

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS Inconsistent and Unreliable

SUMMARY

The 2014-15 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury (Jury) received a number of requests to investigate the accuracy and reliability of the Zoning Information Report (ZIR) and the impacts it has on both sellers and buyers of residences in the City of Santa Barbara (City). Of the 482 California municipalities, approximately 20 require this type of report. Carpinteria is the only other city in Santa Barbara County that requires this type of report.

According to the City, ZIRs provide important information to both the sellers and buyers of residential property by identifying:

- zoning and permitted uses of the property
- past City permits and approvals
- any potential violations of City ordinances
- existing improvements on the site as documented in City files and archive plans

The key phrase here is “as documented in City files and archive plans.” If the City has no record of a permit or approval of existing improvements, the burden of proof falls on the current property owner.

The Community Development Department (CDD), which issues ZIRs, identifies only the following as major violations:

1. illegal dwelling units
2. illegal conversion to habitable space
3. loss of parking space
4. improvements within 50 feet of the coastal bluff
5. violations that pose an immediate fire or life safety risk

When major violations are identified, the report is given an enforcement case number and the seller is given a number to call in the Building and Safety Division. An assigned enforcement officer will work with the seller to remedy the violation(s).

No matter when they occurred, minor violations (Appendix A), can have serious financial consequences for the seller, even if the seller did not commit or know of the alleged violation. While minor violations are not referred to enforcement, the subsequent buyer is required to correct these, before or simultaneously, when applying for a building permit for *any* future improvements.

The seller is required, no later than five (5) days of entering into an “agreement of sale,” to apply for a ZIR. As a result, the ZIR often comes near the end of escrow. Unexpected violations can

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

throw the entire transaction into jeopardy, and may give the buyer a basis for renegotiating the price.

BACKGROUND

The historical intent of the Zoning Information Report, when it was adopted in 1974, was to stop the proliferation of illegal and unpermitted rental units in garages and rooms being split in the larger Victorian homes in the downtown area. At that time, the City had a lack of housing units and the easiest way to add more in the minds of many (sellers, buyers and developers) was to increase the room count within the footprint of existing homes, garages, and outbuildings. The result was overcrowding, lack of adequate parking, and rundown houses which depressed the value of adjacent properties. Therefore, the two initial targets for inspectors were garage conversions and interior room splits. In the beginning, ZIRs were optional. Later they became mandatory.

Within a few years, the expansion of illegal dwelling units had been put in check, and neighbors became the most efficient instrument for reporting illegal conversions. Currently, vigilant neighbors perform a good service for the community when they report illegal units and parking problems within their neighborhood.

At their inception, ZIRs covered only illegal units and parking. They did not include minor violations. This practice resulted in some property owners believing that since a prior ZIR showed no violations and they had made no modifications, the current report would continue to show no violations. Today's ZIRs have morphed into a combination of the City zoning laws, permits and building codes. Today's inspections identify and document major and minor violations as preserving the "health and safety" of the community. However, CDD staff could not produce a definition of what constituted "health and safety."

With the improved technology that became available when the CDD moved to its current Garden Street location in the late 1980s, the amount of permitting information increased due to better resources and centralization of files and archives. Records of permits for improvements, such as decks, fountains and sunrooms were more easily available. However, City personnel admitted that over several years, files pertaining to property records have been misplaced, destroyed, taken and not returned, or simply lost (especially County-issued building permits lost during the 1970s, issued prior to the creation of the CDD).

If permits are not in the file, CDD staff presumes the improvements were not permitted. Many witnesses told the Jury that the City's files are disorganized and papers are misfiled. Staff states this can happen but alleges only rarely. One broker told us he had found documentation from another property in the file of his client. This is particularly disturbing as those misplaced documents are then missing from the proper files and if they cannot be located, the innocent homeowner would be cited with violations.

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

A number of interviewees told the Jury the CDD takes an adversarial position to these alleged violations, which the homeowners resent, especially if the violation occurred decades and many owners ago. According to CDD staff, over the last four years (2010-2013) on average, 82 percent of ZIRs had some sort of violation. This seemed like an unrealistically high number to the Jury. However, when the Jury asked for all ZIRs for the month of July 2014, of the 52 reports received, 46 had violations, or 88 percent. It is hard to believe that over three-quarters of homes sold in the City of Santa Barbara have zoning and/or building violations that require correction and fees.

