, for an allowed use, in accordance with Section 13.10.550 et seq.
Signs, in accordance with Section 13.10.582

SECTION XIII

Section 13.10.521 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) Right-of-way Access. A parcel, newly created by a tentative map or conditional certificate of compliance, may not be used as a building site unless it has its principal frontage on a public street or on a private right-of-way at least 40 feet wide nor may a new vehicular right-of-way be created less than 40-feet in width unless a Level V Use Approval is obtained *for* principal frontage and access on a narrower right-of-way. For any project requiring a subdivision or minor land division tentative map approval, or a conditional certificate of compliance, use of streets not meeting the minimum County standard shall require approval of a roadway exception processed pursuant to Section 15.10.050(f).

SECTION XIV

Subsection (c)(2) of Section 13.10.525 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Except as specified in Sections 13.10.525(c)(3), and 16.50.095, no fence andlor retaining wall shall exceed six feet in height if located within a required side or rear yard not abutting on a street, and no fence, hedge, andlor retaining wall shall exceed three feet in height if located in a front yard abutting a street or other yard abutting a street, except that heights up to six feet may be allowed by a Level III Development Permit approval, and heights greater than six feet may be allowed by a Level V Development Permit Approval. (See Section 12.10.070(b) for building permit requirements.)

SECTION XV

Section 13.10.611 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) Purpose. It is the purpose of this Section to provide for the orderly regulation of residential accessory structures allowed as a use in any zone district, to insure that accessory structures are subordinate and incidental to the main structure or

EXHIBIT B

main use of the land, and to provide notice to future and current property owners that illegal conversion of any accessory structure is subject to civil penalties.

(b) Application Requirements.

(1) The proposed use of the structure shall be identified.

(2) Applications for habitable accessory structures and non-habitable accessory structures shall be processed as specified in Tables One and Two of this Section.

(c) Restriction on Accessory Structures.

(1) Any accessory structure shall be clearly appurtenant, subordinate and incidental to the main structure or main use of the land as specified in the purposes of the appropriate zone district.

(2) Regulations on amenities for accessory structures on parcels with a main residence are as indicated in Table One:

EXHIBIT B

Section 13.10.611(c)(2)
TABLE ONE
AMENITIES REGULATIONS

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE
SINK	llowed	Allowed
TOILET	Pool cabanas: Allowed All other uses: Not allowed unless a Level IV use approval *is* obtained	Allowed
SHOWER AND/OR BATHTUB	Pool cabanas: Allowed All other uses: Not allowed	Not allowed
WASHER/ DRYER AND WATER HEATER	Allowed	Allowed
INSULATION/ SHEET ROCKOROTHER FINISHED WALL COVERING	Both allowed	Both required
BUILT IN HEATING/COOLING	Not allowed	Heating: Required Cooling: Allowed
KITCHEN FACILITIES, EXCLUDING SINK, AS DEFINED IN 13 10 **700-K**	Not allowed	Not allowed
ELECTRICAL SERVICE MAXIMUM	100A/220V/single phase maximum unless a Level IV use approval is obtained	100A/220V/single phase maximum unless a Level IV use approval is obtained
SEPARATE ELECTRIC METER	Not allowed unless a Level IV use approval is obtained	Not allowed unless a Level IV use approval is obtained
USE FOR SLEEPING PURPOSES	Not allowed	Allowed
RENT, LET OR LEASE AS AN INDEPENDENT [DWELLING UNIT	Not allowed	Not allowed

(3) Regulations for level of review, size, number of stories and locational restrictions for accessory structures are as indicated in Table Two:

EXHIBIT B

Section 13.10.611(c)(3)

TABLE TWO

LEVEL OF REVIEW, SIZE, HEIGHT, NUMBER OF STORIES AND LOCATIONAL REGULATIONS

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE
SIZE, STORY AND HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS AND PERMIT REQUIRED	Within the Urban Services Line (USL): Building Permit only for up to 640 square foot size, 2 story and 28-foot height. Outside the USL: Building Permit only for up to 1,000 square foot size, 3 story and 28-foot height on lots less than one acre in size; Building Permit only for up to 1,500 square foot size, 3-story and 28-foot height on lots one acre or greater in size.	Within the Urban Services Line (USL): Building Permit only for up to 640 square foot size, 1 story and 17-foot height. Outside the USL: Building Permit only for up to 640 square foot size, 3 story and 28-foot height.
PERMIT REQUIRED IF EXCEEDS SIZE, STORY OR HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS	Level IV use approval	Level IV use approval
NUMBER OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURES ALLOWED	No limit, if in compliance with the site regulations of the zone district .	One with Building Permit only. Maximum of two with Level IV use approval.
LOCATIONAL RESTRICTIONS	None, if in compliance with the site regulations of the zone district	In addition to the site regulations of the zone district, shall be no more than 100 feet from the main residence, accessed by a separate driveway or right-of-way nor constructed on a slope greater than 30%, unless a Level IV use approval is obtained.

EXHIBIT B

(4) Regulations for accessory structures on parcels with no main residence are as follows:

i. A habitable accessory structure is not allowed;

ii. One non-habitable accessory structure not exceeding 12 feet in height or 600 square feet in size is allowed. No electricity or plumbing other than hose bibs is allowed unless a Level IV approval is obtained.

(5) No accessory structure shall be mechanically heated, cooled, humidified or dehumidified unless the structure or the conditioned portion thereof meets the energy conservation standards of the California Energy Code, Title 24, adopted by Chapter 12.10 of this Code..

(6) Any building permit for the construction of or conversion to an independent dwelling unit shall require an allocation for one housing unit as provided in Section 12.02.030 and shall comply with the dwelling density allowed for the zone district in which the parcel is located, except as provided by 13.10.681.

(d) Restrictions on Electrical Service for Residential Accessory Uses Other than Structures or on Vacant Residential Parcels

1. A 60-amp maximum service for well use is allowed.
2. A 60-amp maximum service for irrigation systems, lighting systems, electric gates and similar appropriate incidental residential uses (not involving a structure) on vacant or developed parcels may be authorized by the Planning Director or designee.
3. Amperages greater than 60-amp require a Level IV use approval.
4. An agreement, as described in Subsection 13.10.681(e), is required to be recorded prior to issuance of an electric permit application.

(e) Required Conditions.

1. Any building or development permit issued for the construction or renovation of a non-habitable accessory structure shall include a condition requiring an agreement not to convert the structure *into* a dwelling unit or into any structure for human habitation in violation *of* this Code. Any building or development permit issued for the construction, conversion to or renovation of a habitable accessory structure shall include a condition requiring an agreement not to convert the structure *into* a dwelling unit or into any other independent habitable structure in violation of this Code. Any electric permit or development permit issued for electrical service for a residential accessory use other than a structure or *on a* vacant residential parcel, as allowed in Subsection 13.10.681(d), shall include a condition requiring an agreement not to use the electrical service for other uses or structures than that authorized by the electric permit or development permit. Each agreement required by this subsection shall provide the recovery by the County of reasonable attorney fees and costs in bringing any legal action to enforce the agreement together with

EXHIBIT K

recovery of any rents collected for the illegal structure or, in the alternative. for the recovery of the reasonable rental value of the illegally converted structure or, in the alternative, for the recovery of the reasonable rental value of an illegally converted structure from the date of construction. The amount of any recovery of rents or of the reasonable rental value of an illegally converted structure shall be deposited in the County's Affordable Housing Fund. The agreement shall provide for periodic condition compliance inspections by Planning Department staff. The agreement shall be written so as to be binding on future owners of the property, include a reference to the deed under which the property was acquired by the present owner, and shall be filed with the County Recorder. Proof that the agreement has been recorded shall be furnished to the County prior to the granting of any building permit permitting construction on the property.

SECTION XVII

Subsection (c)(1) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(1) Location. The second unit shall be located on a residentially-zoned parcel or on a parcel designated for residential use in the General Plan which contains no more than one existing detached, single-family dwelling, or where one detached single-family dwelling shall be constructed concurrently with the proposed second unit, or where more than one second unit is proposed to be constructed in conjunction with a Tentative Map Application. A second unit may be located on agriculturally-zoned land outside the Coastal Zone or on a parcel designated for agricultural use in the General Plan outside the Coastal Zone;

SECTION XVIII

Subsection (d)(4) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(4) Site Standards. All site standards of the zoning district in which the second unit is proposed shall be met. Within the Urban Services Line, second units exceeding seventeen (17) feet in height or one story may be constructed if a Level ~~V~~ IV Development Permit is obtained, pursuant to Chapter 18.10. of this code. Outside the Coastal Zone, on land zoned or designated agricultural, all setbacks of the agricultural zone districts shall be met and all second units must meet the buffering requirements of County Code Section 16.50.095(f), as determined by the Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission, if applicable.

EXHIBIT B

SECTION XIX

Subsection (d)(5) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(5) Parking. Offstreet parking shall be provided to meet the requirements of Section 13.10.550 for the main dwelling and one additional space for each bedroom in the second unit.

SECTION XX

Subsection (e) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa CNZ County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(e) Occupancy Standards. The following occupancy standards shall be applied to every second unit and shall be conditions for any approval under this section:

(1) Occupancy Restrictions. The maximum occupancy of a second unit may not exceed that allowed by the State Uniform Housing Code, or other applicable state law, based on the unit size and number of bedrooms in the unit.

(2) Owner Residency. The property owner shall permanently reside, as evidenced by a Homeowner's Property Tax Exemption on the parcel, in either the main dwelling or the second unit. The Planning Director may require a property owner with less than 50% ownership in a property to demonstrate a substantial financial interest in the property.

(3) Deed Restriction. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the property owner shall provide to the Planning Department proof of recordation of a Declaration of Restrictions containing reference to the deed under which the property was acquired by the present owner and stating the following:

(B) The property owner shall permanently reside, **as** evidenced by a Homeowner's Property Tax Exemption on the parcel, in either the main dwelling or the second unit.

(B) The Declaration is binding upon all successors in interest:

(C) The Declaration shall include a provision for the recovery by the County of reasonable attorney fees and costs **in** bringing legal action to enforce the Declaration together with recovery of any rents collected during any occupancy not authorized **by** the terms of the agreement or, in the alternative, for the recovery of the reasonable value *of* the unauthorized occupancy.

SECTION XXI

Subsection (f) of Section 13.10.681 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

EXHIBIT B

(f) Permit Allocations. Each second unit may be exempt from the Residential Permit Allocation system of Chapter 12.02 of this Code.

SECTION XXII

Section 13.10.700-G *of* the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by repealing the definition of "Guest House."

SECTION XXIII

Section 13.10.700-P of the Santa Cruz County Code **is** hereby amended by adding the definition of "Pool Cabana" to read as follows:

Pool Cabana A small accessory structure used for bathing or changing purposes in conjunction with a swimming pool.

SECTION XXIV

The definition of "Habitable Accessory Structure" found in Section 13.10.700-H of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Habitable Accessory Structure. A detached, subordinate structure, the use of which is appropriate, subordinate and customarily incidental to that of the main structure or the main use of the land and which is located on the same site with the main structure or use and contains all of the required amenities and some or all of the allowed amenities shown in Subsection 13.10.611(c)(2) Table One for Habitable Accessory Structures.

SECTION XXV

The definition of "Non-Habitable Accessory Structure" found in Section 13.10.700-N of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

Non-Habitable Accessory Structure. ***A*** detached subordinate structure, the use of which is appropriate, subordinate and customarily incidental to that of the main structure or the main use of the land and which is located on the same site with the main structure or use and contains some or all of the features and amenities shown in Subsection 13.10.611(c)(2) Table One for Non-Habitable Accessory Structures.

SECTION XXVI

Chapter 13.20 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by adding Section 13.20.069 to read as follows:

EXHIBIT B

13.10.069 Solar energy system exemption.

(a) Any solar collector or other solar energy device whose primary purpose is to provide the collection, storage, and distribution of solar energy for space heating, space cooling, electric generation, or water heating is exempt.

(b) Any structural design feature of a building, whose primary purpose is *to* provide for the collection, storage, and distribution of solar energy for electricity generation, space heating or cooling, or for water heating is exempt.

SECTION XXVII

Chapter 13.20 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended by adding Section 13.20.079 to read as follows:

13.20.079 Demolition on lands outside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line exclusion.

Demolition of structures on lands outside the Urban Services Line and Rural Services Line is excluded, except as follows:

(a) Projects located within any of the following areas:

(1) Between the sea and first through public road paralleling the sea, except in the areas shown on the map entitled "Residential Exclusion Zone," hereby adopted by reference and considered a part of this County Code; or

(2) Within three hundred (300) feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide line where there is no beach, or within three hundred (300) feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff, whichever is the greater distance; or

(3) On land subject *to* public trust; or

(4) On lots immediately adjacent *to* the inland extent of any beach, or the mean high tide line where there is no beach; or

(5) Within one hundred (100) feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream; or

(6) Within a biotic resource area as designated on the General Plan and Local Coastal Program Resources Maps; or

(7) Within a Special Community designated on the General Plan and Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan maps.

(b) Any structure designated by the Board of Supervisors **as** an historic resource.

SECTION XXVIII

Subsection (a) of Section 13.20.100 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended **to** read as follows:

(a) Review Process. All regulations and procedures regarding Coastal Zone Approvals, including application, noticing, expiration, amendment, enforcement, and penalties, shall be taken in accordance with the provisions for Level V

EXHIBIT B

(Zoning Administrator) Approvals pursuant to Chapter 18.10 except for the following categories of development which shall be taken in accordance with the provisions for Level IV (Public Notice) with the exception that any request from the public for a public hearing will trigger a Level V review:

(1) Residential additions and accessory structures greater than 500 square feet in size outside the appeal jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission;

(2) Grading of 100 cubic yards or greater volume, except that grading volumes meeting the criteria found in Section 16.20.040(a) shall be processed at Level VI.

Provision for challenges to determination of applicable process is contained in Section 13.20.085.

SECTION XXIX

Subsection (b) 1 of Section 16.50.095 of the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

1) Provide and maintain a two hundred (200) foot buffer setback between Type 1, Type 2 or Type 3 commercial agricultural land and non-agricultural uses involving habitable spaces including dwellings, habitable accessory structures and additions thereto; and commercial, industrial, recreational, or institutional structures, and their outdoor areas designed for public parking and intensive human use, except that if an existing legal dwelling already encroaches within the two hundred (200) foot buffer setback, proposed additions thereto, habitable accessory structures or private recreational facilities--none exceeding 1,000 square feet in size--shall be exempt from this subsection **so** long as they encroach no further than the existing dwelling into the buffer setback and an appropriate vegetative or other physical barrier, as determined necessary, either exists or is provided and maintained. For the purposes of this Section, outdoor areas designed for intensive human use shall be defined as surfaced ground areas or uncovered structures designed for a level of human use similar to that of a habitable structure. Examples are dining patios adjacent to restaurant buildings and private swimming pools. The two hundred (200) foot agricultural buffer setback shall incorporate vegetative or other physical barriers as determined necessary to minimize potential land use conflicts.

SECTION XXX

The first paragraph of Subsection (g) of Section 16.50.095 *of* the Santa Cruz County Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

(g) Proposals to reduce the required two hundred (200) foot agricultural buffer setback for additions to existing residential construction (dwellings, habitable accessory and private recreational facilities not otherwise exempted by Section 16.50.095(b)1) and for the placement of agricultural caretakers' mobile homes on agricultural parcels shall be processed as a Level **4** application by Planning

EXHIBIT R

Department staff as specified in Chapter 18.10 of the County Code with the exception that:

SECTION XXXI

This Ordinance shall take effect *on the* 31" day afler the date of final passage outside the Coastal Zone and on the 31" day after the date of final passage or upon certification by the California Coastal Commission, whichever date is later, inside the Coastal Zone.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz this _____ day of _____, 2007, by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS
NOES: SUPERVISORS
ABSENT: SUPERVISORS
ABSTAIN: SUPERVISORS

_____
CHAIRPERSON, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ATTEST: _____
Clerk *of* the Board

APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____
County Counsel

Copies to: Planning
County Counsel

EXHIBIT B

EXISTING AND PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND SECOND UNITS (Changes in **bold**)

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE	SECOND UNITS
EXAMPLES OF USES:	Workshop or office (unheated), barn, detached garage, pool cabana	Heated office, heated workshop, detached bedroom, art studio, guest house	Independent dwelling unit – Can be rented to a separate household
SINK	Allowed	Allowed	Required
TOILET	Allowed under certain circumstances with Level IV Approval (Public Notice)	Currently: Allowed under certain circumstances with Level IV Approval (Public Notice) **Proposed: Allow with Building Permit**	Required
SHOWER/ BATHTUB	Not allowed, except for pool cabanas	Not allowed	Required
WASHER/ DRYER AND WATER HEATER	Allowed	Allowed	Allowed
INSULATION/ SHEET ROCK	Currently: Either sheetrock or insulation allowed, but not both **Proposed: Allow both**	Currently: Allowed **Proposed: Required**	Required
BUILT IN HEATING/COOLING	Not allowed	Currently: Allowed **Proposed: Heating required**	Heating required
OWNER REQUIRED TO LIVE ON PROPERTY IF HEATED/ COOLED?	(Not applicable)	Currently: Required **Proposed: Not required**	Owner required to live on property
USE FOR SLEEPING PURPOSES	Not allowed (deed restriction)	Allowed	Allowed

EXHIBIT C

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE	SECOND UNITS
PERMIT REQUIRED – MEETS SIZE RESTRICTIONS	Currently: Urban: Building Permit (BP) only for carports, garages etc, up to 640 sq ft., 28' height 1,000 sq ft, 28 ft height allowed for animal enclosures. Rural: BP for 1,000 sq ft, 28 ft height. **Proposed: Urban: 640 sq ft for all non-habitable accessory structures. Rural: Allow 1,000 sq ft on lots less than 1 acre, and 1,500 sq ft on lots 1 acre or greater.**	Building Permit (BP) for up to 640 sq ft, 1 story, 17 ft height (urban and rural). **Proposed:** **Allow 28 ft height in rural areas.**	Urban: Building Permit (BP) for 640 sq ft, 17 ft height, 1 story. Rural: 28 ft height allowed. Larger size limits depending on size of parcel.
PERMIT REQUIRED – EXCEEDS SIZE RESTRICTIONS	Currently: Level 5, but Level 3 in RA zone (residential agriculture). **Proposed:** **Level 4 (public notice) in all areas.**	Currently: Level 5 (public hearing). **Proposed: Level 4 (public notice).**	Currently: Level 5 (public hearing) to exceed 17' height or 1 story in urban areas. **Proposed: Lower approval to Level 4 (public notice) to exceed specified height and story limit in urban areas.**
NUMBER OF UNITS ALLOWED	No set limit – (Number limited by lot coverage requirements)	Currently: One with BP, more than 1 with Level 5 approval **Proposed**: 1 with BP, **Maximum of 2 with discretionary permit (Level 4 – public notice)**	One only
PARKING AND IMPACT FEES REQUIRED?	No	Required based on number of potential bedrooms	Required based on number of potential bedrooms

EXHIBIT C

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REGULATORY REFORMS: SMALL-SCALE RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

Accessory Structures (art studios, detached garages, workshops, detached bedrooms, etc.)

