

**From:** [Stephen Lebbert](#)  
**To:** [City Council](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to Adding Chapter 10.76, Recreational Vehicle Parking Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, February 21, 2022 3:37:44 PM

---

The concern over the issues surrounding the unhoused have morphed into an unreasonable panic as seen in the declaration that “conditions of extreme peril” now exist city-wide, resulting in the city council rushing into the municipal code new language that singles out particular Sebastopol residents by placing restrictions on certain types of legally registered and licensed vehicles they may own.

The data supporting the extent of this vehicular crisis has not been made available to the public prior to this vote. If a survey or vehicle count has been performed the results should be made public prior to acting on this proposed ordinance. Currently, anyone driving through the residential areas of Sebastopol would see that this supposed crisis is a gross exaggeration.

The issue has been one of sleeping in vehicles within the city limits. This issue is being responsibly and compassionately addressed by the City Council at this time. The City Council should be maintaining its singular focus on the issues of overnight sleeping in vehicles or on the ground, “rough”, not morphing the meaningful concern over the welfare of others into another agenda, that of increasing parking restrictions on a singular group of Sebastopol residents.

Regarding 10.76.020, the purpose of these new ordinances is to “regulate the parking of vehicles actively used as sleeping accommodations.”

There has yet to be a crisis of Sebastopol residents leaving their homes at night to sleep in their vehicles.

There does seem to be a crisis of residents using the City Council to decide which vehicles their neighbors should be allowed to own and park in their neighborhoods.

The City Council is not a neighborhood homeowners association, and it should not act as one.

After the “Findings and purpose,” the proposed ordinance immediately becomes untenable.

Regarding 10.76.030 Definitions, there is no definition of “oversized” vehicles as named in the resolution language of “Ordinance Number 1136.” There is no inclusion of other types of recreational vehicles such as boats, other watercraft or other property situated on trailers that may be parked in residential or commercial areas by a “Homeowner” or “Out-of-town visitor.” There is no definition of “conducting” or “city-related business.”

Regarding the restrictions imposed by 10.76.040 Parking Prohibitions, Section B is unduly restrictive as it leaves unusable the largest parking spaces in the city to both residents and out-of-town visitors. It states that neither residents nor visitors can park any vehicle now defined as a recreational vehicle in a city-owned parking lot. It should be noted that this class of vehicles now includes such vans as Ford, Chevy, Dodge, Mercedes, and Volkswagen, among others, that reasonably fit in a parking space. This class of vehicle now includes all pickup trucks that may be carrying a camper. It leaves undefined what is considered “conducting city-related business.”

I am in opposition to the direction the City Council is taking with this ordinance. If a city wide parking plan is to be developed, it needs to be developed separately from meeting the immediate human needs of the unhoused in our city, and given the planning time and the inclusion of all stakeholders. This ordinance is not only rushed, it is inconsiderate and divisive.

Sent from my iPad