Many homeowners and real estate agents provided evidence that although one ZIR is deemed clear, the next ZIR on the same property may cite violations, especially when a different Planning Technician II (PT II) inspects the property. The CDD is unapologetic about this. Reporting to the Planning Commission regarding who should be responsible for these discrepancies, the CDD replied, “How do you define accountability in the here and now, when the staff is no longer there?” In other words: *If the inspector is no longer with the City, mistakes made by the City are now the responsibility of the current homeowner.* “If we have no information on the property, are we accountable?” In other words: *If we can’t find the proper paperwork, there was no paperwork, and the current owner must make this whole.* The CDD also emphasized that if something is overlooked, it does not mean it is approved.¹

The Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement (TDS-11) has been required for all residential home sales in the State since 1987 (*California Civil Code Section 1102*). Every known problem or defect is required to be disclosed by the seller on this form. Because of this, information on a ZIR has become redundant in many cases as far as health and safety issues are concerned.

Many buyers request home inspections, conducted by licensed professionals who are far more qualified than a PT II. The PT II job description states “equivalent combination of training, education and experience that would provide the required knowledge and abilities.” (See Appendix B.) The CDD staff noted there are no training manuals or consistency training for PT IIs in preparing ZIRs. The Jury was told training material is now being prepared.

METHODOLOGY

The Jury interviewed Community Development Department staff, real estate agents and brokers, homeowners, a private sector consultant, and other real estate industry-related professionals. The Jury spoke with and interviewed representatives from other municipalities. It reviewed ZIRs, minutes of an ad hoc Working Group researching ZIRs, and various drafts for proposed changes. The Jury also attended the Planning Commission meeting devoted to the recommendations of the Working Group as well as the subsequent City Council Meeting.²

¹ City of Santa Barbara Planning Commission Meeting November 13, 2014

² Santa Barbara City Council Meeting February 10, 2015

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

OBSERVATIONS

Following a City Council meeting in December 2013 when the Santa Barbara Board of Realtors argued that ZIRs were being abused by the CDD, an ad hoc Working Group made up of three planning commissioners, two planning staff, three real estate brokers and two real estate staff, was formed to research the problem. The Working Group decided to focus on three main topics:

- Administrative Zoning Approvals
- Administrative Appeals
- Format Changes to the ZIR Form

None of the above topics addresses the crux of the problem: the CDD's reliance on incomplete files to investigate the permitting process, which creates serious discrepancies from one ZIR to the next. Staff told the Jury some discrepancies occurred because there was lack of follow-up of violations in the 1970s and 1980s, but today they are more vigorous about this. The CDD says that today's ZIRs show 5-10 percent discrepancies. A significant number of ZIR discrepancies (from the 1990s to 2005) occurred during the tenure of one City employee who subsequently left. Despite this fact, the City's clear position comes across as *if a permit is not in the file, then it never existed; or the seller must prove it does.*

The Jury heard from a number of homeowners, real estate brokers, agents, consultants and other professionals who experienced the following egregious Zoning Information Report discrepancies:

- A house built circa 1900 had a detached bedroom and bath on the property line. The City ordered it demolished. The homeowners were able to obtain aerial photos showing the original construction including the disputed rooms.
- One homeowner received a clean ZIR when she bought the property, but when she wanted to sell it, the new ZIR cited a number of violations that occurred before she bought her house; one being a fence that for many years sat two inches over the property line. When asked why she had to move the fence, a CDD manager told the Jury it was a "health and safety issue." When asked for clarification, the manager told the Jury they did not know what the fence was made of, so how could they tell it was safe? This cost the homeowner \$53,000 to resolve the problem.
- Another seller told the Jury the ZIR on his property indicated a deck had been built without permits, even though the "deck" was pavers on bare ground. The City added an amendment that said it would not enforce the violation, but they also would not remove it from the ZIR. The seller paid an attorney \$717 to get the matter cleared up.
- Another buyer purchased a house in 2014, and the ZIR was clear. When it recently went back on the market, the ZIR indicated a deck that had been there for 20 years was illegal, and the owner must obtain a permit to either remove it or rebuild the deck. It would not be permitted in its present state. Estimates for this came to \$75,000. As a result, the final price to the buyer was reduced by \$50,000. When dealing with the new buyer, the City changed its mind and allowed the deck to remain unaltered. The seller had no recourse as the property transfer had been completed.