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Bathrooms are prohibited in most habitable and non-habitable accessory structures such as guest houses, detached offices and art studios. Toilets are allowed under certain circumstances with a Level IV Approval.	• Prohibitions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. • Not effective at preventing illegal conversions. • Property owners are prevented from constructing fully functional and comfortable accessory structures with appropriate sanitation facilities.	• Allow sinks in all accessory structures (building permit only). • Allow toilets in habitable accessory structures with a building permit only. • Continue to allow toilets under certain circumstances in non-habitable accessory structures with a Level 4 approval. • Allow exception for toilets and showers in pool cabanas. • Continue to require deed restrictions prohibiting illegal conversions, and provide for inspections.
2) In urban and rural areas, height of habitable accessory structures is limited to 17 feet and one story.	• In rural areas, height requirements for second units, non-habitable accessory structures, and second units are inconsistent.	• In rural areas only, increase height allowed for habitable accessory structures to 28 ft.
3) Habitable accessory structures exceeding the specified size, height and number of stories require a public hearing (Level 5).	• Public hearings are generally not necessary, since most new accessory structures create few impacts and are non- controversial. • The approval process is unnecessarily expensive and time- consuming for owner.	• Eliminate the requirement for a public hearing, but require discretionary review with pubic noticing (Level 4). • Public hearings could be held for controversial projects, at the discretion of the Planning Director.
4) Property owners must live on site in order to install heating or cooling systems in a habitable accessory structure.	• This requirement is difficult to enforce, and not effective at preventing illegal conversions into dwelling units. • Limits options for property owner.	• Require heating systems, and allow cooling systems, to be installed in habitable accessory structures with a building permit, and do not require owner-occupancy on the property. • Continue to require deed restrictions and provide for inspections of habitable accessory structures.
5) A residential habitable accessory structure is not allowed on properties with a second unit. More than 2 habitable accessory structures require a Level 5 approval (public hearing).	• Restrictions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. • Restrictions prevent property owner from making full use of their property. • Example: Owner cannot have a both a second unit and a heated workshop.	• Allow the construction of habitable accessory structures on a property with a second unit. • Require a building permit only for one habitable accessory structure, and allow a maximum of 2 with a discretionary permit (Level 4). • Continue to require deed restrictions to prevent illegal conversions to dwelling units, and provide for inspections.

EXHIBIT D

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
6) Non-habitable accessory structures such as detached garages and workshops are not allowed to have both sheetrock and insulation.	• Prohibitions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. • Many property owners want to finish non-habitable structures such as garages with sheetrock and insulation.	• Allow non-habitable accessory structures to be finished with sheetrock and insulation. • Continue to require deed restrictions prohibiting the conversion of non-habitable accessory structures to habitable uses, and provide for inspections.
7) • In rural areas, non-habitable accessory structures are limited to 1,000 sq ft, regardless of lot size. • Non-habitable accessory structures exceeding the specified size limits require Level 3 Approval in RA (residential agriculture) zones, and public hearing (Level 5) in all other zones.	• On large rural properties, property owners frequently need barns or other structures larger than 1,000 sq ft. • On large rural properties, larger non-habitable accessory structures generally do not impact neighboring properties.	• On rural properties 1 acre or greater, allow non-habitable accessory structures up to 1,500 square feet with a building permit only. • In rural areas, require a Level 4 (public notice) approval for non-habitable accessory structures that exceed specified size limits.
8) • In urban areas, size of non-habitable accessory structures such as garages and carports is limited to 640 sq ft. • Allowed size of animal enclosures is 1,000 sq ft. • Level 5 Approval (public hearing) is required for non-habitable structures in urban areas exceeding specified limits.	• Different size limits for animal enclosures and other types of non-habitable accessory structures lead to confusion for applicants. • Non-habitable accessory structures that exceed size limits typically generate few impacts.	• In urban areas, limit size of all non-habitable accessory structures to 640 sq ft., including animal enclosures. • Require Level 4 approval (public noticing) for non-habitable accessory structures in urban areas that exceed specified size limits.
9) All structures greater than 18" in height must meet all site regulations, including setback and lot coverage requirements.	• Definition of structure is overly restrictive. • Objects that have no potential to impact neighboring properties, such as bird baths and 5-foot garden trellises, are considered structures and are prohibited in side or rear yards.	• Allow objects less than 6 feet in height that do not create health and safety or other impacts to be placed in side and rear yards. • Examples: Garden trellises, garden statuary, play equipment, and ground-mounted solar systems less than 6 feet in height. Decks taller than 18" and buildings would not be allowed in side and rear yards.

EXHIBIT D

Second Units

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Property owners must reside on the property in order to obtain a permit for a second unit.	• Difficult for developers of new subdivisions to construct second units, since they do not live on the property. • Restrictions on second units in new subdivisions limit a significant potential source of second units in the County. • Second units planned during subdivision process can be better integrated into the surrounding neighborhood than those constructed after the subdivision has been built.	• Continue to require that the property owner live on-site in order to construct a second unit, but allow an exception for developers of second units within new subdivisions.
2) Ordinance does not specify the level of financial interest required by a property owner to meet the owner occupancy requirements for a second unit permit.	• Owner with 1% interest in property who lives on property meets owner occupancy requirements under current regulations. • Property ownership requirements can be difficult to quantify, since there may be circumstances where there are several legitimate property owners.	• To verify the owner residency requirements for a second unit permit, the Planning Director may require an applicant with less than 50% ownership in the property to demonstrate a substantial financial interest in the property.
3) Second units can be occupied only by qualifying households. The rent charged for second units cannot exceed certain levels.	• Restrictions on occupancy and rent levels may act as disincentives for the construction of new second units. • Occupancy and rent level restrictions are not accomplishing the intended goal of ensuring that second units are rented primarily by low- income or senior households.	• Eliminate occupancy and rent-level restrictions for second units, in order tc encourage the construction of more second units.
4) Level 5 approval required for second units that exceed 17' height limit in urban areas.	• Neighborhood impacts of second units 28 ft in height are likely to be minimal. • Requiring public hearings (level 5 approval) for units taller than 17 feet in urban areas may discourage the construction of second units on properties with limited lot coverage.	• Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for second units exceeding 17 feet in height in urban areas.
5) No more than 5 second units per year may be constructed in the Live Oak area.	▪ Infrastructure improvements in Live Oak over the past 20 years have eliminated the need for the annual cap on second units in Live Oak. ▪ Property owners in all areas of the County should have the opportunity to construct new second units.	• Eliminate the annual cap on second u in the Live Oak area.

EXHIBIT C

Non-conforming Structures

After numerous amendments to the original County Zoning Code enacted in 1958, the number of residential non-conforming structures - structures that do not conform to the current height, setback, lot coverage, or floor area ratio requirements- continues to increase. The proposed reforms are intended to make it easier for residential property owners to make needed repairs and other improvements to their residences.

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Conforming additions greater than 800 square feet to non-conforming structures require discretionary approval (Level 4).	• Conforming additions generally create few impacts, and such projects are rarely conditioned, so that discretionary review is not needed. • Restrictions on size of additions and permit requirements are especially burdensome to owners of smaller non- conforming residences.	• Allow conforming additions of any size to non-conforming residences with a building permit only.
2) Discretionary approval with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval) is required for structural repairs of structures exceeding the allowed height limit by more than 5 feet ("Significantly non-conforming").	• Owners of such residences find it very difficult to make essential repairs or alterations. • Many houses in the County fall into this category due to changes in the way the County has measured height over the years.	• Treat structures exceeding the height limit by more than 5 feet like other non-conforming structures, allowing owners to make needed repairs and alterations, and construct conforming additions, with a building permit only.

Coastal Regulations

The proposed reforms of coastal regulations are intended to make it easier for residential property owners to make small-scale improvements to their property.

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Demolition of structures in rural areas of the Coastal Zone requires discretionary approval with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval).	• Demolition generally creates few impacts. • Discretionary review with a public hearing is not necessary for most demolition projects.	• Exclude most demolition from requiring a Coastal Approval (would still require demolition permit). • Continue to require Coastal Approval for demolition on sensitive sites such as biotic habitats, and for historic structures.
2) Additions greater than 500 square feet outside the Urban and Rural Service Lines in the Coastal Zone require discretionary review with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval).	▪ Impacts of such additions are generally minor. ▪ Potential project impacts, including visual impacts, could be fully addressed with a lower level of discretionary review, and do not require a public hearing.	▪ Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for additions outside the Rural and Urban Service Lines in the Coastal Zone, reducing the time and expense required by the applicant. ▪ Public hearing would be held only if requested. ▪ Level 5 approval would still be required for additions with the appeal jurisdiction.
3) Grading exceeding 100 cubic yards in the Coastal zone requires Coastal Approval with a public hearing (Level 5).	▪ Required grading permits addresses most grading impacts. ▪ Some impacts, such as visual impacts, are not addressed during the review of the grading permit.	▪ Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for grading in the Coastal Zone, except that grading in the appeal jurisdiction would still require a Level V Approval . ▪ Public hearing would be held only if requested.
4) County regulations require discretionary review of solar energy systems in certain areas of the Coastal Zone (Level 5 Approval).	• New California State Law does not allow discretionary review of solar energy systems. ▪ The county should remove barriers to the installation of sustainable energy systems for residences.	• Allow the installation of solar energy systems in the Coastal Zone with a building permit only. ▪ Continue to require that roof-mounted solar systems shall not exceed the height limit for the zoning district by more than 3 feet.

EXHIBIT D

Other Recommended Modifications

The proposed reforms simplify several regulations that unnecessarily create barriers to routine residential land uses

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) A discretionary permit (Level 3 Approval) is required when using an existing right-of-way less than 40 feet wide to access an existing lot of record.	Other agencies now review all building permits, and can condition building permits to address any issues with rights-of way.	Delete the requirement for a separate discretionary approval for using a less than 40-foot right of way to access an existing lot of record.
2) For properties adjacent to agricultural land, discretionary review (Level 4) is required for additions and new accessory structures within the required 200' agricultural buffer.	For properties with an existing house already in the agricultural buffer, discretionary review of additions or new accessory structures that do not extend further into the buffer area may be redundant.	• Eliminate the requirement for discretionary review of additions or accessory structures less than 1,000 square feet that extend no further into the buffer area than the current residential development. • Condition project to require the installation of a physical barrier.
3) Current regulations require an administrative approval (Level 3) for front-yard fences exceeding 3 feet in height, including front yards of "flag lots" that face another property instead of facing the street.	• Property owners of flag lots and similar lots must obtain a permit to construct privacy fences between their property and the adjacent property. • The construction of privacy fences is allowed without permits between other adjoining properties.	Allow the construction of six-foot fences in the front yard of flag lots and other lots that do not face a right of way, without requiring discretionary review or a building permit.

EXHIBIT D

Other Recommended Modifications (continued)

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
4) A ten-foot separation is currently required between water tanks on a parcel.	• The building code does not require separation between water tanks. • Eliminating the separation requirement between water tanks will not impact neighboring properties.	• Eliminate the separation requirement between water tanks.
5) Electric power is not allowed on vacant residential parcels. Separate electric service for outbuildings on developed parcels requires discretionary review with a public hearing (Level 5).	• Electric service on vacant lots can be important for fire suppression, or for allowed family gardens. • Electric service for outbuildings may be necessary for the construction of electric gates or other structures such as barns located away from the main dwelling.	• Allow low-amperage electric service under specified situations. Owner would be required to obtain all required electrical or building permits. • Require a Declaration of Restrictions to clearly indicate the allowed use of such electric service for current and future property owners, and provide for inspections.

EXHIBIT D

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

The Santa Cruz County Planning Department has reviewed the project described below and has determined that it is exempt from the provisions of CEQA as specified in Sections 15061 - 15332 of CEQA for the reason(s) which have been specified in this document.

Application Number: N/A
Assessor Parcel Numbers: Various parcels throughout County
Project Location: Countywide

Project Description: Regulatory Reform for Small-scale Residential Projects

Person or Agency Proposing Project: County of Santa Cruz

Contact Phone Number: Annie Murphy (831) 454-3111

A. ____ The proposed activity is not a project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.
B. __X__ The proposed activity is not subject ***to*** CEQA as specified under CEQA Guidelines Section 15060(c).
C. ____ **Ministerial Project** involving only the use of fixed standards **or** objective measurements without *personal judgment.*
D. ____ **Statutory Exemption** other than a Ministerial Project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15260 to 15285).
E. ____ **Categorical Exemption**

This project is exempt under CEQA section 15061 (b) **3,** a general rule which states that where it can be determined with certainty that an activity has no possibility of a significant environmental effect, the activity is not subject to CEQA.

F. Reasons why the project is exempt: The proposed ordinance amendments to regulations for accessory structures, additions, second units, and minor residential projects in the Coastal Zone will not create any additional impacts to **the** environment. **The** proposed revisions include changes in review levels, clarify existing regulations, and make the regulations easier to enforce. **The** revisions will not result in any new development that was not allowed under previous regulations. Any environmental impacts created from projects that fall under the scope of the new regulations will continue to be subject to environmental review.

Annie Murphy: Project Planner

Date: 10/11/07

EXHIBIT E

COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
701 OCEAN STREET 4TH FLOOR. SANTA CRUZ. CA 95060
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD (831) 454-2123
TOM BURNS, PLANNING DIRECTOR

August 16, 2007

AGENDA DATE: ***August* 28,2007**

Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Subject: Regulatory Reform **for** Small-Scale Residential **Projects**

Members of the Board:

On June 19th your Board conducted a study session to consider a proposal from Planning staff to methodically review, update and reform our current land use regulatory system. The main topic of that discussion was the first phase of that effort -- focused on simplifying regulations for small-scale residential projects. While there was general support for the overall reform approach, Board members raised initial questions for further staff analysis. The purpose of this letter is to respond *io* those questions and recommend refined proposals for Board consideration. Once you complete this initial discussion, staff will drafl specific regulatory changes for consideration by the Planning Commission and Board at formal public hearings.

Overview **of** Small-Scale Residential **Reforms** and June Discussion

As your Board may recall, the intent of this phase of reform is *to* streamline the planning process for small residential projects **by** eliminating unnecessary regulations, reducing the scope of certain regulations, and establishing the proper level of discretionary review required for certain types of projects. Additionally, staff suggested that significant benefits could be achieved from moving away from regulations that "pre-enforce" in favor of allowing owners more flexible use of their property, as long as those efforts are coupled with a proactive enforcementlinspection program.

Consistent with these goals, staff provided a preliminary list of possible reforms for the Board's June discussion. (The full staff report for this item is provided as Attachment 4.) In response to those suggestions, Board members provided a number of initial comments, including:

- Wanting to design the specific reforms in a fashion that does not result in increased illegal conversions of structures to more intense land uses. These concerns addressed both the scope and specifics of the reforms as well as related enforcement efforts.
- Wanting to make sure that the levels of review for specific discretionary permits are carefully selected to balance applicants' desire for a streamlined process with the

41
EXHIBIT F

interest of surrounding neighbors to have input into changes occumng in their neighborhood.

- Suggesting that these reform efforts **be** coupled with reforms **to** streamline the processing time for review **of** small-scale residential building permits.

In response to initial Board comments, staff has carefully reviewed the June proposals and is proposing some refinements to those initial suggestions, particularly with regard to regulating accessory structures. Attachment 2 provides a summary of the various reform proposals, highlighting changes made in response to the June discussion. The following discussion focuses on the substantive changes made since the June meeting.

Proposed ***Reforms*** **of** ***Accessory Structure Regulations***

A substantial portion of the June discussion focused on staffs proposal to relax accessory structure regulations to allow greater flexibility for use by owners ***of*** residential property. Board member comments ranged from questions about inducing illegal conversions to the number of accessory structures that could be allowed on any one parcel. In response to Board comments, staff has more comprehensively evaluated the range **of** regulations related to accessory structures in an attempt to address the comments and further simplify the current system and made substantial revisions to the June proposal.

The details of this revised proposal are included in Attachment 1. The proposal clarifies and categorizes the allowed features and permit requirements for non-habitable structures (not intended for sleeping) and habitable structures (structures that would allow sleeping but not independent living). These two types of accessory structures are in turn contrasted with Second Units (independent living units).

Figure 1: Summary of Proposed Accessory Structure and Second Unit Features & Related Requirements

Features	Non-Habitable[1]	Habitable	Second Units
Sink	Allowed	Allowed	Required
Insulation & Sheetrock	Allowed	Required	Required
Toilet	Not allowed[2]	Allowed	Required
Built-in Heating	Not Allowed	Required	Required
Shower/Bath	Not allowed	Not allowed	Required
Related Requirements			
Owner Residency	Not required	Not required	Required
Used for Sleeping	Not allowed	Allowed	Allowed
Parking Required	Not required	Required	Required
School/traffic Fees	Not required	Required	Required

[1] Pool cabanas would continue to allow toilets and showers, but would be limited in size and must be associated with a pool on the property.
[2] Toilets could be allowed in non-habitable structures under limited circumstances with a Level 4 approval.

41

EXHIBIT F

Attachment 1 specifies the allowed features and permit processes related to each type of accessory structure and to second units, and contrasts proposed revisions (in bold) to current regulations. Attachment 2 also contrasts the current proposal to the proposal offered in June Figure 1 summarizes the key physical features and requirements for the two categories of accessory structures and for second units.

This proposed structure is a significant simplification of the current regulations, focusing less on uses and more on physical features within the building. For example, under the proposed revisions, a homeowner wishing to construct a detached office could choose to build it as a Non-Habitable structure (not allowing a toilet or built-in heating, and not requiring insulation or sheetrock) or as a habitable structure (requiring insulation, sheetrock, and heating, and allowing a toilet). But, if they built it as a Habitable structure, they would need to build it to meet all code requirements for a sleeping space and have the flexibility of using that space for a separate bedroom in the future. Finally, if they wanted the most flexible long-term use of the structure, they could build it as a Second Unit, including a small kitchen and full bathroom. Besides providing for greater flexibility for homeowners, such a regulatory structure reduces the scope of our code enforcement efforts, focusing more on habitable features. rather than the uses (often based on the furniture present in the room).

The following discussion explains in more detail the proposed changes with regard to accessory structures and second units that have taken place since the June discussion

Allowed features and permit requirements for accessow structures

In June some Board members raised concerns about the number of accessory structures allowed on a property along with allowed features. With your Board's concerns in mind, staff has comprehensively reviewed our entire accessory structure regulations. Through this review, we considered what are legitimate desired uses for accessory structures, while at the same time attempting to avoid features that could allow such units to be easily converted into illegal separately rented dwelling units.

In our daily interactions with the public, we frequently receive requests for insulation and sheetrock in detached garages and workshops to protect belongings in these structures or simply "finish" a garage or workshop. Staff believes that this is a reasonable request and is recommending that insulation and sheetrock be allowed in all accessory structures without a discretionary permit. We also receive frequent requests for toilets in accessory structures. Staff believes that toilets should be allowed in habitable accessory structures to provide for comfortable structures with appropriate sanitary facilities. Toilets could be allowed in non-habitable structures only in limited circumstances, such as pool cabanas (by right) or in a rural setting at a specified distance from the main dwelling unit through a discretionary permit process. In response to Board comments about establishing regulations that do not too easily facilitate illegal expansions of use, staff is recommending that showers and bathtubs not be allowed in accessory structures (except in small pool cabanas and Second Units), since the presence of a shower along with a toilet, sink and heating could easily allow such units to become separate units through adding non-structural kitchen features. Built-in heating and cooling would be allowed in habitable accessory structures without requiring the owner to live on the property, but would not be allowed in non-habitable accessory structures.