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

- A seller was informed by CDD staff, "...there is evidence that you have moved a door and window." The seller hired two contractors to confirm this had not happened. Staff did not offer any evidence that it had. The upshot was CDD essentially said "never mind." Still, the seller had to pay the contractors for revised plans and the City for revised permits.
- The City wanted a seller to remove a carport that had been in existence for 50 years and had been reported as legal on three prior ZIRs. It cost him \$20,000 to verify the carport had existed from the time the house was built.
- In a similar instance the homeowner was cited for a deck shown incorrectly on the plans. However, the changes the inspector observed were due to changes at the time of construction. It cost more than \$4,000 to get the violation removed, but this was less than the cost for the City's demand for demolition.
- A son, trying to sell his deceased mother's home, received a ZIR stating the garage had been moved from its original site because of the window and door placement, resulting in a violation. He was able to locate a 30-year-old photo of himself at the age of 6 taken in front of the garage, showing the original placement had not changed. When originally developed, this tract had the option of locating the garage in different configurations on a site. If the inspector had done proper research, this would have been known.

If the PT II determines there is a violation, documents supporting the violation should be provided. Currently, it is up to the seller to provide documentation that proves otherwise. The Jury learned the position of CDD is that "We believe we can't support grandfathering in all improvements because we don't know for sure if they cause fire or life safety risks."³

There is no formal appeal process, nor does CDD recommend one. Rarely are the ZIRs disputed since they often come so close to the end of the escrow period. The most serious problem with the dispute process is that it must go back to the original PT II who made the report, leaving objectivity in question. Homeowners are charged \$465 for the ZIR and an additional \$135/hour with a three-hour minimum, if disputed. A formal appeal process with an independent party has not been established which would guarantee homeowners due process.

Clearly, there are no checks and balances with this current process.

Common sense must prevail regarding violations that go back decades or owners ago. If CDD feels it imperative to correct the alleged violation, it should have a documented system for remedying the situation. In other words, the Jury concludes, "if you did not do the crime, you should not pay the fine." If the City has no compelling reason for correction of these violations, other than income generation, how does the community benefit? The CDD appears to be unfocused and caught up in unnecessary minutia.

³ Ibid

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

The City of Carpinteria is an interesting contrast. It also requires an Inspection on Sale Report which costs \$245. Again, these began in the '80s because of illegal dwellings. Inspectors review the file prior to visiting the property and take relevant papers with them and then discuss with the seller what needs to be done to remedy a situation. Staff spends 30-45 minutes researching the office files. The inspector will spend approximately 30 minutes on the property, and at the end of an inspection, hand the homeowner a copy of the report. Total time for staff and inspector is 1.75 hours, and up to two hours for a complicated file. In contrast, the CDD of Santa Barbara states every attempt is made to complete the ZIR within 15 working days after an application is received. Additionally, the Jury was told Santa Barbara inspectors view the property first and then research the files. In the Jury's opinion, this is inefficient.

A Carpinteria inspector estimated major violations are about one percent. The discrepancy process is simple. When on site, the inspector tells the seller what needs to be done to remedy any violation. Remedies can be discussed with the inspector until both sides are satisfied. Where there are clerical errors, the City will clean them up.

The cost of a City of Santa Barbara ZIR is \$465, which is the highest in the state, however, the total cost can easily exceed \$1,000. If a homeowner disputes the findings and staff does additional research, the costs begin to escalate. If changes must be made, new permits must be acquired, even if the permit is for a demolition. This would be in addition to any requirement for new plans. While Staff says the department is "revenue neutral" these charges are in excess of other jurisdictions. Other municipalities charge much less for this type of report: the City of Los Angeles charges \$70.20, Pasadena \$150, Ventura \$35, and Carpinteria \$245. According to the CDD, ZIRs alone generate over \$240,000 annually.

ANALYSIS

The State mandates the seller provide the buyer with a Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement (TDS-11). In addition to this Statement, many potential home buyers have a professional home inspection performed. These licensed professional inspectors are better qualified to inform the buyer and document any deficiencies, such as whether there is ball-and-tube wiring, adequate links to the sewer system and water and power hookups, whether the roof needs repair/replacing, or if a property is unhealthy, illegal or unsafe. These inspections are very detailed and much more comprehensive than the Zoning Information Report.