41
EXHIBIT F

Finally, in response to Board comments, staff is recommending that the number of habitable accessory structures on a property (in addition to any allowed Second Unit) be limited to one with a building permit, or two through obtaining a discretionary permit.

Staff believes that these modifications, in conjunction with the provision for code compliance inspections (discussed later in this report), will allow property owners to construct more functional and comfortable accessory structures, while at the same addressing concerns regarding potential illegal conversions.

Accessory structure regulations related to density of development

Some Board members suggested that in some circumstances, less stringent review standards and requirements for accessory structures might be appropriate in less densely populated rural areas than would be appropriate in more densely populated urban areas. In response to those comments, staff is proposing to change some of the size and permit requirements for accessory structures to allow larger non-habitable structures on larger rural lots (see Attachment 1). Specifically, we are suggesting that the size limit for non-habitable accessory structures exempt from discretionary permits in rural areas on lots greater than one acre be increased from 1,000 to 1,500 square feet.

Review levels for accessory structures exceeding specified limits

Board members commented that staffs initial recommendation to require only administrative review (Level 3 approval) for accessory structures that exceed the specified size and height limits would not allow for public input on projects that could potentially impact neighborhoods. Staff concurs with this concern and has revised the permit level to Level **4** for these permits. We are also proposing that oversized non-habitable structures in the rural area be subject to a Level 3 review rather than the current Level 5. Additionally, it is suggested that habitable accessory structures built in the rural areas be allowed without a discretionary permit up to 28 feet in height, consistent with the current standards for rural Second Units and non-habitable structures.

Decks and site standards

In response to Board member's concerns that elevated decks located close to adjoining properties could be problematic for neighbors, staff is modifying earlier recommendations and will specify that decks greater than 18 inches in height must meet all site standards (Attachment 2).

Second Units

Occupancy limits

During the discussion on proposed changes to regulations on second units, the Board directed County Counsel to research whether state law authorizes local jurisdictions to set occupancy limits on second units. The State Housing Code allows a sleeping room to be occupied by one person if the room is at least 70 square feet, and by two persons if the room is at least 120 sauare feet. For each additional 50 sauare feet. the Housina Code allows an additional person to sleep in the room. In their response, County Counsel concluded the County is preempted

from adopting different standards from those set by the State Housing Code unless the County can make findings that varying from the state standards is reasonably necessary due to our particular climatic, geological, or topographical conditions (see Attachment 3).

Ownership requirements

Staff had previously recommended that a property owner must own at least 50% of the property in order to obtain a permit for a second unit. Staff is proposing to modify that proposal since it has been brought to our attention that there are many situations where property ownership may be shared among a group of individuals, each with less than 50% ownership. Rather than provide an absolute specific percentage ownership requirement, we are suggesting that ownerships of less than 50% could be required to provide more information, at the request of the Planning Director, to demonstrate the particular circumstances of that ownership interest. That would allow significant flexibility, but avoid contrived ownership structures to get around the owner-occupant requirement.

Improvements ***to*** **Code** Compliance Process

As discussed in our June report, relaxing the County's regulations to allow accessory structures to have more features than the rules presently allow will provide homeowners with greater flexibility to use their property for legitimate residential purposes. But it was argued that such changes could make it easier to convert a legal use to an illegal one. Therefore, the Board asked staff to report back on steps that could be taken to ensure that the regulatory reform effort did not result in increased frequencies of code violations.

In order to address those concerns, staff has modified the conceptual changes proposed in June to provide more definable physical distinctions between different accessory structures. As a result, the proposals downplay using features that can easily move in and out **of** a structure (like kitchens) to distinguish between legitimate and illegal uses, and instead focuses on less migratory features. particularly baths and showers. Not only will these physical distinctions be easier to enforce, but they will also help guide the nature of the use. For example, it is far less likely that a detached "bedroom" will become an illegal second unit if it does not include a shower or bath.

In addition to providing more logical and enforceable physical features to distinguish between various accessory structures, we are proposing the development of a proactive inspection program for some accessory structures that are constructed under the new rules to ensure that legitimate accessory structures and uses do not morph into illegal second units. The three basic components of such a program are discussed below.

Legal Authority

Presently, we require property owners to record a declaration of restrictions in connection with the issuance of a building permit for an accessory structure. This *form* gets recorded on title and runs with the land. These forms are effective in describing the limitations of the uses that are allowed for accessory buildings, and provide constructive notice io new owners as well. **But** the current form does not provide the authority to make periodic, proactive compliance inspections. Instead, we rely on the receipt of a complaint, and use our normal enforcement

process to investigate any report of an illegal conversion or use, including obtaining an administrative search warrant if necessary.

But with some minor modifications, the existing declaration can be amended to provide the express authority to make compliance inspections, even in the absence of a code compliance complaint. We intend to modify the current form and begin using this new form in the near future, but it's important to acknowledge that this new authority would only exist for such structures looking forward from a fixed point in time and would not extend inspection authority to previously permitted accessory structures.

Staffing Resources

As your Board is aware, our current code compliance program is responsible for the enforcement *of* violations of building, zoning, and environmental regulations throughout the County. Effectively managing the heavy workload with our existing resources is an ongoing challenge. Over the years, backlogs have developed, especially during times of staffing vacancies and turnover. Recently, we have done a better job of keeping the overall ratio of resolved violations in balance with the rate of new complaints, so that the backlog is not growing by any significant degree.

In our judgment, adding the additional responsibility for proactive inspections to the existing staff would be problematic and ineffective in light of their current caseloads. It is clear that the existing code staffs attention should continue to be devoted to cases where there is a citizen or neighborhood complaint, a confirmed violation, and a legitimate public expectation for the County to take whatever action is necessary to compel the property owner to resolve the violation.

Therefore, we believe that the best way to start a proactive inspection program is to over time expand current staff resources and create a compliance inspections program. This will ensure that we can make timely compliance inspections for all newly permitted accessory structures and take appropriate follow-up enforcement action when a violation **is** discovered. We will work with the County Administrative Office to consider such a position in our FY **2008-09** budget for the Planning Department.

Financing

The costs of a new position might be partially offset through inspection fees or the dedicated use *of* fines or penalties, but it is likely that there will be a general fund cost to sustain this function. Enforcement efforts do not typically pay for themselves. But we will survey other California cities and counties to find out how any other local agencies have financed such programs in their jurisdictions, and we will discuss and explore financing options with the County Administrative Office as part of the development of our FY **2008-09** budget.

Streamlining the Building Permit Process

As part of the June Board discussion, staff was asked to evaluate whether companion simplifications could be made to the building permit process for small-scale residential structures to simplify that process as well. In response to that request, staff has developed a

concept for simplifying the review process that would require reducing the scope of outside agency reviews for small residential structures (<500 square feet) and prioritize Planning staff resources to accelerate the review of such projects. For such a change to be successful, it will be essential to eliminate or dramatically simplify the review of these permits that currently are done by Public Works, General Services, and the various fire departments. We will continue to work on possible process simplifications and report back *to* you on these efforts when the other regulatory reforms come back before you for final action.

In addition you asked staff to research whether the County could eliminate building permit requirements for roofs and water heaters. The 2001 California Building Code specifically require building permits for new roofs, re-roofing, and installation of water heaters. State Law does not allow local jurisdictions *to* exempt such construction projects from permit requirements. Additionally, requiring permits for roofs and water heaters is important for safety reasons. Roofs that are not rated for fire safety can be combustible and pose significant fire dangers, and improperly installed roofs can compromise the structural stability of a building. For new water heaters, gas lines must be inspected to ensure that they are properly installed and do not pose a fire danger, proper ventilation must be achieved to avoid fire risks, and the water heaters must be strapped to meet seismic safety standards. In recognition of the small-scale nature and cost of these improvements, your Board has established building fees at below our full cost recovery for these two unique types of construction projects. Finally, these permits are handled as Over-the-counter Permits, allowing very fast permit issuance.

Conclusion/Recommendation

Staff believes that the modified regulatory reform proposals for small-scale residential projects will provide greater flexibility and a more streamlined planning process for property owners. while providing sufficient opportunities for public participation in the planning process, limiting opportunities for illegal conversion of structures *to* dwelling units, and protecting neighborhood character, public health and safety, and the environment.

It is therefore RECOMMENDED that your Board take the following actions:

1. Approve the concepts described in this letter for small-scale residential regulatory reform (illustrated in Attachment 2);

2. Direct staff to develop ordinance amendmenis to implement the modifications recommended in this report for review and comment by the Planning Commission and your Board as part of formal public hearings;

3. Direct staff *to* coordinate with other reviewing departments and agencies to simplify the building permit review process for small-scale residential projects, with the goal of eliminating outside agency reviews of these structures, with a further report on this item to be provided at the time of the public hearing on the proposed ordinance amendments; and

4. Direct the CAO and Planning Director to address the issue and staff and associated financing for the inspection/code enforcement aspect of this program as part of the *FY* 2008-09 Budget proposal.

EXHIBIT F

Sincerely,

Tom Burns
Planning Director

RECOMMENDED:

Susan A. Mauriello
County Administrative Officer

Attachment 1 – Existing and Proposed Requirements for Accessory Structures
Attachment 2 – Summary of Proposed Regulatory Reforms
Attachment 3 – Letter from County Counsel
Attachment 4 – Letter of the Planning Director dated June 5, 2007

cc: County Counsel
Planning Commission
Board of Realtors – Phil Tedesco
Coastal Commission

41

EXHIBIT F

ATTACHMENT 1

EXISTING AND PROPOSED REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND SECOND UNITS (Changes in **bold**)

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE	SECOND UNITS
EXAMPLES OF USES:	Workshop or office (unheated), barn, detached garage, pool cabana	Heated office, heated workshop, detached bedroom, art studio, guest house	Independent dwelling unit – Can be rented to a separate household
SINK	Allowed	Allowed	Required
TOILET	Currently: Not allowed, except for pool cabanas **Proposed: Level 4 (public notice), must meet certain criteria. (Pool cabanas: Allow with Building Permit)**	Currently: Not allowed **Proposed: Allow with Building Permit**	Required
SHOWER/ BATHTUB	Not allowed, except for pool cabanas	Not allowed	Required
WASHER/ DRYER AND WATER HEATER	Allowed	Allowed	Allowed
INSULATION/ SHEET ROCK	Currently: Either sheetrock or insulation allowed, but not both **Proposed: Allow both**	Currently: Allowed **Proposed: Required**	Required
BUILT IN HEATING/COOLING	Not allowed	Currently: Allowed **Proposed: Heating required**	Heating required
OWNER REQUIRED TO LIVE ON PROPERTY IF HEATED/ COOLED?	(Not applicable)	Currently: Required **Proposed: Not required**	Owner required to live on property
USE FOR SLEEPING PURPOSES	Not allowed (deed restriction)	Allowed	Allowed

EXHIBIT F

0481

	NON-HABITABLE	HABITABLE	SECOND UNITS
PERMIT REQUIRED – MEETS SIZE RESTRICTIONS	Currently: Urban: Building Permit (BP) only for carports, garages etc, up to 640 sq ft., 28' height 1,000 sq ft, 28 ft height allowed for animal enclosures. Rural: BP for 1,000 sq ft, 28 ft height. **Proposed: Urban: 640 sq ft for all non-habitable accessory structures. Rural: Allow 1,000 sq ft on lots less than 1 acre, and 1,500 sq ft on lots 1 acre or greater.**	Building Permit (BP) for up to 640 sq ft, 1 story,17 ft height (urban and rural). **Proposed: Allow 28 ft height in rural areas.**	Urban: Building Permit (BP) for 640 sq ft, 17 ft height, 1 story. Rural: 28 ft height allowed. Larger size limits depending on size of parcel.
PERMIT REQUIRED – EXCEEDS SIZE RESTRICTIONS	Currently: Level 5, but Level 3 in RA zone (residential agriculture). **Proposed: Level 3 in rural areas. Level 4 (public notice) in urban areas.**	Currently: Level 5 (public hearing). **Proposed: Level 4 (public notice).**	Currently: Level 5 (public hearing) to exceed 17' height or 1 story in urban areas. **Proposed: Lower approval to Level 4 (public notice) to exceed specified height and story limit in urban areas.**
NUMBER OF UNITS ALLOWED	No set limit – (Number limited by lot coverage requirements)	Currently: One with BP, more than 1 with Level 5 approval **Proposed**: 1 with BP, **Maximum of 2 with discretionary permit (Level 4 – public notice)**	One only
PARKING AND IMPACT FEES REQUIRED?	No	Required based on number of potential bedrooms	Required based on number of potential bedrooms

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED REGULATORY REFORMS: SMALL SCALE RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS

Notes: Changes from earlier proposals are in **bold type**
~~Strikeout text~~ represents language deleted from earlier proposal

Accessory Structures (art studios, detached garages, workshops, detached bedrooms, etc.)

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Bathrooms are prohibited in most habitable and non-habitable accessory structures such as guest houses, detached offices and art studios.	• Prohibitions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. • Not effective at preventing illegal conversions. • Property owners are prevented from constructing fully functional and comfortable accessory structures with appropriate sanitation facilities.	• ~~Allow bathrooms with showers and baths in habitable and non-habitable accessory structures with a building permit.~~ • Allow sinks in all accessory structures (building permit only). • **Allow toilets** in **habitable** accessory structures with a building permit only. • **Allow toilets under certain circumstances in non-habitable accessory structures with a Level 4 approval.** • **Allow exception for toilets and showers in pool cabanas.** • Continue to require deed restrictions prohibiting illegal conversions, **and provide for inspections.**
2) In urban and rural areas, height of habitable accessory structures is limited to 17 feet and one story.	• In rural areas, height requirements for second units, non-habitable accessory structures, and second units are inconsistent.	• **In rural areas only, increase height allowed for habitable accessory structures to 28 ft.**
3) Habitable accessory structures exceeding the specified size, height and number of stories require a public hearing (Level 5).	• Public hearings are generally not necessary, since most new accessory structures create few impacts and are non- controversial. • The approval process is unnecessarily expensive and time- consuming for owner.	• Eliminate the requirement for a public hearing, **but require discretionary review with pubic noticing (Level 4).** • **Public hearings could be held for controversial projects, at the discretion of the Planning Director.**
4) Property owners must live on site in order to install heating or cooling systems in a habitable accessory structure.	• See issues above under bathrooms. • This requirement is difficult to enforce.	• Require heating systems, and allow cooling systems, to be installed in habitable accessory structures with a building permit, and do not require owner-occupancy on the property. • Continue to require deed restrictions **and provide for inspections of habitable accessory structures.**
5) A residential habitable accessory structure is not allowed on properties with a second unit. More than 2 habitable accessory structures require a Level 5 approval (public hearing).	• Restrictions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. • Restrictions prevent property owner from making full use of their property. • Example: Owner cannot have a both a second unit and a heated workshop.	• Allow the construction of habitable accessory structures on a property with a second unit. • Require a building permit only for one habitable accessory structure, **and allow a maximum of 2 with a discretionary permit (Level 4).** • Continue to require deed restrictions to prevent illegal conversions to dwelling units, and provide for inspections.

ssory Structures (continued)

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
6) Non-habitable accessory structures such as detached garages and workshops are not allowed to have both sheetrock and insulation.	• Prohibitions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. • Many property owners want to finish non-habitable structures such as garages with sheetrock and insulation.	• **Allow non-habitable accessory structures to be finished with sheetrock and insulation.** • Continue to require deed restrictions prohibiting the conversion of non-habitable accessory structures to habitable uses, **and provide for inspections.**
7) • **In rural areas, non-habitable accessory structures are limited to 1,000 sq ft, regardless of lot size.** • Non-habitable accessory structures exceeding the specified size limits require Level 3 Approval in RA (residential agriculture) zones, and public hearing (Level 5) in all other zones.	• On large rural properties, property owners frequently need barns or other structures larger than 1,000 sq ft. • On large rural properties, larger non-habitable accessory structures generally do not impact neighboring properties.	• **On rural properties 1 acre or greater, allow non-habitable accessory structures up to 1,500 square feet with a building permit only.** • **In rural areas, require a Level 3 (administrative) approval for non-habitable accessory structures that exceed specified size limits.**
8) • **In urban areas, size of non-habitable accessory structures such as garages and carports is limited to 640 sq ft.** • **Allowed size of animal enclosures is 1,000 sq ft.** • Level 5 approval (public hearing) required for non-habitable structures in urban areas exceeding specified limits.	• Different size limits for animal enclosures and other types of non-habitable accessory structures lead to confusion for applicants. • Non-habitable accessory structures that exceed size limits typically generate few impacts, and do not require public hearings.	• **In urban areas, limit size of all non-habitable accessory structures to 640 sq ft., including animal enclosures.** • **Require Level 4 approval (public noticing) for non-habitable accessory structures in urban areas that exceed specified size limits.**
9) All structures greater than 18" in height must meet all site regulations, including setback and lot coverage requirements.	• Definition of structure is overly restrictive. • Objects that have no potential to impact neighboring properties, such as bird baths and 5-foot garden trellises, are considered structures and are prohibited in side or rear yards.	• Allow objects less than 6 feet in height that do not create health and safety or other impacts to be placed in side and rear yards. • Examples: Garden trellises, garden statuary, play equipment, and ground-mounted solar systems less than 6 feet in height. **Decks taller than 18" would not be allowed in side and rear yards.**

Second Units

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Property owners must reside on the property in order to obtain a permit for a second unit.	• Difficult for developers of new subdivisions to construct second units, since they do not live on the property. • Restrictions on second units in new subdivisions limit a significant potential source of second units in the County. • Second units planned during subdivision process can be better integrated into the surrounding neighborhood than those constructed after the subdivision has been built.	• Continue to require that the property owner live on-site in order to construct a second unit, but allow an exception for developers of second units within new subdivisions.
2) Ordinance does not specify the level of financial interest required by a property owner to meet the owner occupancy requirements for a second unit permit.	• Owner with 1% interest in property who lives on property meets owner occupancy requirements under current regulations. • Property ownership requirements can be difficult to quantify, since there may be circumstances where there are several legitimate property owners.	• ~~Property owner must maintain at least a 50% ownership in the property to meet owner residency requirements for a second unit permit.~~ • **To verify the owner residency requirements for a second unit permit, the Planning Director may require an applicant with less than 50% ownership in the property to demonstrate a substantial financial interest in the property.**
3) Second units can be occupied only by qualifying households. The rent charged for second units cannot exceed certain levels.	• Restrictions on occupancy and rent levels may act as disincentives for the construction of new second units. • Occupancy and rent level restrictions are not accomplishing the intended goal of ensuring that second units are rented primarily by low- income or senior households.	• Eliminate occupancy and rent-level restrictions for second units, in order to encourage the construction of more second units.
4) Level 5 approval required for second units that exceed 17' height limit in urban areas.	• Neighborhood impacts of second units 28 ft in height are likely to be minimal. • Requiring public hearings (level 5 approval) for units taller than 17 feet in urban areas may discourage the construction of second units on properties with limited lot coverage.	• Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for second units exceeding 17 feet in height in urban areas.
5) No more than 5 second units per year may be constructed in the Live Oak area.	• Infrastructure improvements in Live Oak over the past 20 years have eliminated the need for the annual cap on second units in Live Oak. • Property owners in all areas of the County should have the opportunity to construct new second units.	• Eliminate the annual cap on second units in the Live Oak area.

EXHIBIT F

Non-conforming Structures

After numerous amendments to the original County Zoning Code enacted in 1958, the number of residential non-conforming structures - structures that do not conform to the current height, setback, lot coverage, or floor area ratio requirements- continues to increase. The proposed reforms are intended to make it easier for residential property owners to make needed repairs and other improvements to their residences.

[illegible] regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Conforming additions greater than 800 square feet to non-conforming structures require discretionary approval (Level 4).	• Conforming additions generally create few impacts, and such projects are rarely conditioned, so that discretionary review is not needed. • Restrictions on size of additions and permit requirements are especially burdensome to owners of smaller non- conforming residences.	• Allow conforming additions of any size to non-conforming residence with a building permit only.
[illegible]	[illegible] difficult to	• Treat structures exceeding the height limit by more than 5 feet like other non-conforming structures, allowing owners to make needed repairs and alterations, and construct conforming additions, with a building permit only.

Coastal Regulations

The proposed reforms of coastal regulations are intended to make it easier for residential property owners to make small-scale improvements to their property.

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
1) Demolition of structures in rural areas of the Coastal Zone requires discretionary approval with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval).	• Demolition generally creates few impacts. • Discretionary review with a public hearing is not necessary for most demolition projects.	• Exclude most demolition from requiring a Coastal Approval (would still require demolition permit). • Continue to require Coastal Approval for demolition on sensitive sites such as biotic habitats, and for historic structures.
2) Additions greater than 500 square feet in rural areas in the Coastal Zone require discretionary review with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval).	▪ Impacts of such additions are generally minor. ▪ Potential project impacts, including visual impacts, could be fully addressed with a lower level of discretionary review, and do not require a public hearing.	• Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for rural additions in the Coastal Zone, reducing the time and expense required by the applicant. • Public hearing would be held only if requested.
3) Grading exceeding 100 cubic yards in the Coastal zone requires Coastal Approval with a public hearing (Level 5).	▪ Required grading permits addresses most grading impacts. ▪ Some impacts, such as visual impacts, are not addressed during the review of the grading permit.	• Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for grading in the Coastal Zone. • Public hearing would be held only if requested.
4) County regulations require discretionary review of solar energy systems in certain areas of the Coastal Zone (Level 5 Approval).	• New California State Law does not allow discretionary review of solar energy systems. • The county should remove barriers to the installation of sustainable energy systems for residences.	• Allow the installation of solar energy systems in the Coastal Zone with a building permit only. • Continue to require that solar systems shall not exceed the height limit for the zoning district by more than 3 feet.

Other Recommended Modifications

The proposed reforms simplify several regulations that unnecessarily create barriers to routine residential land uses

Current regulations		
1) A discretionary permit (Level 3 Approval) is required when using a right-of-way less than 40 feet wide to access an existing lot of record.	Other agencies now review all building permits, and can condition building permits to address any issues with rights-of way.	Delete the requirement for a separate discretionary approval for using a less than 40-foot right of way to access an existing lot of record.
2) For properties adjacent to agricultural land, discretionary review (Level 4) is required for additions and new accessory structures within the required 200' agricultural buffer.	For properties with an existing house already in the agricultural buffer, discretionary review of additions or new accessory structures that do not extend further into the buffer area may be redundant.	• Eliminate the requirement for discretionary review of additions or accessory structures less than 1,000 square feet that extend no further into the buffer area than the current residential development. • Condition project to require the installation of a physical barrier.
3) Current regulations require an administrative approval (Level 3) for front-yard fences exceeding 3 feet in height, including front yards of "flag lots" that face another property instead of facing the street.	• Property owners of flag lots and similar lots must obtain a permit to construct privacy fences between their property and the adjacent property. • The construction of privacy fences is allowed without permits between other adjoining properties.	Allow the construction of six-foot fences in the front yard of flag lots and other lots that do not face a right of way without requiring discretionary review or a building permit.
4) Current regulations require an administrative approval (Level 3) for front-yard fences exceeding 3 feet in height, but required pool barriers must be at least 4 feet in height.	Since County regulations require pool barriers to be at least 4 feet, approval of required pool barriers is always granted and administrative approval should not be required.	• Eliminate the requirement for administrative approval for required pool barriers in front yards **with existing pools.** • Require that pool barriers in front yards be constructed with materials that do not obstruct site distance.

0489

Other Recommended Modifications (continued)

Current regulations	Issues	Proposed reforms
5) A ten-foot separation is currently required between structures on a parcel, and also between water tanks on a parcel.	• The building code requires only a six-foot separation between structures, and does not require separation between water tanks. • Reducing the required separation between structures to 6 feet, and allowing zero separation between water tanks, will not impact neighboring properties.	• Require only 6-feet between structures located on a property. • Eliminate the separation requirement between water tanks.
6) Electric power is not allowed on vacant residential parcels. Separate electric service for outbuildings on developed parcels requires discretionary review with a public hearing (Level 5).	• Electric service on vacant lots can be important for fire suppression, or for allowed family gardens. • Electric service for outbuildings may be necessary for the construction of electric gates or other structures such as barns located away from the main dwelling.	• Allow low-amperage electric service under specified situations. • Require a Declaration of Restrictions to clearly indicate the allowed use of such electric service for current and future property owners, and provide for inspections.

ATTACHMENT

0490

COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

701 OCEAN STREET, SUITE 505, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4068
(831) 454-2040 FAX: (831) 454-2115

DANA MCRAE, *COUNTY* COUNSEL

Chief Assistant
Rahn Garcia

Marie Costa
Jane M. Scott
Tamyra Rice
Julia Hill

Assistants
Shannon M. Sullivan
Miriam L. Stombler
Jason M. Heath
Christopher R. Cheleden
Betsy L. Allen
David Brick
Jessica C. Espinoza
Sharon Carey-Stronck

Special Counsel
Dwight Herr
Deborah Steen
Samuel Torres, Jr.

August 14,2007
Agenda: August 28,2007

Board of Supervisors
county of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street, Room 500
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: AUTHORITY OF COUNTY TO LIMIT THE OCCUPANCY OF SECOND UNITS

Dear Members of the Board:

On June 19,2007, your Board directed this Office to prepare a report on the authority of the County to place occupancy limits on second unit dwellings. As explained below, the State Housing Law sets occupancy limits for residential units and the County is preempted from adopting a more restrictive standard unless certain findings can be made to justify varying from the state standard.

1. Existing County Imposed Occupancy Limits

The regulations pertaining to second units are found under **$13.10.681** of the Santa Cruz County Code. Subsection (e)(1) of that section limits occupancy of second units as follows:

> The maximum occupancy of a second unit may not exceed that allowed by the State Uniform Housing Code, or other applicable state law, based on the unit size and number of bedrooms in the unit.

Under the state standard established by the State Housing Law, every dwelling unit is required to have at least one room with a minimum of 120 square feet of floor space; other habitable rooms are required to have an area of at least 70 square feet; and in any room used for sleeping purposes, the required floor area must be increased at the rate of 50 square feet for each occupant in excess of two. Different rules apply in the case of "efficiency units".

EXHIBIT F

ATTACHMENT 3

In ***Briseno v.*** **City** *of Santa* ***Ana*** (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1378, the Court expressly held that the occupancy standards in the State Housing Code generally preempt local ordinances with regard to occupancy. Although State law authorizes local governments to modify provisions in the uniform building codes, any such changes must be reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological, or topographical conditions (Health & Safety Code Sections 17958.5 and 17958.7). The ***Briseno*** Court observed that **it** would be "highly unlikely, if not impossible", that the City of Santa *Ana* could make such findings regarding its climate, geology, or topography to justify a change in the Statewide occupancy standards. (Supra at 1386, fn 3). The ***Briseno*** **ruling** on preemption was based on an analysis of the changing nature of the State Housing Code, which will now be briefly reviewed.

2. Historical Development of the State Housing Law

The State Housing Law presently constitutes a legislative design to secure uniform building standards throughout the state and to preempt local differences, except **as** specifically authorized by it.

A. Pre-1970 Law. Prior to 1970, the State Housing Law, although detailed and comprehensive, had not preempted the field of building safety standards because it specifically authorized local governments to enact building regulations imposing standards that were "equal to or greater" than those adopted by the state and it made the state **standards** inapplicable in those local jurisdictions which did *so.*

B. 1970 Legislative Changes. In 1970, however, the Legislature substantially revised the State Housing Law in order to establish a general **uniformity** of building standards throughout the state in matters such **as** safety and structure of buildings, details of construction, use of materials, and electrical, plumbing and heating specifications. (Stats. 1970, ch. 1436, § 7, p. 2786). **It** (1) directed the State Department of Housing and Community Development to adopt rules and regulations imposing "the same requirements" that are contained in various uniform industry building codes (Stats. 1970, ch. 1436, § 1, p. 2785, amending § 17922, subd. (a)); and then **(2)** it removed the authority of cities and counties to adopt more stringent building standards and required instead that every city and county adopt ordinances or regulations imposing those same requirements **within** their jurisdictions within one year, or they would be made applicable in them at that time by force of law (*id.,* **§ 3,** p. 2786, adding § 17958).

When it adopted the 1970 amendments to the State Housing Act, the Legislature declared that "the uniformity of codes throughout the State . . . [was] a matter of statewide interest and concern since it would reduce housing costs and increase the efficiency of the private housing construction industry and its production" and that such "uniformity [could] be achieved within a framework of local autonomy, by allowing local governments to adopt changes making modifications in [the] codes based on differences in local conditions. . . ." (Stats. 1970, ch. 1436).

EXHIBIT F
41

ATTACHMENT

0492

In 60 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 234 (1977) the Attorney General pointed out that the utilization of the uniform codes was an attempt to reduce housing costs by reducing production costs and increasing the efficiency of the housing industry. *(Id.*, at 237.) By allowing the industry to rely on a single set of standards rather than a different one for every area, it could develop more economical and efficient approaches to basic design, construction techniques and materials. *(Id.*, at 238.) Of course another purpose underlying the building regulations was the protection of the public health and safety. The Attorney General also noted that since uniform codes were based on professional expertise, research and testing that is not routinely available to local agencies, the adoption of statewide Uniform standards would also serve that end.

But even then local jurisdictions were allowed wide latitude to deviate from the standards established under the State Housing Law. This is because while the 1970 amendments to the Law were designed to secure a uniformity of codes throughout the State, the Legislature showed a "sensitivity to, and deference for, local conditions and needs." (See ***Baum Electric*** Co ***v. City of Huntington Beach (1973)*** 33 Cal.App.3d 513, 584.) In 55 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 157 (1972), the Attorney General opined that the former provision demonstrated an intention to allow cities and counties to adopt regulations with additional or more restrictive building standards than those set by the state ***(id.,*** at 160-161), and in 54 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 87 (1971), the Attorney General said that the latter provision meant that the law's requirement for uniformity did not apply to building activity that was already regulated by an existing local regulation enacted on or before November 23, 1970.

C. 1980 Legislative Changes. Significantly, in 1980 the Legislature (1) amended section 17958.5 of the State Housing Law to severely limit the types of local conditions for which local agencies could deviate from statewide building standards (Stats. 1980, ch. 130, p. 303, § 2; ***Stats.*** 1980, ch. 1238, p. 4203, § 9), and (2) the Legislature deleted the exception from the requirement of uniformity previously found in section 17958.7 for nonconforming local building regulations that were enacted on or before November 23, 1970 (Stats. 1980, ch. 1295, p. 4381, § 1). These changes expanded the reach of state preemption in the field of building standard regulation. As amended, section 17958.5 permits a city or county to make changes or modifications to the building standards under limited circumstances when it determines they are "reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological, *or* topographical conditions" (§ 17958.5).

Since the 1980 legislative changes to § 17958.5, there have been few cases analyzing how local governments may vary from the State Housing Law due to "local conditions". In *Abs Inst. v.* City *of Lancaster* (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 285, the Court upheld the City's prohibition against the use of acrylonitrile-butadiene-styrene (ABS) cellular pipe finding that it was not preempted by the state building code. The City based its prohibition on unchallenged testimony that the prevalence of major earthquake faults in the area and related health and safety reasons justified its deviation from state standards based on local geologic conditions.

41

EXHIBIT F

ATTACHMENT

The reasoning employed in the ***Briseno*** decision was cited with approval in ***College Area Renters and Landlord Association v. City of San Diego*** (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 543. In the *San Diego* case, the Court struck down a City ordinance setting occupancy limits on the number of persons who could live in a nonowner occupied residence on the grounds that it irrationally distinguished between owner and nonowner occupied residences in violation of the equal protection clause of the California Constitution. After deciding that the City's ordinance was unlawful due to an equal protection violation, the Court went on to evaluate the preemption challenge brought by the ***Landlord Association*** as well. Although considered dicta, the Court concluded, in accord with ***Briseno,*** that the City was preempted from addressing neighborhood-overcrowding problems via residential occupancy standards that varied from those imposed by the state

Finally, the court in ***Building Industry Association of Northern California v. City of Livermore*** (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 719, upheld the City's stricter standards for automatic fire-extinguishing systems. However, the ***Building Industry Association*** did not challenge the sufficiency of the § 17958.5 findings made by the City, but instead argued that residential fire sprinkler systems were not subject to § 17958.5 and thus the City was not permitted to adopt a standard that varied from the state.

3. Conclusion

The State Housing Law sets occupancy limits for residential units and the County is preempted from adopting a different standard unless the County can make findings that varying from the state standards is reasonably necessary due to our particular climatic, geological, or topographical conditions. This would appear very difficult in light of the logic of the ***Briseno*** decision.

DANA MCRAE, COUNTY COUNSEL

By _____
Rahn Garcia
Chief Deputy County Counsel

RECOMMENDED:

_____
SUSAN A. MAURIELLO
County Administrative Officer

cc: Tom Bums, Planning Director

EXHIBIT F

41

ATTACHMENT 0494

COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
701 OCEAN STREET, 4TH FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123
TOM BURNS, PLANNING DIRECTOR

June 5,2007

AGENDA DATE: June **19,2007**

Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Subject: Study Session **to Consider Proposals** for Land **Use** Regulatory Reform

Members of the Board:

As Board members are aware, over the course of the past several years the Planning Department has focused on a number of initiatives to improve customer services, including instituting more efficient systems at our permit centers, formalizing **a** method for developing and memorializing policy interpretations, simplifying permit review processes, and bringing forward minor changes lo our regulatory system. The purpose **of this** letter is to initiate the next stage of that process – proposing more significant changes **lo** the regulatory system to reduce the scope **of** land use regulation. Because of the nature of **the** recommendations, staff has scheduled this for a Study Session, providing Board members with a chance to receive a presentation on the item, consider initial public comments, and have staff return in August for more formal discussion and action. Only after action is taken at the August meeting would staff draft specific policy amendments for formal consideration by the Planning Commission and Board at public hearings in future months.

Background

While there is broad community support for the concept of protecting the environment, the character of our neighborhoods, and public health and safety, there are widely divergent points of view of how that can best be achieved in our community. As a result. opinions vary widely with regard to the proper level of regulation that should take place **in** Santa Cruz County for proposed land use activities. While most residents would recognize the need for a very thorough process for larger development projects – subdivisions and large commercial projects -- the supporl for time-consuming and costly processes wanes as *the* scope of the project reduces in scale

Over the years the Board has discussed the issue of regulatory reform; but those efforts have never materialized as there has not been agreement on the approach and scope of such an effort. Often past discussions have focused on wholesale revisions of Volume 2 of the County Code – a lengthy document that contains most of the County's land use regulations. It is no surprise that such approaches have floundered due to the sheer magnitude of such an endeavor.

Over the past year Planning Department staff has evaluated approaches for initiating such reforms. In developing a proposal for how to undertake a review of our regulations, it's importanl to remember that the department must dedicate a majority of its resources to processing pending development applications. As a result, any regulatory reform effort must be designed to be supported by a limited but sustained staff effort over time. Therefore, rather than taking a wholesale approach to code revisions, we are suggesting that efforts be focused *in* smaller more digestible thematic packages of reform concepts. Such an approach would allow your Board to engage in a focused manner on thematic areas, with an early emphasis on those areas of our regulations that impact the greatest number of local residents.

In evaluating how such an approach might operate, staff is suggesting that the initial thematic groups include the following topics, in the order noted:

- Small-scale residential issues, including related structures;
- Small-scale commercial issues, particularly streamlining processes for tenant turnover and reuse of existing commercial buildings; and
- Non-conforming building and use issues – both for residential and commercial activities.

Based on the success of these efforts, additional categories would be identified in the future.

Goals of Reform Effort

It is important to understand that the focus of these efforts is to reduce the scope of regulatory process while not sacrificing reasonable protection of the community's values. That said, it is equally important to understand that true reform cannot be accomplished without revisiting fundamental philosophical underpinnings of the current regulatory system. In other words, it will be essential, as we undertake any reform effort, to clearly understand the regulatory goal and the best approach to accomplish those goals, being mindful of the impact on affected property owners. For example, there are multiple approaches for addressing concerns about possible future conversions of workshops and garages to illegal living areas. On one hand, the regulations can be designed, as they currently are, to closely scrutinize every proposed accessory structure, subject many to public hearings, and limit the use of insulation, sheetrock, and plumbing fixtures. Alternatively, with the proper code enforcement effort, the regulation of such structures could be minimal, allowing property owners more latitude to meet their needs (within the limits *of* the code) and the County to focus resources on the small percentage of property owners who actually undertake illegal conversions of structures in the future.

In addition, there are a number of current regulations that made good sense at the time that they were developed but, with events that have occurred over the years, no longer do. For example, it was understandable why the Board wanted to limit the number of Second Unit permits in the Live Oak area back when there were significant infrastructure shortfall issues. However, in spite *of* the substantial investment of the Redevelopment Agency in area infrastructure and changes in State law with regard to Second Units, the regulations limiting he issuance of Second Unit permits in Live Oak remain on the books.

EXHIBIT F
41

ATTACHMENT

0496

As staff considers input from users of the system and develops recommendations for your Board's consideration, the basis for recommended changes is proposed to include the following

- Eliminating/modifying outdated regulations.
- Eliminating/modifying regulations that result in significant process costs and delays but typically no change to the ultimate project.
- Simplifying the process for applications requiring discretionary review to the lowest practical level of review to reduce applicant costs and delays.
- Resolving internal inconsistencies between regulations in different parts of the code.
- Shifting the philosophical underpinnings of the regulations to focus on regulating high-probability events and utilize the code enforcement program **to** address low probability events.