However, the perception of many is that the intense diligence of the CDD is to ferret out past sins, which generates additional income for the City. More than one witness told the Jury, "...every time the inspector comes out there are more violations." Indeed the City expects the CDD to generate 100 percent of its budget for this program from the money it collects. PT II inspectors appear to have taken their responsibility to a whole new level. The regulations are applied inconsistently with new inspectors and even, on occasions, with the same inspector. As an example, the Jury obtained five ZIRs on a particular property spanning the period from 1997

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

to 2014. This property remained unchanged during these years (no new construction, additions or demolition performed) and was reported as follows:

| ZIRs On One Property For Years 1997 to 2014 | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <u>Year</u> | <u>Bedrooms</u> | <u>Full Bathrooms</u> | <u>Half Bathrooms</u> | <u>Violations**</u> |
| 1997 | 5 | 4 | 2 | Zoning & Building |
| 2000 | 5 | 4 | 1 | None |
| 2002 | 4 | 4 | 2 | Building |
| 2011 | 3 | 3 | 2* | None |
| 2014 | 4 | 4 | 2* | Building |
| * In 2011 two legal sinks noted; in 2014 same inspector noted those two sinks illegal | | | | |
| ** See Appendix C for violation details by year | | | | |

In another example, a property was listed on a ZIR as a triplex and the City collected taxes on it as a triplex. One ZIR indicated that since there were no permits on file prior to the 1950s, the City assumed the triplex was permitted. The next ZIR on the property noted that since there were no permits on file prior to the 1950s, permitting was not presumed and the triplex was therefore illegal.

A violation puts the property under a cloud which is reflected in the price of the home, as seen by the above examples. These decisions can cause hardship, both financially and emotionally, to the City's residents. Many are often under stress to sell because of health or relocation circumstances. A violation is consequential and letters from the City threaten fines. Banks' strict standards often require all violations be addressed immediately, prior to the close of a sale transaction. The results can be that the buyer backs out of escrow, or demands concessions. The concessions will probably be more than the cost to remedy, because the actual cost is unknown. The seller may decide to take the property off the market. To correct the violation, the owner pays fees, pays for plans, etc. It can cost thousands of dollars before approval is confirmed.

What disturbs the Jury most is the buyer of a property with a clean ZIR is not protected in the future. The next time the house is on the market, the current seller has no guarantee violations will not be cited, violations the homeowner did not commit, but will be required to abate.

The wording of the violation(s) in ZIRs is often ambiguous. A Planning Commissioner was troubled by such vague terms as "might encroach," "something appears to be," "there is evidence," and "appears," considering the weight the ZIR now has. This is particularly troubling when the City feels no obligation to confirm this, but insists that the homeowner must provide proof that the property, in its existing state, is not in violation. Interestingly, a City Attorney approves this vague language as "intentionally qualified language." The CDD is proposing that in the case of inconsistencies/discrepancies between ZIRs, it would only refer for enforcement the creation of an illegal dwelling unit and the physical loss of parking. What creates a "habitable space" appears to be discretionary. The CDD stated that areas used for living, eating, or sleeping

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

are what makes a room “habitable.” However, for 25 years a storage room in the home that had been converted to an office, and used to conduct business as such during that time, was deemed an unpermitted “habitable space.” Currently, staff is proposing changing “habitable space” to “the creation of new floor area” or “new conditional space.” At the City Council meeting, this was defined as “having heating and air conditioning.” A member of the Council asked, “In your mind, is this precise?”

In another proposal, CDD is suggesting a new Administrative Zoning Approval Process to reduce or waive zoning standards when there are unclear city records, discrepancies in the record (including in the ZIRs), or it is evident that the improvement has been there for a very long time, i.e. 50 years. When there are unclear records and discrepancies in the records, and it is evident an improvement was on the site prior to 1974, those improvements could be eligible for this approval. The word “could” is problematic as it involves a judgment call which could be reversed when the house again comes on the market. The Jury has concerns about this. Violations today are often called out when one inspector disagrees with the findings of the previous inspector. This proposal appears to set up uncertainty for future sellers and buyers. With the CDD’s more vigorous follow-up policy, the Jury is concerned as to how violations, both major and minor, will be treated. Without reliability, ZIRs are a worthless document to both the buyer and the seller.