Timing for Overall Regulatory **Reform** Proposals

Given the time available to pursue the proposed overall regulatory reform process in the context of other project commitments, staff is proposing the following general schedule for considering the three first phases of reform discussed earlier. That schedule is as follows:

Topic Area	Initial Concept to Board	Possible Final Board Action
Small-scale Residential Issues	June 2007	Late 2007
Small-scale Commercial Issues	Late 2007	Spring 2008
Non-conforming Uses/Bldgs	Spring 2008	Fall 2008

Overview of Small **Scale** Residential **Issues**

Inquiries and permit requests for small-scale residential projects comprise the largest percentage of daily visits to the Planning Department. These every-day sorts of projects bring many residential property owners in the community **to** the Planning Department–some for the first time. Partly as a result of the difficulty in buying up to larger homes, many homeowners come to the County looking for ways to expand use from their older homes. Typical requests include: an owner wishing lo build an art studio; a family that wants to add a room to an older home that does not conform to current height requirements; or a resident needing to add a minor addition on their home adjacent to farmland. While such applications appear very minor in nature, under our current regulations they oftentimes run into significant regulatory hurdles and extensive process issues. **As** a result, the potential applicants are frustrated by the costs, time delays and process. Such situations lead the public to question the value of the County's land use regulations and reflect poorly on the County in general. Additionally, such frustration can lead to property owners proceeding with the work outside of the **permit** process.

Based on the goals stated above, extensive internal staff discussions, and years of feedback from applicants using the current system, staff has identified a number of areas that we believe need to be addressed to reform the process for small-scale residential structures. In every instance the recommendations either substantially reduce or eliminate staff review, process and costs for applicants. The various proposals, which are described in more detail in Attachment 1, are summarized below.

41

EXHIBIT F

ATTACHMENT 4

0497

Changes for Accessory Structures

Accessory structures (detached from the main residence) -- whether for habitable use (art studios, offices, etc.) or non-habitable (garages, workshops, etc.) – are common features of most residential properties. In reviewing current regulations, it is clear that significant process was created with the intention of discouraging future illegal conversion of such structures. As a result, many well-intentioned homeowners are surprised at the regulatory barriers and intense process connected with relatively minor proposals for accessory structures. Staff believes that many of the current limitations can be reduced and thereby simplify the current processes. Those include:

- Lowering the level of discretionary review for habitable accessory structures exceeding 640 square feet in size or non-habitable structures exceeding 1,000 square feet or 17 feet in height from a Level V (ZA public hearing) to Level III (administrative review).

- Eliminating the requirement that an owner live on-site in order to permit habitable accessory structures to have heating or cooling features.

- Allowing bathrooms to be installed in accessory structures, under certain circumstances, solely with a required deed restriction, but not a discretionary permit

- Allowing multiple habitable accessory structures to be built on the same property with the requirement of a deed restriction.

- Allowing many structures less than six feel in height (fence height or lower) to be allowed in side and rear yard setbacks without variances.

Chanaes to Regulations Related to Second Units

The County's Housing Element calls for the County to encourage the construction of second units, yet there remain significant barriers to second unit construction. Staff is suggesting the following changes to enhance use of second units as a key source of rental housing:

- Deleting the affordability requirements and occupancy restrictions for renters of second units, allowing units to be rented at market rate to any household without oversight by the County, but ensuring oversight by the homeowner by retaining the requirement for the owner to reside on the property.

- Lowering the level of review for second units exceeding 17 feet in height from Level V (ZA hearing) to Level IV (public notice, which can lead to ZA hearing).

- Eliminatina the current annual limit of five second unit permits per year within the Live Oak Planing Area

EXHIBIT F

41

Non-Conforming Structures

While more comprehensive changes to the non-conforming regulations are envisioned for a future round of policy changes, there are two areas that staff believes should be addressed at this time, as part of the residential changes

- Allowing, without any discretionary permit, all conforming additions to non-conforming residential structures.

- Eliminating the Level V (ZA hearing) discretionary permit required to allow routine maintenance and repairs to structures that exceed the height limit by more than five feet by eliminating the requirement for a Level V discretionary permit.

Coastal Regulations

The County's coastal regulations present a number of challenges to homeowners wishing to do some relatively routine activities. As a result, staff is proposing:

- Allowing coastal exclusions for demolition of structures in rural portions of the Coastal Zone without coastal permits.

- Simplifying the coastal permit requirements for small residential additions and related grading activities.

- Exempting *most* solar energy systems from Level V (ZA hearing) coastal permits.

Other Changes

In addition to the four broad areas discussed above, staff is proposing amendments to the current regulations with several additional proposals that we believe unnecessarily create barriers to routine residential land uses:

- Eliminating the requirement for a discretionary permit for use of a right-of-way that is less than 40 feet in width.

- Eliminating the requirement for Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) review of agricultural buffer issues in instances where small-scale residential additions or new accessory structures do not further encroach into the agricultural buffer setback than the existing residence.

- Allowing six loot fences in front yards of flag lots without requiring an over height fence permit.

- Providing consistency between the building and zoning codes with regard to setbachs between structures and between water tanks. by reducing the setback standards required by the zoning ordinance.

41

EXHIBIT F

- Exempting front yard fencing required to comply with the County's swimming pool barriers policy from overheight fence permits.

- Allowing, in limited situations, the installation of electrical service on vacant properties

While these changes individually may appear to be minor in nature, cumulatively the proposed revisions would, if approved, substantially reduce the number of discretionary permits required for small-scale residential structures, thereby dramatically shortening the time required to get a permit, reducing the cost of permits, and eliminating public review for what would otherwise be minor building permits. Based on an ongoing monitoring of the weekly new discretionary applications, these changes could eliminate the requirement for or reduce the level of review of **15-25%** the total number of discretionary permits currently required arid processed annually by the department.

Related Code Enforcement Issues

A key element needed to support some of the proposed changes is an effective program for proactively enforcing the various deed restrictions that are routinely recorded as part of the permit process for certain applications. For those proposed regulatory reforms to **be** effective, staff resources would need **to** be redirected or augmented to allow for targeted periodic site inspections to verify compliance with the commitments of property owners lo use structures in the manner allowed by their approved permits. Lacking such increased enforcement efforts, a number of these reforms could result in a greater level **of** illegal conversion of structures. Staff will bring recommendations for how to provide such enforcement services as part of the final report back on the current package.

Conclusion/Recommendation

After years of talk about reform **of** our current land use regulations, staff is proposing a structure for engaging in meaningful and achievable process for addressing the most significant areas where staff believes that our current regulatory system unnecessarily impacts properly owners. That approach is intended to focus initial efforts on those areas of the code that create the most frustration for homeowners wanting to add an addition or small business owners wishing to make a timely business move.

As well, staff **is** suggesting the first topic for the Board's consideration – focused on small-scale residential structures. Staff believes that these proposed changes will both significantly reduce the process for future applicants and reduce the volume **of** code enforcement cases, while not compromising the core values of the community – protecting the environment, the quality of neighborhoods, and public health and safety.

It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that your Board take the following actions:

1. Conduct a Study Session on the concepts proposed, including receiving initial public testimony; and

2. Direct staff to schedule this item for lurther consideration by the Board on August 14, ***2007***

Sincerelv.

Tom Bums
Planning Director

RECOMMENDED:

Susan A. Mauriello
County Administrative Officer

Atlachment 1 – Summary of Proposed Regulatory Changes

cc County Counsel
Planning Commission
Board of Realtors – Phil Tedesco

Attachment 1

ATTACHMENT 4

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Accessory Structures

1) Lower the level of discretionary review required for habitable and non-habitable accessory structures exceeding the specified size, story or height limits.

Problem and requlatory context: 'Current regulations require a Level V (public hearing before the Zoning Administrator) discretionary review for habitable accessory structures that exceed 640 square feet, are over 17 feet in height, or are taller than one story. Non-habitable accessory structures exceeding 1,000 square feet also require a Level V approval (Level III approval allowed in the RA or SU zone districts). Generally, applications for accessory structures exceeding the specified limits are non-controversial, and raise few issues.

Residential property owners applying for permits for accessory structures exceeding the specified limits are frustrated with the long and expensive review process: applicants are required to pay a 81,500 to $2.500 deposit and proceed through a review process lasting several months. A 500 square foot art studio located over a garage, or a 700 square foot single-story detached guesthouse are two examples of accessory structures that typically generate few impacts but nonetheless require a Level V review. In contrast, the construction of a single family dwelling up to 7,000 square feet and 28 feet in height requires only a building permit.

Proposed solution: To bring accessory structures regulations in line with the impacts such projects generate, staff is proposing to lower the level of discretionary review required for accessory structures exceeding the specified limits to Level III (Administrative Review). Staff would still retain authority to address project impacts, and those projects that in the opinion of the Planning Director require more extensive review could be referred to a Level IV (Public Notice) review.

2) Allow for bathrooms in habitable and non-habitable accessory structures.

Problem and regulatory context: Regulations on accessory structures (13.10.611 (c)) prohibit the installation of toilets and bathrooms in most accessory structures. Residential property owners are frequently frustrated by these regulations, because projects which seem very reasonable, such as building a guesthouse with a bathroom for occasional guests, or adding a bathroom in a barn located far from the main house, are currently prohibited.

Restrictions on bathrooms in habitable accessory structures were implemented as a 'pre-enforcement" measure to prevent the illegal conversion of habitable

EXHIBIT F

41

ATTACHMENT 4

0502

accessory structures into dwelling units. However, staff believes that it is time *to* consider whether it is reasonable to restrict all property owners from constructing functional accessory structures in order to prevent a few properly owners from illegally converting accessory structures to dwelling units. Other regulations exist to discourage illegal conversions, including requiring deed restrictions prohibiting conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units, and prohibiting kitchen facilities. Additionally, it is important to consider these regulations in the context of the current regulations for second units. Second units with bathrooms and kitchens are allowed with no discretionary permits. Our regulations may unintentionally force a property owner desiring a guesthouse with ***a*** bathroom on their property to instead construct an unwanted second unit in order lo have a unit with a bathroom available for guests.

Proposed solution: Allow for the installation of bathrooms in existing and proposed habitable or non-habitable accessory structures. To prevent illegal conversion of accessory structures to dwelling units, continue to require recorded deed restrictions to acknowledge limits of use and inform future buyers of such limits. and implement periodic field checks to venfy legal uses.

3) Eliminate the requirement that an owner live on site **if a** habitable accessory structure has heating **or** cooling features.

Problem and regulatory context: Accessory structure regulations (13.10.611 (c)) require that the properly owner live on site in order for the structure to have a heating.or cooling system. This requirement is very frustrating to property owners who do not currently reside on their property, and who see no logical reason why they should not be allowed to construct a heated detached office, workshop or other heated or air-conditioned accessory structure on their property.

Like the restrictions on bathrooms in accessory structures, restrictions on heating and cooling systems in habitable accessory structures were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of habitable accessory structures into dwelling units. As discussed under (2) above, these regulations may unfairly restrict the majority of property owners who have no intention of illegally converting their accessory structures **to** dwelling units. Additionally, the heating and cooling requirement *is* not easily enforceable and staff has not found it to be an indicator of illegal conversion. Finally, it is unclear what happens once a property that was granted rights associated with owner occupancy becomes a rental property.

Proposed solution: Delete the requirement that the owner live on the property in order for a habitable accessory structure to have heating or cooling features. To prevent illegal conversion of accessory structures to dwelling units, continue to require recorded deed restrictions and implement periodic field checks to verify legal uses.

EXHIBIT F

41

4) Allow for multiple residential habitable accessory structures on a property, and allow a second unit to **be** constructed on a property that also has habitable accessory structures.

Problem and regulatory context: Current regulations on second units (13.10.681 (d)(7) prohibit the construction of a second unit on a lot with other habitable residential accessory structures, such as a heated art studio or agricultural caretaker quarters. Regulations on accessory structures (13.10.611(c)(5) allow only one habitable accessory structure on a property unless a Level V permit is first obtained. The presumption behind these requirements is that residential accessory structures may be illegally converted into dwelling units, and therefore it is appropriate to limit the number residential accessory structures allowed, and to prohibit habitable accessory structures on lots with second units. It is important to note that the definition of "habitable accessory structure" is driven by a structure's proposed features: heating or cooling, sheetrock and insulation, or plumbing other than hose bibs. Therefore, a property containing an existing heated art studio may not have a detached garage with a sink without a Level V permit approval, and may not have a second unit at all.

As discussed under **(2)** above, these requirements unfairly restrict the majority of property owners who have no intention of illegally converting habitable accessory structures into dwelling units. Other regulations exist to discourage illegal conversions of habitable accessory structures, including 'requiring recorded deed restrictions prohibiting conversion of habitable accessory structures into dwelling units, and prohibiting the installation of kitchen facilities.

Proposed solution: Staff is recommending that regulations be amended to allow for residential accessory structures and a second unit both lo be constructed on a property, and to allow multiple habitable accessory structures on the same parcel. To discourage the illegal conversion of residential accessory structures into dwelling units, we would continue to require recorded deed restrictions to acknowledge limits of use and inform future buyers of such limits.

5) **Allow** structures less than **six** feet in height that do not impact neighboring properties to be allowed within side or rear yards.

Problem and regulatory context: The current definition of structure (13.10.700-S) includes anything constructed or erected which requires a location on the ground and is greater than 18 inches in height, but excludes swimming pools, fences and walls, and decks less than 18 inches in height. Structures included in this definition must meet all site regulations such as side and rear yard setbacks, 10-foot separation between structures and lot coverage requirements.

This definition treats garden statuary and pool equipment the same as houses for potential impacts on neighboring properties. **A** homeowner placing a birdbath or a five-foot high garden trellis in a side or rear yard setback is in violation of the

EXHIBIT F
41

County Code. Staff believes that our definition of structure is unnecessarily restrictive to properly owners.

Certain types of these small structures can have an impact on neighboring properties, such as noise from exterior mechanical equipment, visual impacts from structures higher than six feet located immediately outside a window, and loss of privacy resulting from buildings located too close to a property line. Therefore, it is not proposed that there be a wholesale allowance for all structures, but the regulations should not prohibit benign small structures being located within side and rear yards.

Proposed solution: Structures that do not create impacts and do not present any health and safety risks should be excluded from site regulations. Staff is proposing that a number of structures, if they are less than 6 feet in height, be allowed in required side and rear yards and not count towards lot coverage requirements. Examples of such structures include trellises and arbors, garden ornaments. play equipment, and ground-mounted solar energy systems.

Second Units

1) Allow the construction of second units in new subdivisions and clarify ownership requirements.

Problem and regulatory context Current regulations require that property owners live on the properly in order to obtain a permit for a second unit. Staff agrees with this regulation. However, this requirement makes it difficult for developers of new subdivisions to construct second units, thereby discouraging second units to be incorporated into subdivision proposals. Ironically, once a unit is built on a recently subdivided lot. the property owner is able to obtain a second unit permit without County discretion. Establishing a regulatory framework for developers to incorporate second units into the subdivision application would allow the County to review the project in its entirely (with the inclusion of the second units), thereby furthering County policy to ensure that new developments are designed in a manner compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Additionally, there have been enforcement issues over the years in terms of what qualifies a resident to be considered an owner-occupant. In one code compliance case, the owner was attempting lo define a party who had a 1% stake in the property as being eligible for owner-occupancy status.

To address these two issues, the meaning of the term "ownership" should be clarified with respect to owner occupancy requirements lor second units.

Proposed Solution: Continue to require that the properly owner reside on the property in order to obtain a permit for a second unit, but do not apply that requirement to developers of new subdivisions with second units In such

EXHIBIT F

41

instances, the initial purchasers would be required to be owner-occupants in order to utilize the second unit. This will encourage the inclusion of second units at a time in the planning process where the project design can be more thoroughly reviewed by County staff. Allowing second units in new subdivisions will also promote the development of new second units as a source of much needed housing for County residents. In order to address the second issue, staff is recommending that the owner residency requirements in Section 13.10.681 (e) be modified to require that a property owner applying for a permit for a second unit must maintain at least a 50% ownership in the property in order to receive a permit.

2) Delete income and occupancy restrictions **for** second units.

Problem and regulatory context: Under current regulations (Section 13.10.681), only low-income households, moderate-income senior households, or family members can occupy second units. The rent levels charged for such units cannot exceed those set by the Department **of** Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which are based on fair market rent levels. Regulations also require that the County certify that tenants of second units meet the occupancy requirements, and require the properly owner to periodically provide reports to the County with rent and occupancy information.

In light of the recent Travis decision that invalidated the County's occupancy restrictions for moderate-income seniors, the Board must revise the Second Unit regulations to comply with this ruling. To that end, staff is suggesting using this opportunity to review the regulations in their entirely with an eye toward removing the regulatory barriers and improving program efficiency.

Requiring owners to enter into legally binding agreement to restrict occupancy of second units serves as a deterrent to the development oi second units among some property owners who would like more flexibility about who will be living on their property. In addition, because the rent limits are based on market rents, the rent restrictions create an added administrative burden without a clear public policy benefit. These factors combine to discourage the development **of** second units, and indirectly encourage illegal second units by owners seeking to avoid burdensome regulatory requirements.

The uses of second units suggest that our current regulations restricting occupancy and rent levels are not effectively **serving** low-income and senior households in the County. Out of the 276 designated second units in the unincorporated County, only 30 units are rented to a low-income household that has been certified by the County over the past three years - representing less than 11% of the inventory; only one unit is occupied by a moderate income senior households certified by the County.

EXHIBIT F

41

While the income and occupancy restrictions included in this program are a worthy public policy goal, these goals are not being achieved, placing an administrative burden on the public and department, and resulting in a disincentive for construction **of** second units.

Proposed solution: Staff recommends removing all income and occupancy restrictions for tenants of second units. This will encourage the development and use of second units as rental housing, addressing a critical housing need in the community. It is worth noting that given the smaller size and configuration of second units, generally speaking these units are more affordable than traditional housing in the market place and will continue to provide a source of rental housing for lower income households and seniors.

3) Lower the Approval Level required **for** second units exceeding **17** feet in height or one **story from** a Level **V** to a Level **IV.**

Problem and regulatory context: Second unit regulations (13.10.681(d)(4)) require Level V approval with a full public hearing for second units exceeding 17 feet in height or one story located within the Urban Services Line. Frequently however, the optimum location for a second unit is above an existing garage. This is often the case on smaller lots in urban areas where the construction of a second unit might not otherwise be possible due to restrictions on lot coverage.

Proposed Solution: Staff is proposing to lower the Approval Level required for second units exceeding 17 feet in height or one story from a Level **V** to a Level IV. Reducing the level of approval required for second units exceeding the specified standards would reduce **the cost** and time required for property owners applying for such units, and could potentially encourage more property owners to construct second units on their property and provide needed housing for County residents. Opportunities **for** neighborhood input would be retained and an application could be subject to a public hearing, if warranted.

4) Eliminate the annual cap on second units in the Live **Oak** Planning Area

Problem and regulatory context: Section 13.10.681(f) requires that no more than five second units be approved in the Live Oak area per year. This requirement was implemented in the 1980's when there were legitimate concerns that the infrastructure in Live Oak was insufficient to support a substantial increase in density. However, in the last two decades redevelopment projects undertaken in Live Oak have resulted in significant improvements to roadways, drainage systems and sidewalks. In addition, retaining the five unit limit is questionable, in light of the recent State mandated changes made to the second unit ordinance that remove local discretion from most second unit applications. Recently, the number of applications received *for* second units in Live **Oak** came close to exceeding the annual cap, and planning staff was required to inform the applicants that we would have lo hold their application until the following year.

41

EXHIBIT F

Stafl believes that there is no longer a public policy or planning basis for the fe unit limit and that the second unit program should be administered uniformly throughout the County.

Proposed solution: Eliminate the annual five-unit cap on second units in Live Oak.

Non-conforminq Structures

After numerous amendments to the original County Zoning Code enacted in 1958, the number of structures that do not conform to the current height, setback, lot coverage, or floor area ratio regulations, continues to increase. Although placing severe restrictions on repair and improvements to non-conforming structures was a logical requirement at the time the original zoning ordinance was enacted, such regulations may no longer be realistic given the large number of non-conforming structures in the County and the dwindling number of undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels. In a future ordinance revisions package, staff will bring to your Board recornmendations for a broader review of non-conforming regulations.

In the meantime, staff is proposing to modify regulations affecting non-conforming structures that exceed the height limit. and regulations affecting additions to non-conforming structures. Both of these sets of regulations are especially problematic, as they severely limit the ability of many homeowners to repair, restore or modify their homes. Stafl believes that the following recornmendations will provide greater flexibility to property owners, while promoting orderly development in the County, consistent with the purpose of the regulations for non-conforming structures.

1)Allow by right all conforming additions to non-conforming structures.

Problem and requlatory context: Section 13.10.265 (b) requires discretionary approval for a conforming addition greater than 800 square feet to a non-conforming structure. Smaller conforming additions are allowed by right with a building permit. Since by definition all additions must conform to existing site standards, additions exceeding 800 square feet are generally compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Requiring discretionary approval for larger additions particularly affects owners of older. smaller non-conforming homes who may wish to preserve the existing home for its charm and character, while adding to the home to increase its functionality. While regulating these larger additions may have seemed appropriate when adopted, to staff's knowledge, an application for a conforming addition to a nonconforming structure has never been denied or conditioned beyond the normal provisions imposed on building permits. When a category of discretionary application is always approved -and not heavily conditioned. it is likelv that the discretionarv review with the associated costs and time required by the applicant is not warranted

EXHIBIT F

41

ATTACHMENT 4

Proposed solution: Staff is recommending that all conforming additions to non-conforming structures would no longer require discretionary approval, and would be allowed with an approved building permit.

2) Reclassify structures that exceed the height limit by more than five feet from significantly non-conforming to non-conforming, allowing for structural enlargement, reconstruction, repairs and alterations of such structures.

Problem and regulatory context: Currently, structures that exceed the allowable height limit by more than five feet are considered significantly non-conforming under section 13.10.265(j). Significantly non-conforming structures (which also include structures built over property lines, within five feet to a structure on an adjoining property *or* within five feet of a vehicular right-of-way) are considered to be detrimental to the general welfare of the County. A Level V permit is therefore required for any structural change to a significantly non-conforming structure. In contrast, houses that exceed the required height limit by less than five feet are currently considered non-conforming rather than significantly non-conforming. Owners of such houses can make structural repairs and construct conforming additions with an approved building permit.

A large number of houses in the County exceed the current height limit by more than five feel, and are thus considered significantly non-conforming, due to changes in the way the County has measured height over the years. This is particularly the case for structures located on sloping lots. Owners of such Structures find it extremely difficult to properly maintain, repair or add to their homes, since current regulations require a Level V approval for any structural alterations. By making it difficult for such property owners to make needed structural repairs, the County may in fact be encouraging deterioration of structures, conflicting with the intent of the ordinance *to* promote orderly development in the County.

It is clear how other types of significantly non-conforming structures, such as structures located across a property line, could be detrimental to the general welfare. It is less clear **how** structures exceeding the height limit by more than five feet are as problematic, especially since they were initially permitted by the County. The degree of non-conformity posed by structures exceeding the height limit by more than five feet seems more similar to structures classified as non-conforming, such as structures that extend over a required setback.

Proposed solution: Staff recommends eliminating height as a significantly non-conforming category, and treating all structures over the height limit as non-conforming structures. This would allow owners of over-height structures to make needed structural repairs and construct conforming additions to such structures.

EXHIBIT F

41

ATTACHMENT 4

Coastal Regulations

1) Allow Coastal exclusions for demolition of structures in rural areas in the Coastal Zone.

Problem and regulatory context: In the Coastal Zone, demolition within the appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission, and demolition outside of the Urban and Rural Services Lines (rural properlies) requires a Level V Coastal Approval with a full public hearing. However, demolition in other areas of the Coastal zone is excluded from permit requirements, pursuant to 13.20.071. In discussions with staff, it was agreed that for most demolition projects, requiring a full public hearing is unnecessary and is burdensome for applicants, since demolition normally creates few impacts. Other counties in the Coastal Zone, such as Marin County, exclude demolition from requirements for Coastal Approval, unless the demolition occurs within an environmentally sensitive habitat.

Proposed solution: Staff is recommending that the Coastal regulations be modified to allow exclusions for most demolitions. However, any demolition that could affect a prehistoric or historic resource, a biotic resource or sensitive habitat. or cause damage to a significant tree would still require Coastal Approval. Demolition within the appealable areas would still be subject to Coastal Approval. During preliminary discussions, the Coastal Commission expressed their willingness *to* consider this approach to demolition.

2) Develop an administrative Coastal Approval process for residential additions greater than 500 sq ft in rural areas of the Coastal Zone.

Problem and regulatory context: Section 13.20.071 in the Coastal regulations requires Coastal Approval with a Level V public hearing for additions greater than 500 square feet in rural areas. However in non-rural areas of the Coastal Zone, additions generally require only a building permit. Since additions to homes in rural areas in the Coastal Zone typically generate few impacts, such projects generate little public concern and receive very few comments during public hearings. However, there are a few limited situations where large additions in rural areas have the potential to create minor visual impacts or other impacts. Although a full public hearing is not needed to address the minor impacts of such projects, staff still finds it appropriate to retain a level of discretionary authority.

Proposed solution: Fortunately, the Coastal Act allows for minor projects such as rural additions to be approved administratively without a public hearing, as long as the project is noticed properly and a public hearing is held if requeste

EXHIBIT F

41

ATTACHMENT

Several other Coastal Counties include provisions for administrative approval of certain categories of projects in the Coastal Zone. Staff believes that. an administrative review process for rural additions in the Coastal Zone would give the approving body sufficient discretionary authority to address any project impacts. The Coastal Commission has expressed their willingness to consider an adminisiralive approval process.

3) Develop an administrative Coastal Approval process for grading in the Coastal Zone.

Problem and regulatory context Section 13.20.077 in the Coastal Zone regulations requires Coastal Approval with a full .public hearing for grading that exceeds 100 cubic yards. Grading exceeding 100 cubic yards in all areas of the County also requires a grading permit. The review process for grading permits addresses most grading impacts, requiring implementation of erosion control measures and environmental review, such that in most situations the requirement for an additional Coastal Approval is redundant. Occasionally however, there may be potential minor visual impacts or other types of impacts that would not be addressed during the review of the grading permit, such that discretionary review may be appropriate. However, grading projects do not generate the level of impacts or public concern to justify a full public hearing. The current requirement for a full public hearing for grading projects requires the applicant to spend a disproportionate amount of time and expense to obtain approval of their project.

The requirement for a Level V Approval with a public hearing for grading in the Coastal zone also appears overly stringent in relation to other Coastal zone requirements. For example, single-family dwellings in certain areas of the Coastal Zone require only a building permit, but the grading for the house requires a Coastal Approval with a full public hearing if the grading exceeds 100 cubic yards.

Proposed solution: Similar to staffs recommendation for administrative review of rural additions, staff believes that an administrative review process for grading greater than 100 cubic yards in the Coastal Zone would give the approving body sufficient discretionary authority lo address any project impacts and would provide a level of review in proportion to the level of impacts generated. The Coastal Commission has expressed their willingness to consider this approach.

4) Exempt solar energy systems in the Coastal Zone from requirements for Coastal Approvals, in compliance with state law. Continue to require that roof-mounted solar systems shall not exceed the height limit of the zone district by more than 3 feet.

Problem and Regulatory Context: State Law AB 2473 requires that local jurisdictions approve solar energy systems for residential, business and agricultural use, through the issuance of a building permit or other non-

EXHIBIT F

41

ATTACHMENT

discretionary permit. It further specifies that the review of such a system shall be limited Io considering whether the system meets all health and safety requirements of local, state and federal law. The law prohibits design review of solar systems for aesthetic purposes. The stale law does not provide for separate provisionswithin the Coastal Zone.

Currently, County regulations exempt improvements to single-family residences and to other structures within the Coastal Zone from requirements for Coastal Approvals. However, improvements to structures that are located within 50' of a coastal bluff or on a beach are not exempt. Those portions of our coastal regulations that require discretionary review of solar energy systems and allow for consideration of criteria other than health and safety do not conform to state law. Although a policy interpretation has been written to address immediate concerns, our Coastal zone regulations should be amended Io comply with state law. Additionally, it is important for the County to remove bamers standing in the way of property owners wishing to install sustainable energy systems for their homes.

Proposed solution: To comply with state law, all solar energy systems will be exempt from requirements for Coastal Approval throughout the Coastal Zone. Existing County regulations prohibiting all roof-mounted solar systems from exceeding the height limit of the zone district by more than 3 feet should address visual impacts resulting from roof-mounted systems.

Other recommended modifications

1) Modify Section 13.10.521 to delete the requirement for a discretionary permit when using a less than 40-foot right-of-way as access to an existing lot of record.

At the time this ordinance was enacted in 1962, Planning was the only agency that reviewed development applications. Other agencies now review ministerial permits including the Fire Department and Public Works, and address any issues with rights of way and road standards as pari of this review process. It is therefore no longer necessary and redundant to have a separate permit to use a less than 40-foot right-of-way as access Io an existing lot of record. Deletion of this permit requirement would not alter the requirement to obtain discretionary approval to create a new less than 40-fool right-of-way or utilize one for a proposed lot.

2) For residential properties with an existing house within an agricultural buffer, allow by right minor additions or new habitable accessory structures within the agricultural buffer, as long as the new development does not extend further into the agricultural buffer than the existing structure.

EXHIBIT F

41

Current regulations (Section 16.50.095(g)) require Level IV Approval for additions to existing residential structures or for new habitable accessory structures within agricultural buffers, *if* the proposed construction is closer than 200 feet to commercial agricultural land. Such requirements were implemented primarily to allow staff to require the installation of appropriate physical barriers to minimize the need for the 200' buffer, and to require the property owner lo record deed restrictions acknowledging their responsibility to permanently maintain the required barrier. However, such requirements can be included as standard project conditions, and do not require discretionary review. Since such properties already have a residential use within the 200-foot buffer area, requiring a Level IV discretionary approval for minor additions or new habitable accessory structures that extend no further into the agricultural buffer seems redundant.

Staff is proposing to eliminate the requirement for Level IV Approval for additions and habitable accessory structures less than 1,000 square feet that do not extend any further into the required agricultural buffer than the existing residential development. Staff would require as standard conditions of approval the installation of appropriate physical barriers and the recordation of a deed restriction acknowledging that the property owner must permanently maintain the required buffer setback and physical barrier.

3) **Allow** by right the construction **of** fences **up** to six feet **in** height **in** all residential yards that **do** not abut a street **or** right **of** way.

On some County properties such as corridor access lots. the front yard does not abut **a** street but is instead bordered by another property, as illustrated by lots A and **B** at right.



Although technically a front yard by definition, these yards effectively function more as side or rear yards. The front yard fence of such properlies has no impact on the street and do not affect sight distance of neighboring driveways or roads. Existing regulations (Section 13.10.525(c)) require a Level III approval for all front yard fences taller than three feet, regardless of whether the front yard abuts a street or another property, yet regulations allow fences up to six feet in height in side and rear yards not abutting a street. and do not require permits for such fences. Staff is recommending that we allow by right fences up to six feet in height in all yards or portions of yards that do not abut a street or right of way, in order to allow all property owners the right to install privacy fences between adjoining properties.

EXHIBIT

41

4) Allow required pool barrier fencing to be four feet in height within required front and street side yards.

The Uniform Building Code and section 12.10.070 require a minimum four-foot high barrier fence around swimming pools for safety reasons. The current fence regulations limit the maximum fence height within front yards to three feet; therefore, the required fencing for pools located within front yards always requires Level III discretionary permits to exceed the three-foot height limitation. Since these Level III requests are always approved because of the four-foot minimum requirement, it makes sense to add an exception to the fence height requirements to allow the installation of a pool barrier four feet in height. However, the installation of any required pool barrier within a front yard must be constructed with materials that do not obstruct sight distance.

5) Reduce the10-foot required separation between structures on a property to 6 feel, and eliminate the separation requirement between water tanks.

Section 13.10.323(e)6(C) currently requires a ten-foot separation between any two structures on a parcel. However, the Fire Code and Building Code typically requires only six feet between habitable structures. The additional zoning restrictions were imposed to provide additional light, air, and privacy between structures on a parcel. It is logical from a zoning perspective to regulate privacy and light access between properties. For structures located on the same property however, it may be more appropriate to require sufficient separation between structures lo protect health and safety, and to allow the property owner to determine the appropriate amount of light access or privacy required. Allowing a six-foot separation between structures on a property should have minimal impacts to neighboring properties, as required setbacks will protect privacy and access to light and air between structures on different parcels.

Existing zoning regulations also require a 10-foot separation between water tanks. However, Building and Fire Codes do not require any separation between water tanks. Additionally. the Fire Department now requires greater on-sile water storage in some areas due to Urban-Wildland Intermix Code requirements. such that multiple water tanks may be required on a parcel. Allowing zero separation between water tanks provides greater flexibility for property owners, and has the potential to generate fewer visual impacts than requiring that water tanks located on separate areas of a parcel.

6) Allow electric power to vacant residential parcels or separate electric meters on a parcel, in certain circumstances

Section 13.10.611 regulates the circumstances of when electric power is allowed for residential oarcels. Currently, electric Dower is not allowed on vacant

EXHIBIT F

41

residential parcels nor is a separate electric service allowed for outbuildings on developed residential parcels without first obtaining a Level V permit. This regulation was created as a method to deter the creation or conversion of illegal dwelling units.

Electric service to wells on vacant residenlial parcels is often appropriate to facilitate fire suppression or to allow family gardens, a permitted use. Separate electric service for other incidental residential uses, such as electric gates. are often necessary due to the **use** not being located near the single-family dwelling.

Staff is proposing that the regulations be changed to allow **low** amperage electric service for these types of situations. **A** Declaration of Restrictions **could** be required to clearly indicate the allowed use of the electric service for the current and future property owners.

41

EXHIBIT F

Stanley M. Sokolow
301 Highview Court
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone 831-423-1417 • Fax 831-423-4840
Email stanley@thesokolows.com

August 7,2007

Board of Supervisors
county of santa Cruz
701 Ocean St., Room 500
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Proposed revision of land-use ordinances for **second units** presented June 19, 2007, scheduled for further consideration in the August 14,2005, agenda.

Dear Supervisors:

1 **am** writing to provide my input for your consideration of *the* Planning Department's proposed revisions which were presented at your June 19,2007, regular meeting **as** item 54. I have some information regarding the written and oral proposals by the Planning Department and in response to questions and issues raised by individual Board members at that meeting. In brief, I oppose the proposed regulation that would require a minimum 50% ownership percentage by the resident owner in order to apply for and/or continue to use **a** second unit. Such a regulation does not serve a useful purpose in that **a** co-owner of any percentage, residing on the property, would have the same care and concern about the construction and occupancy **as** a *50%* owner. All owners under a tenants-in-common deed, regardless of their percentage of ownership, have full legal rights to use of the entire property on an equal basis with any other owner of the parcel. A *50%* **rule** would have unintended consequences, which I'll illustrate below. I agree with the staff proposal to remove the other occupancy restrictions and rent controls. Further, I urge the Board to allow an owner of two contiguous parcels, that is, two parcels which touch each other at a common side or lot comer, to develop and rent out a second unit on the parcel which is not the owner's residence provided that the owner lives on one of the two parcels.

I agree with most of the reforms proposed by the Planning Department staff report, however, the proposal that "Section 13.10.681(e) be modified to require that a property owner applying **for** a permit for a second unit must maintain at least 50% ownership in the property **in** order to receive a permit" has serious problems. The report proposes this as a solution to the enforcement issue it cites on page 4: "In one code compliance case, the owner was attempting to define a party who had **a** 1% stake in the property as being eligible for owner-occupancy status." Before adopting the proposal, the Board should carefully consider the possible scenarios that it would affect.

There are two distinct issues to keep separate. First, who qualifies to be an applicant for the ministerial second unit building permit. Second, who qualifies as an owner for the requirement that the owner shall reside on the parcel when the second unit is occupied. The proposed language confounds these two issues by saying that the applicant must maintain at least a 50% ownership in order to receive a permit. This seems to imply that the owner-applicant must continue to reside on the parcel and

EXHIBIT F

41

continue to be at least a half-owner at the time the permit is granted, but why use the term "maintain"? The "code compliance" case mentioned seems to be one involving the continued occupancy of a second unit when only a 1% owner resides on the parcel. The granting of a permit to build a second unit is an entirely different issue. Ownership at the time of granting the permit is a one-time matter. Maintaining ownership beyond the granting of the permit makes no sense as a requirement for granting a permit. If you mean that 50% ownership must be maintained after the permit is issued in order to continue using the second unit, then there are other problems created.

Scenario 1: The owner-occupant is granted the permit, builds the second unit, resides on the parcel and allows the second unit to be occupied by a tenant or family member, and then sells the place. The new owner is not the owner-applicant. The proposed regulation language would not apply to him or her.

Scenario 2: The owner dies and the heirs inherit the property in equal parts as tenants in common, but only one of the heirs moves into the home. If there are more than two heirs, no one of them is at least a 50% owner. The proposed regulation would not allow any of the heirs, even one actually residing in the house, to apply to build a second unit or to continue to operate an existing second unit.

Scenario 3: For estate planning purposes, the owner(s) give a part-ownership of the home to the adult children, taking advantage of the gift-tax exclusion. After the gift, neither the parent nor any one of the children are 50% owners, similar to scenario 2. Then neither the parent (nor any one of the children if the parent moves away) would qualify to build a second unit nor to allow it to be occupied, even if he or she resides in the existing house.

Scenario 4: To be able to afford the purchase, a low-income household partners with an investor or relative who agrees to be an equity-sharing non-resident co-owner. (Such equity-sharing financing does exist and is usually arranged between unrelated investors by realtors who specialize in making a market for home loans, or by relatives such as parents and their young adult children.) The resident household may put in less than 50% of the acquisition cost (down payment, closing costs, etc.) and the non-resident investor puts in the rest, and they own the property as tenants in common, each owning a share in proportion to the respective contribution to the purchase and ongoing expenses. The proposed regulation would not allow any second unit to be built because the owner-occupant is not at least a 50% owner.