Absurd as it sounds, portions of garages used for storage are deemed to have created a “physical loss of parking,” and therefore a major violation. A ZIR will state, “...the workbench and cabinets encroach into the required parking area in the garage. By City Zoning Ordinance, two covered parking spaces are required and must be maintained at all times.” This means a 20 by 20 foot covered unobstructed parking space. If half the garage is used for a workshop or for storage, it must be cleared out. This is where common sense comes into play. The Jury understands the need for off-street parking, but the requirement for a 20 by 20 foot cleared space that is covered is overly restrictive and impossible to achieve in some of the older homes in the City. The City should require adequate off-street parking, but in the Santa Barbara climate, requiring covered parking seems excessive and the regulations need to be revised.

CONCLUSION

After a vigorous investigation, the 2014-15 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury concludes that while Zoning Information Reports had an important role to play in preserving neighborhoods from overcrowding, time has caught up with them and they no longer hold the relevance they once had. When it became possible to access previous history, the ZIR process changed and staff began to play catch-up with often disastrous unintended consequences. With the introduction of the Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement and often subsequent home inspections, health and safety issues were more reliably described and identified by professionals in their fields. The parking rules originally designed to preserve neighborhoods against overcrowding have become arbitrary, and to many, absurd.

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

The City of Santa Barbara needs to stand by the Zoning Information Reports produced by the Planning Division of the Community Development Department. The *past-mistakes-must-be-corrected* attitude is unprofessional and unfair to the innocent people simply trying to sell their homes. The onus should be on the City to prove that a violation exists, and not on the seller to prove that one does not exist.

Once the City affixes its official seal to the document, it should stand behind its staff and the information it provides.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding 1

While the City of Santa Barbara Zoning Information Report, instituted in 1974, has served an important purpose, the State now requires many of these safeguards through the Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement.

Recommendation 1

That the City of Santa Barbara declare Zoning Information Reports voluntary, and used for informational purposes only.

Finding 2

The practice of the City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department is that if information cannot be located by the Planning Technician II inspector, it is assumed it never existed and that owners must produce proof of its existence, or face violations.

Recommendation 2

That the City of Santa Barbara Community Development Department institute a policy that if staff cannot prove that the property was altered during the current ownership, the City presumes the alteration previously existed.

Finding 3

Homeowners, after having spent many hundreds, often thousands of dollars to establish that an improvement was permitted, and that the City was incorrect, still bear the cost of the investigation.

Recommendation 3

That if the alleged violations prove to be incorrect, the City of Santa Barbara reimburse the homeowner for all costs incurred in the subsequent investigation.

Finding 4

A City of Santa Barbara Zoning Information Report with no violations does not guarantee a future report will not show alleged unreported violations by previous owners.

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

Recommendation 4

That the City of Santa Barbara provide certainty to the buyer by certifying each Zoning Information Report as accurate.

Finding 5

If a violation reported on a City of Santa Barbara Zoning Information Report is found to be incorrect, the report is amended but the alleged violation is not necessarily removed by the Community Development Department.

Recommendation 5

If a Zoning Information Report violation is found to be incorrect, that violation be removed entirely from the report.

Finding 6

There is no formal appeal process. An “intent to dispute” is not an adequate appeals process.

Recommendation 6a

That the City of Santa Barbara establish an appeals process that requires an outside mediator.

Recommendation 6b

That the Zoning Information Report include a prominently stated and documented appeal process.

Finding 7

The City Zoning Information Report Planning Technician II inspectors do not typically research the property records prior to the site visit.

Recommendation 7

The Planning Technician II inspector review all relevant files prior to a site visit.

Finding 8

The basic cost of a City of Santa Barbara Zoning Information Report is \$465.00, the highest in the State. Other municipalities charge considerably less.

Recommendation 8

The price for a Zoning Information Report should be consistent with other municipalities.

Finding 9

The requirement that a single-family residence maintain a covered, unobstructed, 20 foot by 20 foot parking space is overly restrictive.

Recommendation 9

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

That the City rewrite this parking ordinance requirement in a more flexible manner while keeping on-street parking under control.

Finding 10

There is no training manual for staff to conduct consistent Zoning Information Report inspections and reports.

Recommendation 10

That the City of Santa Barbara write a detailed training manual defining the research policies, inspections, and procedures.

REQUEST FOR RESPONSE

In accordance with *California Penal Code Section 933.05* each agency and government body affected by or named in this report is requested to respond in writing to the findings and recommendations in a timely manner. The following are the affected agencies for this report, with the mandated response period for each.

City of Santa Barbara City Council – 90 Days

Findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10

Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6a, 6b, 7, 8, 9, and 10

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

Appendix A

Minor Violations Listed on ZIR's issued during July 2014

Zoning Violations

- The workbench and cabinets encroach into the required parking area of the garage. By City Zoning Ordinance, two covered parking spaces are required and must be maintained at all times
- Trash cans and a wood pile are being stored [*sic*] in the required interior setbacks
- The trash enclosure encroaches [*sic*] into the front yard setback
- The viewing deck encroaches into the required interior setback
- The detached storage shed and playhouse encroach into the required interior setbacks
- The front fence exceeds the maximum allowable height of three and one half feet within 10 feet of a front lot line and within 10 feet of either side of a driveway for a distance of 20 feet back from the front lot line. The front hedge exceeds the required height of three and one-half feet (3-1/2') when located within a triangular area on either side of a driveway measured as follows: A. When a driveway directly abuts a portion of a street improved with a sidewalk and a parkway, the triangle is measured on two sides by a distance of ten feet (10') from the side of a driveway and ten feet (10') back from the front lot line
- The storage shed encroaches into the required interior setback
- The play structure encroaches into the required interior setback
- The 1996 permit for [*sic*] the rear viewing desk in the rear yard expired in 1996. The deck requires a new building permit and design review approval
- The air conditioning unit was added on the roof of the garage without the required design review approval
- The detached metal storage shed encroaches into the required interior yard setback
- The attached small storage room was added without the required permit. (Any attached structure required a building permit)
- The detached shed and the trash enclosure are located in the remaining front yard and possibility in the required interior setback
- The wood storage shed encroaches into the required interior setback
- The patio cover and the outdoor fireplace encroach into the required interior setbacks
- Debris, construction materials, and trash cans are being stored in front and interior setbacks
- The storage shed in the rear of Unit A encroaches into the setback
- Miscellaneous items are being stored in setbacks in Unit B
- Miscellaneous construction items are being stored behind garage and encroach into rear setback
- The trellis in the rear of the property was built within the 40' bluff setback, which in [*sic*] a violation of the Conditions of Approval of Planning Commission Resolution 057-90. Advisory Comment: In order to legalize trellis, the condition would have to be amended at Planning Commission with a revised geologist report

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

Building Violations

- There is [sic] no permits on record for the barbeque, sink and electrical appliances [sic] for the outdoor cooking area
- A door has been added to the carport without the required permit (within the front interior setbacks)
- Remodel was done to create a fourth bedroom without a building permit
- There is no permit on record for the attached patio cover at the rear of the house
- The stairs on the side of the garage were constructed without the required permit
- The trellis in the rear of the property was built without the required permit
- The trash enclosure was built without permits
- The built-in barbeque was constructed without permits
- There are no permits on file for the construction of the rear detached patio cover
- The playhouse with rabbit hutch underneath was constructed without building permit
- There are no permit on [sic] for the washer/dryer hookups in the garage
- The kitchen has been remodeled and enlarged to include part of the family room as shown on the 1961 floor plan. A center island with a new sink was installed and the washer/dryer hookups were moved from the kitchen area to the garage. A laundry sink was also added to the garage. All work was done without the required permits
- There is no permit on record for the air conditioning unit on the side of the dwelling
- The side patio cover was added without the required permit
- The kitchen was remodeled under a permit issued in 2009 (BLD2008-XXXXX). This permit was issued but never finalized [sic]. It appears that a kitchen island was added (with an additional sink) however this change was not documented in a revised project description
- The attached small storage room was added without the required permit. (Any attached structure required a building permit)
- There is no permit on record for the rear attached patio cover
- The air conditioning unit was added on the roof of the garage without the required permit
- The two vehicle carport was added without the required permit and design review approval. Also, the original plans for the duplex show a carport where the existing garage attached to Unit XXXX is located. The enclosure of the carport required a building permit and design review approval
- The trellis covers and deck were added without the required permits
- The shower was added in the upstairs ½ bathroom without the required permit
- A building permit is required for the side attached patio trellis
- There is no record of a permit for the bar sink in the guest bedroom. Further, Zoning allows only a five foot long counter
- The building permit for the deck (BLD2000-XXXXX) was issued in 2000 but expired in 2002
- The sink and electrical outlet were added to the outdoor counter without the required permit