As you can see, the proposed 50% ownership regulation, which would forbid the second unit in the above scenarios, goes against the public purpose of providing for second units without unreasonably burdensome restrictions. It also would unnecessarily interfere with owners who want or need to apply the tools legally available to them for estate planning and home financing. The ownership residency requirement has the purpose of ensuring that an owner will provide close oversight of the second unit so that it is not a nuisance to neighbors. Regardless of the percentage of ownership, any owner actually residing on the property will have that sort of concern about the second unit occupancy. Likewise, even if the applicant for the second unit owns less than 50%, all of the owners would be reasonably concerned about the construction of a second unit, since they all would own their percentage of it according to the deed. Imposing an ongoing 50% ownership rule for continued use of the second unit would thus unreasonably restrict the right of owners to use their property.

With regard to the continued owner-occupancy requirement, I urge you to extend the requirement to allow an owner of two adjacent parcels to develop and rent out a second unit on the parcel that is not the owner's residence. This would still provide close supervision, since the owner would be living in close proximity not only to the second unit but also to the main house, both of which could be tenant occupied. This relaxation of the requirement would better serve the purpose of

A 1

EXHIBIT F

creating additional affordable housing without loss of owner supervision.

At the June 19 meeting, various questions arose during the Board's discussion of the staff proposal on second units.

Supervisor Beutz was concerned that "ten surfers" would rent the second unit, creating an unreasonable burden and nuisance to the neighbors. Of course, this could happen to any house that is rented out, with or without a second unit, so it's a matter of the code compliance department enforcing the housing over-crowding regulations that already exist. The state housing code, which applies to all housing in the County, provides ample regulatory basis for code compliance staff to put an end to such over-occupancy of any dwelling. The state housing code allows any sleeping room (that is, any room other than bathrooms, hallways, closets, and stairwells) to be occupied by one person if it is at least 70 square feet of floor area, or by two persons if it is at least 120 square feet For each additional 50 square feet, one more person can sleep in the room. Sleeping rooms must have an exterior door or window of a certain minimum *size* for emergency access, so completely interior rooms can't legally be used for sleeping. Since the housing code comes under the statewide uniform building codes, a city or county can adopt more stringent occupancy standards ONLY IF it *makes* express **findings** that the changes are reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological, *or* topographical conditions. No legal basis exists in this county for more stringent local restrictions on the number of persons who can occupy a dwelling unit.

Moreover, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act makes it unlawful to discriminate against any persons in housing accommodations on the basis of familial status (having children under age 18 in the household). Generally the state recognizes an occupancy limit of two persons per bedroom plus one additional person, for purposes of investigating housing discrimination under the Act. Any more stringent restrictions could be considered discrimination against families with children.

Therefore, the County is stuck with applying the statewide occupancy standard, but this is no problem because it nevertheless provides reasonable restrictions that would prevent the over-crowding problem that Supervisor Beutz is womed about.

Supervisor Beutz also repeated the concern expressed in past *years,* whenever the second unit regulations came before the Board, that the regulations essentially allow every house to become a duplex. Yes, that's the way the state Legislature set up the statute on second units. Faced with a long-standing critical statewide shortage of housing, the Legislature had to make tough decisions balancing various conflicting factors. There's no point rehashing those decisions, since the County is bound by the statute and already has adopted its own ordinance providing for second units. Supervisor Pirie got it right when she said that the proposed changes in second unit regulations don't change that fact.

Supervisor Beutz was concerned that removal of the occupancy restrictions and rent controls on second units would make "crime the norm." She wondered how many illegal second units already exist in the County, units which would now be made legal if these restrictions *are* lifted. Of course, removal of the occupancy restrictions and rent controls would not in itself make illegal units, that is, units built or converted without any building permit, into legal structures. A building permit would still be required so that the County can ensure safe construction exists. What the relaxation of restrictions would do is remove burdensome regulations that have discouraged homeowners from creating these additional small and relatively affordable units without government funds. It's really telltale that the County has only 276 legal second units, out of the 10,000 or so that could exist according to the data cited by the planning department in the housing element. The County's second unit ordinance has existed since 1982, 25 years ago. That's an average of 11 units built per year. The more the regulations were relaxed over the recent years, the faster the units were built. The existing regulations just are not fulfilling the purpose intended.

A free-market approach would work better. In a letter dated September 13, 1995, to County

EXHIBIT F
41

Counsel Wittwer regarding second units in the housing element, the Housing and Community Development Department mentioned the experience of the city of Sausalito, which had no rent controls on second units. A 1992 study by that city found that 82% of the second units were affordable to moderate, low, and very low income households even though there were no rent level restrictions on them. Sausalito, being a desirable place to live which is in close proximity to the major employment center of San Francisco, is reasonably comparable to the County: so that study is relevant to this County. With a greater supply of second units of varying size, quality, and location, normal market forces will tend to keep a check on the rent levels.

The loss of privacy that people complained about to Supervisor Beutz would be exactly the same if a neighbor were to add onto their existing house. A second-story bedroom addition over an attached garage has the same impact on neighbors as a second story second unit does. The County allows home additions without any of the rent controls and occupancy restrictions the current regulations impose on second units. We all must realize that living in a civilized society creates various benefits and burdens. All neighbors have equal rights to add onto their house or build a second unit, so no one should complain that it's unfair to allow a neighbor to build a second unit, even if it's the first one in the neighborhood. Someone will always be the first, but that doesn't mean it's out of character for a residential neighborhood or an unreasonable invasion of privacy.

Supervisor Beutz said that the limit of 5 second unit permits per *year* in the Live *Oak* area was not imposed for lack of infrastructure (sewer and water), but rather to control the growth of rentals in Live Oak, which has more than its proportionate share of higher density housing in the County. However, the state statute says that the number of second unit permits may not be restricted by any policy limiting growth. Therefore, the County has no legal authority to maintain the 5-units-per-year restriction once the rational basis for it has been eliminated, which the planning director says is now the case. You should follow his recommendation and comply with state law by removing the unjustifiable 5-unit growth limit.

In *summary,* I urge you not to impose a 50% ownership requirement in the second unit restrictions. An owner of any percentage, regardless of bow small, should still be equally qualified to be the resident owner for the purposes of the second unit ordinance. Further, an owner of two contiguous parcels should be able to develop and rent out a second unit on the parcel which is not owner-occupied as long as one of the two parcels is owner-occupied.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley M. Sokolow

Stanley M. Sokolow

cc: County Planning Director
County Counsel

41

County of Santa Cruz
Planning Department

Planning Commission
Meeting Date: 10124107
Agenda Item: # 9
Time: After 9:00 a.m.

Additions to the Staff Report for the Planning Commission

Item: 9

Late Correspondence

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY GROUP
Of The Ventana Chapter
P.O. Box 604, Santa Cruz, CA 95061 phone (831) 426-4453
www.venrana.org e-mail: scscrg@cruzio.com

October 15,2007

Santa Cruz County Planning Commission
701 Ocean St. 4th floor
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Subject: October 24.2007 Meeting -- Agenda item #9
Public Hearing to consider proposed amendments to Santa Cruz County Code Chapters 13.10, 13.20, and 16.50 to simplify the County's regulations for small scale residential **structures,** with particular emphasis on accessory structures and second units, non-conforming structures, and projects in the Coastal Zone.

Dear Commission Members and Staff:

Please accept the following comments as our preliminary response to the captioned proposals drafted by the Planning Department. The impacts that the proposed changes could have on rural areas of the County are dramatic in scope and effect. They are likely to *make* rural areas no longer rural and to destroy community character in urban neighborhoods throughout the County Therefore, we are making extensive comments in the hope that they will lead you *to* reconsider the fundamental land **use** issues that would be altered by the proposed Amendments.

1. **First, we want to address some procedural deficiencies:**

1.1. These proposals intend to overturn and extensively revise many sections of Santa Cruz County land use and building codes. Yet, these code sections are not identified in **this** proposal. In the present form, recommendations from this Commission will be forwarded to tbe Board of Supervisors without **a** specific review by the Commission or the public of the existing code provisions and the proposed replacement language.
Therefore, we request that a strikeout version of the proposed changes to the code's text he provided to this Commission and the public.

1.2. No account is given of the cumulative environmental impacts of the proposed changes. The proposed changes are so extensive that they will create increased residential density which will have innumerable and cumulative impacts on the environment, including at least the following:

- increased impacts upon water supplies, on waste water treatment and disposal and on non-point source water pollution;
- increased impacts on wild lands and rare plant and animal habitats as they are converted to residential uses;
- increased impacts on off-street vehicle parking areas, local traffic circulation. and emergency vehicle access to areas of increased density.
- In addition, this proposal seems to remove minimum width requirements for rural roads' right of way, without any evaluation *of* the impact that such changes in engineering standards might have on health and safety issues that will be created by such changes.

Therefore, we request that an Environmental Impact Report be prepared, assessing the impacts of the proposed changes on the environment and the public health and safety.

1.3. In proposing the changes before you, the Planning Department has noted that the Board of Supervisors expressed a desire "to design the specific reforms in a fashion that does not result in increased illegal conversions of structures to more intense land uses. These concerns addressed both the scope and specifics of the reforms as well as related enforcement efforts." (source: from the staff proposal as agenda item 41, August 28,2007.)

Currently County Code Enforcement staff respond only to citizen complaints. Code enforcement is fundamental to any presumption about the effect of a change to the Code itself. Without the deterrent effect of prompt clear enforcement action, the code itself becomes an opportunity for violators to game the system and use intimidation to discourage neighboring land owners from filing complaints. At present, it appears that county staff does not initiate inspections or investigations to determine compliance with County Building, Zoning and Environmental Code – it reacts in response to the most egregious violations when they are filed as citizens' complaints.

The absence of enforcement is well understood by many contractors and property owners in the County. The result is a widespread flouting of code requirements and a willingness of many landowners to take the risk of building without permits because the consequences of being caught are not an effective deterrent to illegal construction, road building grading, etc. Members of the Sierra Club have personally witnessed situations were the Planning Department has violated its own rules and procedures in order to avoid exercising effective code enforcement. Code compliance is fundamental to consideration for this proposal. Otherwise this proposal simply becomes a means to legalize what was illegal instead of an attempt to rationally modify the code to accommodate legitimate land uses. This is a matter of priorities when it comes to the allocation of resources.
Therefore, we believe that it is of the utmost importance that any regulatory change make explicit how the uew rules will be enforced and how the public will be protected from further degradation of the environment due to lack of enforcement.

2. <u>In the following comments we address some specific elements of the proposed changes:</u>

2.1. Fundamental to the proposal under review are the 3 classes of what the Planning staff calls "Accessory Structures." These are classified as Non-Habitable, Habitable and Second Units.

One of the proposed changes allows toilets in structures classified as "Hahitable." The toilet is the most important plumbing addition to make a building function as a "Second Unit" or independently occupied unit. Toilets are proposed as permitted in "Habitable Structures" such as "heated office, workshop, detached bedroom, art studio, and guesthouse."

Toilets are currently not allowed in "Habitable" structures because prior Boards of Supervisors understood that the toilet is the key to the entire plumbing system and would provide for easily converting to a rental unit. The addition of a toilet may seem reasonable, but the problem is that the sewer drains are the basis of plumbing and the toilet sets the

scale of drains to accommodate any other additions to plumbing. Water supply lines and additional drains for a kitchen and bath are usually easy to retrofit onto most types of buildings and are not significant in this context. The toilet legalizes the connection of a large diameter drain to the septic system or sewer. With a toilet in a building, the conversion to an independent rental is a relatively straightforward matter for a property owner. This change would make an "office" or "detached bedroom" easily convertible into a rental unit without the attendant required increase in the capacity of the septic system and parking area that the rules for a "Second Unit" or rental unit would require.
The Planning Department claims to be focusing on the "physical features" of the building rather than on its "uses", however because both of these attributes are interlinked and can be modified after a building permit final inspection takes occurs, this distinction is meaningless in terms of predictable impacts. It is more reasonable to assume that a "habitable" unit can easily become a "second unit" and to review a permit application accordingly. Some enforceable legal mechanism needs to accompany a permit to build accessory structures that are convertible to rental units. Planning proposes the vague idea of a new type of agreement with the property owner to cooperate with inspections. This is not plausible considering the current void of staff initiated code enforcement actions by Planning.

The proposed new rules will allow the construction of more ancillary buildings on rural (and Urban Service Area) lots. The consequent result is that, over time, most of these buildings will be converted into rental units, whether legal or not. The financial incentive to rent living space is intense due to the high rents that can be charged. This means that whatever the original intention of the property owner is, the additional buildings constructed as a result of rule changes will very likely be rented out (with necessary internal utilities added without permit), resulting in dwelling units without adequate parking, septic system capacity or consideration for water supply. Rural dwelling density will increase without adequate review or consideration of environmental impacts.

2.2. Some have suggested that in some circumstances, less stringent review standards for accessory structures might be appropriate in less densely populated m a l areas than would be appropriate in more densely populated urban areas. In response to those comments, staff is proposing to change some of the size and permit requirements for accessory structures to allow larger non-habitable structures on larger rural lots. Specifically, the proposal suggests that the size limit for non-habitable structures exempt from discretionary permits in rural areas on lots greater than one acre be increased from 1,000 to 1,5000 square ft. It is important to note that environmental review is more important in rural areas because environmental consequences tend to be greater, e.g., there are more open space and thus unspoiled resources that are at risk.

This idea of distinguishing between habitable and non-habitable is not enforceable because non habitable structures include finished buildings with windows and wiring, sheet rock and insulation that may originally be proposed as art studios or workshops and then later be converted into rental units.

2.3. Staff is also recommending that the number of habitable accessory structures on a property (in addition to any allowed Second Unit) be limited to one with a building permit, or two with a

discretionary permit. In addition this proposed change also includes removing the provision that the property be owner occupied.

The potential result of this change is that a single family detached house might wind up having 3 "accessory structures" on the property in addition to the original house: (one second unit, plus two "habitable" structures of 680 sq. ft. and 28 ft. high, or two 1,500 sq. ft. 28 ft. high "non-habitable" units that later could be illegally converted to independent occupancy). The prospect of having 4 occupied structures on one lot of record suggests that the County is going to convert the single family residential zones into areas where even an absentee owner could develop a rental complex of four units on each lot. An accessory structure with a toilet can be called a "guest house" or "detached bedroom" and be legal under the proposed rules because it is not formally a "second unit." This is a violation of the General Plan and any reasonable pretense of controlling land use so as to protect natural resources, and limit residential density in the interests of neighboring property owners.

3. In the following sections we address excerpts from the rules matrix pages of the proposed rules, describing existing rules and proposed changes:

3.1 Section: "Existing And Proposed Requirements For Accessory Structures and Second Units"

Definition: A "habitable unit" is a "heated office, heated workshop, detached bedroom, art studio, or guest house." It is supposedly not to be rented to a separate household. A "second unit" can be rented to a separate household. A non-habitable unit is "an unheated workshop or office, barn, detached garage, or pool cabana."
Comment: the distinction among the various classes of units is essentially unenforceable. It would require an excessively intrusive form of compliance monitoring.

Toilet: proposed change: to allow a toilet in some "non-habitable" units and allow toilets in all "habitable units." They are required in a "second unit."
Comment: By essentially allowing toilet connections in all *types* of units, they all become new residential structures on the same lot.

Insulation and sheetrock: proposed change: to allow in a non-habitable units. They are currently allowed in a habitable unit.
Comment: In essence, all units can be insulated, which (together with toilet connection) become new residential structures.

Built in Heating/Cooling: proposed change: to require built in heating in "habitable units."
Comment: Same as above.

Owner required to live on property if heated/cooled: proposed change: Do not require owner occupation for accessory structures to be heated/cooled.
Comment: This change will essentially convert lots zoned for single family occupancy into multi-family lots, with absentee landlords.

Use for sleeping purposes, no change. Sleeping in habitable units will continue to be a permitted use.
Comment: There is not any point in trying to make a distinction between habitable units and second units: they both allow sleeping, toilets, insulation, electricity – all the essential components for residential living.

Unit size restrictions (and has building permit): Currently Nan-habitable Urban carports and garages **up** to **640** sq. ft. and 28' high, rural 1000 sq. ft. 28 ft. high.
Proposed change: same on lots of less than **1** acre. Rural allow 1,500 sq. ft. non-habitable units on lots **1** acre or greater. For habitable structures allow 28 ft. height in rural areas.
Comment: This allows for a 2 story habitable unit or a loft sleeping area and substantially increases the actual usable square footage of the building, essentially making a habitable unit the size of a substantial house.

Units size restrictions, if proposal exceeds size restrictions: Non-habitable currently requires a level 5 review, or level *3* in RA zone. Proposed change: Level 3 review in rural areas. Level 4 (public notice but not public hearing) in urban areas. Proposed change: Habitable units currently need Level 5 review to exceed size restrictions. Proposed change: Level 4 review, public notice only.
Comment: Reducing the level of review required to build larger than the size limits is an important matter for neighboring property owners and should continue to require Level 5 review and a public hearing **so** that adequate consideration is made for neighbors. Level **4** review is essentially an administrative decision with public notice.

Number of allowed units: Non-habitable; No set limit, the number is limited by lot coverage requirements. Proposed change: Second Unit plus Habitable units: **1** with building permit. Maximum of 2 with a level **4** (public notice) discretionary permit.

Existing rule "Second units are limited to **1** requiring a level **5** (public hearing) discretionary permit.
Comment: This provisionally allows **4** habitable units (depending of definition) for one home of record: the house. the second unit, and the 2 habitable units. The "Habitable units" would now be allowed to include toilets. Thus a property owner could build **4** independent units (with the temptation to upgrade kitchens and baths without permits or two legal detached bedrooms plus the house and second unit.)

3.2 Section: Accessory Structures (art studios, detached garages, workshops, detached bedrooms etc.)

3.2.1) Accessory structures: Planning discusses issue of bathrooms (document page **0438** agenda numbering) "Prohibitions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. Not effective at preventing illegal conversions. Property owners are prevented from constructing fully functional and comfortable accessory structures with appropriate sanitation facilities.
Comment: Planning acknowledges problem with enforcement of prohibitions and suggests the solution is simply to make what was previously illegal, now legal. Other communities have

effective code enforcement. Santa Cruz County has apparently decided to accept non-compliance as a predicted outcome because it is not willing to enforce its codes. This practice rewards those who constructed illegal units in the past without penalty or consequence; and is an affront to those who have abided by County permit requirements.

3.2.2) "In urban and rural areas, height of habitable accessory structures is limited to 17 ft and one story. Proposed Change: In rural areas only, increase height allowed for habitable accessory structures to 28 ft."
Comment: This change would allow a two story structure with a potential doubling of square footage if the stairs are on the exterior (less if stairs are interior). Height can be even a greater problem in rural areas because of its visual the impact on the rural character.

3.2.3) Currently the rules for Habitable structures exceeding the specified size and height and number of stones require a level 5 approval (public hearing).

Proposed change: Eliminate the requirement for a public hearing, but require discretionary review with public notice (level 4). "Public hearings could be held for controversial projects at the discretion of the Planning Director."
Comment: This type of permit needs Level 5 approval to protect the interests of neighboring property owners.

3.2.4) Current d e : "Property owners must live on site in order to install heating or cooling systems in a habitable accessory structure.

Proposed change: Require heating systems, and cooling systems, to be installed in habitable accessory structures with a building permit, and do not require owner-occupancy on the property. Continue to require deed restrictions and provide for inspections of habitable accessory structures.
Comment: Considering the current state of code compliance, the effectiveness of this provision is implausible.

3.2.5) "A residential habitable accessory structure is [currently] not allowed on properties with a second unit. More than 2 habitable accessory structures require a level 5 approval (public hearing).

"Restrictions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units. Restrictions prevent property owner from making full use of their property. Example: Owner cannot have a (sic) both a second unit and a heated workshop.

Proposed change: "Allow the construction of habitable accessory structures on a property with a second unit. Require a building permit only for one habitable accessory structure, and allow a maximum of 2 with a discretionary permit (level 4). Continue to require deed restrictions to prevent illegal conversions to dwelling units, and provide for inspections.

Comment: Considering the current failure **of** code compliance enforcement, the effectiveness ***of this*** provision is not plausible. Again, this allows a property owner to have **4** possible fully legal dwelling units associated with one original home. Note: A legal Habitable **Unit** like a detached bedroom with a toilet is a legal "accessory structure" under this proposal. A "second Unit" is a separately functioning apartment with kitchen and bath.

3.2.6) Non-habitable accessory structures such as detached garages and workshops are not allowed to have both sheetrock and insulation. Prohibitions were implemented to prevent the illegal conversion of accessory structures into dwelling units.

Change: Allow non-habitable accessory structures to be finished with sheetrock and insulation. Continue to require deed restrictions and provide for inspections.
Comment: same as previously mentioned.

3.2.7) In rural areas, non-habitable accessory structures are limited to 1,000 sq. A. regardless of lot **size.**

Change: **On rural properties 1 acre or greater, allow non-habitable accessory structures up to 1,500 sq. ft. with a building permit only. In rural areas, require a level 3 (administrative) approval for non-habitable accessory structures that exceed specified *size* limits.**
Comment: Many one acre house lots are in steep terrain and the assumption that there is enough useable land **so** that a large "accessory structure" that will not interfere with neighboring home owners is incorrect. The actual conditions **of** the properties that will be subject to these rule changes are not being taken into consideration. Most homes in the rural area are in steep, unstable mountains and canyons where "useable land" (i.e. –10% grade **plots), is** very limited, even on large properties. This provision would encourage buildings that encroach on neighboring land owners and also result in extensive land grading and driveway construction.

3.2.8) In urban areas, size of non-habitable accessory structures such as garages and carports is limited to **640 sq.** ft. Allowed size of animal enclosures is 1,000 **sq. ft.**

Change: Require level 4 approval (public noticing) for non-habitable structures in urban areas that exceed specified *size* limits.
Comment: The problem of illegal conversion to second units and or "habitable structures" is not addressed.

3.3 Section: Second Units

3.3.1) Addresses issue that property owners must reside on the property in order to obtain a permit for a second unit. Commentary: "Difficult for developers of new subdivisions to construct second units, since they do not live on the property. Restrictions on second ***units*** in new subdivisions limit a significant potential source **of** second units in the County. Second units planned during subdivision process can be better integrated into the surrounding neighborhood than those constructed after the subdivision has been built."

Proposed change: Continue to require that the property owner live on site in order to construct a second unit, but allow an exception for developers of second units within new subdivisions.
Comment: This proposed rule turns the issue of second units on its head. The casual "right" to construct a second unit adjacent to a principal residence is based on the premise of a "granny unit" to house family members (whether or not a family member actually occupies the unit). It should not be reversed into a proposal to dramatically increase the number of legal dwellings permitted on each single family lot in a new subdivision. The issue of lot size is not addressed and is left entirely to speculation. This is a de-facto amendment of General Plan policy that is not acknowledged as such anywhere in this extensive proposal. It is unreasonable and excessive.

3.3.2) "Ordinance does not specify the level of financial interest required by a property owner to meet the owner occupancy requirements for a second unit."
Proposed change: Vague language about requiring a part owner to "demonstrate a substantial financial interest."
Comment: This is an unclear and, therefore, unenforceable rule change. The original proposal was "at least 50% ownership". This seems to be a reasonable solution

3.3.3) "Second units can be occupied by qualifying households. The rent charged for second units cannot exceed certain levels." Commentary: "Restrictions on occupancy and rent levels may act as disincentives for the construction of new second units. Occupancy and rent level restrictions are not accomplishing the intended goal of ensuring that second units are rented primarily by low-income or senior households.

Proposed change: Eliminate occupancy and rent-level restrictions for second units, in order to encourage the construction of more second units.
Comment: What is being proposed is to discard the socially useful, legal conditions to create affordable housing through second units. It proposes, instead, that it is in the public interest to promote the construction of second units, disregarding any impacts on water resources, water pollution, erosion, traffic, watershed protection, and conservation of rare plants and animals, and other impacts that are fundamental to zoning and land use regulations. This proposal will affect the Santa Cruz Mountains where natural resources are over-taxed and most rural lots have environmental constraints The present regulations emphasize affordable housing through accessory units. The proposed rules dismiss this emphasis because the County does not find it convenient to enforce rent restrictions.

3.3.4) "Level 5 approval required for second units that exceed 17' height limit in urban areas. Commentary: Neighborhood impacts of second units 28 ft. in height are likely to be minimal. Requiring public hearings (level 5 approval) for units taller than 17 ft. in urban areas may discourage the construction of second units on properties with limited lot coverage.

Proposed change: Lower the level of discretionary review required (to level 4) for second units exceeding 17 ft. in height in urban areas.
Comment: It is entirely incorrect to suggest that neighbors on urban streets will not be concerned by the construction of additional 28 ft. tall, 2 story structures next door. Exactly the opposite is likely to be the case. In some locations these second units will be larger than 680 ft.

through variances processes, and some will have garages or work-spaces below living space. Public hearings are currently required precisely in order to consider the concerns of neighboring property owners who may be hemmed in by 2 story tall second units.

3.3.5) "No more than 5 second units per year may be constructed in the Live *Oak* area. Commentary: Infrastructure improvements in Live *Oak* over the past 20 years have eliminated the need for **the** annual cap on second units in Live *Oak*. Property owners in all areas of the County should have the opportunity to construct new second units.

Proposed change: "Eliminate the annual cap on second units in the Live *Oak* area."
Comment: This proposal is a reversal of General Plan policy which is concerned with **the** preservation of neighborhood character. This proposal needs to be reviewed by an informed public with an environmental analysis which articulates the consequences of this major change.

3.4 Section: Non-Conforming Structures

3.4.1) "Conforming additions greater than 800 sq. ft. to non-conforming structures require discretionary approval (Level 4). Commentary: Conforming additions generally create few impacts, and such projects are rarely conditioned, *so* that discretionary review is not needed. Restrictions on size of additions and permit requirements are especially burdensome to owners of smaller non-conforming residences."

Proposed change: "Allow conforming additions of any size to non-conforming residences with a building permit only."
Comment: Staff asserts that conforming additions "generally create few impacts". **The** impacts that 800 sq. ft. house expansions, or in this case "additions of any size", have upon water supplies, water pollution, traffic, parking and so on, are substantial. Small old structures could be used as the basis to legalize what would be essentially new homes in sites that should never have been built on because of landslide hazards, incursions into riparian corridors, lack of adequate parking and other home site problems. The problems of "non-conforming structures" are often based on non-conformance to the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The UBC is fundamentally a means to insure the safety of housing **to** the home's occupants. Many older homes are "non-conforming" because they have old and potentially dangerous wiring, inadequate foundations, doorways and windows that are useless as for escaping a fire, may be located on hillslopes prone to landslides, may have failing or antiquated septic systems and so **on.** These are very common problems with old or illegally constructed housing. The proposed rules assert that "such projects are rarely conditioned, so that discretionary review is not needed". Enforcement of the existing **rules** should result in safety upgrades before new permits for major increases in square footage are issued. In the **1983** Love Creek landslide, the County **was** responsible for its part in issuing building permits for houses constructed on that slide which resulted in loss of life. In the years following that landslide the requirements for soils reports and engineered foundations became the norm. The proposed changes could result in the issuing of permits to expand houses built on 40% slopes without foundation upgrades to the original building. These considerations are probably the reason the current discretionary review rule exists. This proposed change to the code is counter to public safety, and to environmental protection.

3.4.2) "Discretionary approval with a public hearing (level 5 approval) is required for structural repairs of structures exceeding height limits by more than 5 ft. ("Significantly non-conforming") Commentary: "Owners of such residences find it very difficult to make essential repairs or alterations. Many houses in the County fall into **this** category due to changes in the way the County has measured height over the years."

Proposed change: "Treat structures exceeding the height limit by more than 5 ft. like other non-conforming structures, allowing owners to make needed repairs and alterations, and construct conforming additions, with a building permit only.
Comment: The restrictions in the current **rule** refer only to "structural repairs". Older tall houses may be more likely to have existing structural or foundation problems because the house is constructed on a slope. This is often **the** reason that a house exceeds the standard height limits. A **28** ft tall 2 story house with **8** ft ceilings and **a** standard **4** in 12 roof would have a foundation height of about **5** A. Such **a** house is built into **a** hillside. A requirement that the structure he evaluated for safety by a qualified person (a county building inspector) before processing a building permit would be prudent. The existing rule suggests that this is an issue of structural integrity.

3.5 Section: Coastal Regulations

3.5.1) "Demolition of structures in rural areas of the Coastal Zone requires discretionary approval with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval" Commentary: Demolition generally creates few impacts. Discretionary review with a public hearing is not necessary for most demolition projects."

Proposed change: "Exclude most demolitions from requiring a Coastal Approval (would still require demolition permit). Continue to require Coastal Approval for demolition on sensitive sites such as biotic habitats, and for historic structures."
Comment: This proposed rule change appears to be reasonable. However, structure demolition often involves the use of bulldozers both to knock down structures and to pick up debris. In cases where the terrain upon which the proposed demolition will **take** place is steeper than 20 degrees above the horizontal, or is within **a** riparian exclusion zone (60' from a stream), the permit to demolish should not be issued without a site visit by Planning staff to evaluate potential erosion hazards and establish a designated path or paths to the building site by heavy equipment in order to limit ground disturbance. A grading permit should be required if foundations deeper than **18**" below grade are to be removed. Without such controls, extensive and possibly unnecessary ground disturbance may occur.

3.5.2) "Additions greater than 500 sq. ft. in rural **areas** in the Coastal Zone require discretionary review with a public hearing (Level 5 Approval)." Commentary: "Impacts of such additions are generally minor. Potential project impacts, including visual impacts could be fully addressed with a lower level of discretionary review, and do not require a public hearing."

Proposed change: "Lower the level of discretionary review required (to Level 4) for rural additions to the Coastal Zone, reducing the time and expense required by the applicant. Public hearing would be held only if requested."

Comment: Level 4 review (public notice) may be adequate. However the public notice should be mailed to neighbors within at least 500 ft. and include the provision that a public hearing can be held if requested

3.5.3) "Grading exceeding 100 cubic yards in the Coastal Zone requires Coastal Approval with a public hearing (Level 5)." Commentary: "Required grading permits addresses (sic) most grading impacts. Some impacts, such **as** visual impacts, are not addressed during the review of the grading permit."

Proposed change: "Lower the level of discretionary review required ***(to*** Level 4) for grading in the Coastal Zone." Public hearing would he held only if requested.)
Comment: The County's Grading Ordinance itself needs updating. It is confusing and it is often violated or its provisions are ignored. It dates from the 1970's and it should be updated to **bring** it into a rational relationship with the Sec. 303(d) Clean Water Act listing for sediment pollution of many of the streams in Santa Cruz County. Level 4 approval for grading permits in the Coastal Zone is reasonable if that public notice includes the provision that a public hearing can be requested.

3.5.4) "County regulations require discretionary review of solar energy systems in certain areas of the Coastal Zone (Level 5 Approval). Commentary: "New California State Law does not allow discretionary review of solar energy systems. **The** County should remove harriers to the installation of sustainable energy systems for residences."

Proposed change: " Allow the installation of solar energy systems in the Coastal Zone with a building permit only. Continue to require that solar systems shall now exceed the height limit for the zoning district by more than 3 feet."
Comment: If as stated in this proposal, "New California State Law does not allow discretionary review of solar energy systems."; then this needs clarification. It is very unlikely that endangered plant communities can now he covered or extirpated by solar systems due to some change in state law. The actual text of **the** law needs to **be** understood before this change is adopted. To say that discretionary review is not permitted may mean that local government cannot prevent the installation of solar systems based on considerations such as impacts on view sheds and other ordinary residential concerns. If this is the case, it needs to be clearly understood. Solar system installation is basically in the public interest considering the alarming speed of climate change.

3.6 Section: Other Recommended Modifications

3.6.1) "A discretionary permit (Level **3** Approval) is required when using a right-of-way less than 40 ft. wide. to access an existing lot of record." Commentary: "Other agencies now review all building permits, and can condition building permits to address any issues with rights-of-way."

Proposed change: "Delete the requirement **for** discretionary approval for using a less than 40-foot right of way to access an existing lot of record.

Comment: The proposal needs to be clarified so that the actual text of the rule change will not affect the current rules for private roads and driveways. The suitability of a driveway is a critical matter which cannot be left to the vagaries of separate small fire districts that are not planning agencies. The pressure on small agencies to allow development on lots Without reasonable access will be intense. Regulations would end up being variable and uncertain all across the County. Most of the rural and mountain lots with reasonable access in regard to legal Width of a right of way and interrelated issues such as the slope, drivable width, and turn radii have already been developed. Many lots of record are simply not developable because to cut a road to them would cause tremendous erosion inducing grading in the form of tractor blading. slope cutting and stream crossings with culverts and bridges. Permanent hillslope failures, continuous erosion, and new landslides are the result of unregulated road cutting. The County recently (perhaps *3* or **4** years ago) attempted to clarify its driveway access requirements *so* that they worked with the rules used by fire districts. In the face of noisy opposition from land-owner and development interests this proposal was abandoned and the problem was left with an inadequate set of Planning regulations still in place. What is being proposed does not seem to correct the deplorable current situation.

3.6.2) "For properties adjacent to agricultural land, discretionary review (Level **4)** is required for additions and new accessory structures within the required 200 ft. agricultural buffer." Commentary: "For properties with an existing house already in the agricultural buffer, discretionary review of additions or new accessory structures that do not extend further into the buffer area may be redundant."

Proposed change: Eliminate the requirement for discretionary review of additions or accessory structures less than 1,000 sq. ft. that extend no further into the buffer area than the current residential development. Condition project to require that installation of a physical barrier.
Comments: If the principal residence where the addition or accessory structure is proposed is a legal house of record and not illegally constructed, this proposal may be reasonable, however it will likely increase the number of occupants who are exposed to the noise, chemicals, and dust of agricultural operations. This should be considered. It is a public health matter.

3.6.3) "Current regulations require an administrative approval (Level *3)* for front-yard fences exceeding **3** feet in height, including front yard "flag lots" that face another property instead of facing that street." Commentary: Property owners of flag lots and similar lots must obtain a permit to construct privacy fences between their property and the adjacent property. The construction of privacy fences is allowed without permits between other adjoining properties.

Proposed change: "Allow the construction of six-foot fences in the front yard of flag lots and other lots that do not face a right of way without requiring discretionary review or a building permit."
Comment: This proposal seems reasonable though it does not address the issue of the possible obstruction of landscape views from the adjoining property. If a *6* A. tall fence is much longer than house it surrounds, the neighbor may have objections that are not clear in this discussion.

3.6.4) Current regulations require an administrative approval (Level **3)** for front-yard fences exceeding 3 ft. in height, but required pool barriers must be at least **4** A. in height." Commentary: "Since County regulations require pool barriers to be at least **4** ft., approval of required pool barriers is always granted and administrative approval should not be required."

Proposed change: "Eliminate the requirement for administrative approval for required pool barriers in front yards with existing pools. Require that pool barriers in front yards be constructed with materials that do not obstruct site distance."
Comments: This proposal seems reasonable.

3.6.5) A ten-foot separation is currently required between structures on a parcel, and also between water **tanks** on a parcel." Commentary: "The building code requires only a six-foot separation between structures, and does not require separations between water **tanks.** Reducing the required separation between structures to 6 feet, and allowing zero separation between water tanks, will not impact neighboring properties.

Proposed change: "Require only 6-feet between structures located on a property. Eliminate the separation requirement between water **tanks.**"
Comment: The six foot separation in the Uniform Building Code between structures is probably related to fire transmission between structures. The UBC standard is probably adequate. Many water **tanks** distort slightly when filled due to internal water pressure. In order to maintain the stability **of** large tanks it is a good idea **to** have a separation between the tanks of at least one foot **so** that the condition **of the** tank and its base can be determined.

3.6.6) "Electric power is not allowed on vacant residential parcels. Separate electric service for outbuildings on developed parcels requires discretionary review with a public hearing (Level 5)." Commentary: "Electric service on vacant lots can be important for fire suppression, or for allowed family gardens. Electric service for outbuildings may be necessary for the construction of electric gates or other structures such **as** barns located away from the main dwelling."

Proposed change: "Allow low-amperage electric service under specified situations. Require a Declaration of Restrictions to clearly indicate **the** allowed **use** of such electric service for current and future property owners, and provide for inspections.
Comments: Electric power should **not** be permitted on "vacant" parcels because it may be used for camping or other illegal activity. It has no legitimate uses. **It** is more likely to cause a fire than be used **to** suppress one. Regarding the related issue **of** separate electric services on the same property, the requirement for a Level 5 approval is not a prohibition on this use in the case **of** out-buildings. It was the intention of former Boards of Supervisors to allow neighboring property owners to have the ability to address this issue as it impacts them. Separate electric services are a safety issue because each electric panel is grounded **and** has circuits designated and sized for a specific use such as a remote gate or a barn. It is not in the County's interests or in the interest of public safety to have live circuits **run** from building to building without the safety offered by separate eclectic service panels. This is also an issue of controlling the construction of illegal dwelling units on a property.

4. Conclusion.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on **the** proposed Amendments and we are available to expand upon or clarify any of our comments. These proposed Amendments **are** very far reaching and will have enormous impacts on the natural environment, resources, and infrastructure of the County. Under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), an Environmental Quality **Report** ("EIR") must be prepared when it can be fairly argued, based on substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that a project may have a significant impact on the environment. **See** Pub. Res. Code secs. 21080(d), 21082.2(d). If such substantial evidence of significant impacts is presented, the Lead Agency **(here,** the County of Santa Cruz) must prepare an EIR, even if it is presented with **other** substantial evidence that the project would not have significant impacts. *See* CEQA Guidelines sec. 15064. **A** "project" **is** defined broadly, and can include the enactment and amendment **of** zoning ordinances, and the adoption and amendment of local general plans. See **CEQA** Guidelines sec. 15378(a); Publ **Res.** Code sec. 21065.

Therefore, we request that you consider our comments, suggested revisions, and our request that a complete EIR be prepared so that everyone can be fully informed of **the** impacts of the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Kevin Collins,
Member, Executive Committee
Sierra Club - Santa Cruz County Group

Aldo Giacchino,
Chair, Executive Committee
Sierra Club - **Santa** Cruz County Group