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

- The viewing deck was added without the required building permit
- The patio cover was added without the required permit
- There is no permit on record for the alcove at the rear of the dwelling. This area is not habitable space.
- The wall between two of the bedrooms was removed to create one master bedroom. This work was done without the required permit
- The basement has been converted to habitable space with bedroom and full bathroom without building permits
- A half bath was added to one of the bedrooms without building permits
- There are no permits on file for the washer and dryer in the storage area of the basement
- There are no permits on file for the conversion of the carport in a garage by the addition of a garage door
- The trash enclosure was built without permits
- The half bathroom in the garage was added without the required permit

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

APPENDIX B

Planning Technician II Job Qualifications, ca 2005:

Knowledge of:

- Basic principles and concepts of urban planning.
- Basic computer functions.
- Basic report writing, research methods and data compilation.
- Basic principles and techniques of inspection.
- Modern office methods, practices, procedures and computer equipment.
- Databases such as Crystal, Access, Excel.
- Pertinent laws, codes, ordinances, and regulations related to planning activities.
- Principles and concepts of urban planning.
- Penal code arrest and seizure procedure.
- Methods and techniques of conflict resolution.
- Complex principles and techniques of inspection.

Ability to:

- Learn to understand and interpret laws underlying general plans, zoning, and applicable environmental laws and regulations.
- Learn to interpret planning and zoning programs to the general public.
- Learn to enforce proper zoning requirements.
- Learn to work with diverse cultural and socio-economic groups.
- Compile technical and statistical information and prepare basic reports.
- Read and interpret mapping and survey data, site plans, zoning codes, legal descriptions and related information.
- Establish and maintain databases such as Crystal, Access, Excel.
- Understand and carry out oral and written directions.
- Communicate clearly and concisely, both orally and in writing.
- Establish and maintain cooperative working relationships with those contacted in the course of work.
- Maintain physical condition appropriate to the performance of assigned duties and responsibilities which may include the following:
 - Sitting and standing for extended periods of time
 - Operating equipment
- Maintain effective audio-visual discrimination and perception needed for:
 - Making observations
 - Communicating with others
 - Reading and writing
 - Operating related equipment

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

- Interpret and enforce applicable City, State, and Federal codes, ordinances, and regulation related to zoning, planning, and environmental laws.
- Enforce proper zoning requirements.
- Foster and use techniques of conflict resolution while working cooperatively with those contacted in the course of work.
- Effectively and competently present presentations to Planning Commission.

Experience and Training Guidelines

- Any combination of experience and training that would likely provide the required knowledge and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the knowledge and abilities would be:

Experience:

- A minimum of two years of planning or related experience is typically required.
- Training: Equivalent to the completion of the twelfth grade supplemented by college level course work in planning, geography, business administration or related field.

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ZONING INFORMATION REPORTS

Appendix C

Violations Called Out for One Property: 1997 – 2014 with No New Construction, Additions or Demolition Performed

1997 Violations

Zoning Violation: A portion of the carport encroaches into the required interior yard setback.

Building Violations:

1. The hot tub/spa and deck were constructed without the required permits.
2. The carport and attached trellis were constructed without the required permits.
3. Where there is a pool or body of water over 18 inches, gates opening through fence or wall enclosures shall be equipped with a self-closing and self-latching device.

2000 Violations – None noted

2002 Violations

Building Violation: Gates leading to pool area must be self-closing and self-latching.

2011 Violations

Building Violations Permits also cannot be located for the barbeque, sink and electrical applicances [*sic*] for the outdoor cooking area. (Note, this inspector indicated “none” for Zoning Ordinance or Building Code violations.)

2014 Violations:

Building Violations

1. There are no permits on record for the barbeque, sink and electrical applicances [*sic*] for the outdoor cooking area.
2. A door has been added to the carport without the required permit (within the front and interior setbacks).