

From: April Reid <aprilreid@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, July 30, 2023 6:35 PM
To: City Clerk Group
Cc: aprilreid@live.com
Subject: Objection to rezoning Kenwood Village
Attachments: KenwoodVillageobjections1.pdf

Dear City Council and City Clerk:

This paragraph is to everyone in the public reading my e-mail. I e-mailed Tristan Lanza at the State Housing and Community Development. He stated, “[Y]ou may send your prepared comment to the housing element inbox, housingelements@hcd.ca.gov The inbox will record your comment and it will also be shared with the City.” I was told it is best to send your comments in early so the State has a chance to consider it.

It is my understanding that I need to include all arguments in my written or oral statements to the City Council. Otherwise, I will not be able to use those arguments in the future for whatever I may need to do. Therefore, I am trying to include as much as I can, though I am not an expert on what issues need to be stated or how to express those issues.

As I stated in my last e-mail, it is hard to make objections to the Kenwood Village Project when the owner has shared drawings/plans with at least one member of the City Council, but those drawings/plans have not been shared with the general public.

Some people have stated that the Kenwood Village Project should be rezoned because they allege the project is ready to go and can be built soon. However, the current plans for the Kenwood Village Project only had 60 housing units. It is my understanding that new plans would have to be developed and approved for 284 housing units. Thus, it will take time for the new Kenwood Village Project to be completed. Further, after that, it may not even be approved.

I also think the high density housing should be spread out throughout the City. West Goleta should not have to bear the brunt of the majority of new high density housing and rezoning.

In addition, I was told by someone that if a project will not be approved at a later date by the City, it should not be included in the list of housing units to be sent to the State.

Further, I was told that once a certain number of units is approved for a particular project, it is very difficult to then reduce the number of units at a future date. So, it is important to stop the 284 housing units now, before the property is rezoned.

Also, regarding the properties discussed at the last meeting, if there is a housing project submitted by developers/owners that the City Council believes are reputable and the people of Goleta do not object, then the property should be rezoned to high density housing. For example, there were certain properties on Hollister that the owners wanted to convert to high density housing. This housing would be consistent with the design of the Hollister area, which is primarily commercial property and multi-unit housing. Further, I have been to that area multiple times, and I have never had a problem with traffic that would prevent the properties in question from being developed. The City Council should consider all sites that are being proposed. If a reputable owner/developer wants to build high density housing in a certain area and the public does not object, the property should be included in the list of properties to be sent to the State. At the very least, it would decrease the number of housing units needed in other areas. Further, the Kenwood Village land is partially zoned agricultural land. It is my understanding that the City Council has indicted they were not going to use agricultural land as part of their housing unit count, though I could be mistaken. Previous owners successfully grew pumpkins and tomatoes on the property. There is no reason the land can not be used for agricultural purposes.

Also, developing on the land will likely kill many of the land animals on the vacant property. For example, ever since I was little, I have seen garter snakes on the vacant property and on my property at 15 Baker Lane. The Kenwood Village Document states that these garter snakes are listed by the California Department of Fish and Game as "sensitive." I have also seen many birds of prey in the area over the years. The Kenwood Village Residential Project Scoping Document states that, "[s]ite development would eliminate approximately 10 acres of non-native grassland that has some value as foraging habitat for birds of prey." There are also additional animals in the field, such as mice, skunks, rabbits, chipmunks, raccoons and opossums. I have also seen evidence of moles. Building houses with paved streets would essentially destroy the habitat for the garter snakes. It would also prevent the birds of prey from finding much needed food. In addition, it would most likely kill many of the other land animals that currently live in the vacant property since there are no other places for them to easily escape to in the area. I have learned that, throughout the years, over 30 skunks were caught on or near the field and re-homed to a different site. Despite this, I can tell from my security camera located on my property at the opposite end of the Kenwood Village property from El Encanto Creek by the different markings on the skunks that there are still well over 40 additional skunks still living in the field. There are also well over 30 opossums, 15 different raccoons, 10 different chipmunks, multiple moles and a rabbit living in the field. This is well up from the number of animals I counted in 2019. I am sure there are also many more animals that I do not see because they do not come onto my property.

There are also rare plants and shrubs that would be destroyed by removing them to make way for large duplexes and triplexes.

In addition, the traffic on Calle Real near Baker Lane is terrible and dangerous. It is my understanding it is already considered one of the most dangerous intersections in Goleta. There is only one lane of traffic in each direction on Calle Real at Baker Lane. I noticed that the road curves to the right after Baker Lane going toward the 7-11 and there is no view of the edge of the street going toward 7-11 on Calle Real at the intersection of Baker Lane. I spent several days standing on Calle Real at Baker Lane. As I watched the cars drive on Calle Real and next to Calle Real on the US 101 Highway, I noticed that the cars on the Highway were not passing the cars on Calle Real. Thus, it appears the cars on Calle Real were driving as fast as the cars on the US 101 Highway, which means they were driving at least 65 miles per hour, despite what the actual speed limit on Calle Real is. Though I am not an expert, I would submit that the cars coming around the curve at 65 miles per hour plus may not all have the time/feet to stop before hitting any cars that have stopped/slowed down to turn right into any road that goes into Kenwood Village. As a result, there would be even more accidents/injuries/fatalities on Calle Real near Baker Lane.

As it is, the intersection of Calle Real and Baker Lane is already listed as dangerous, with many accidents/fatalities. Documentation of the newspaper articles is attached. The following is just a short list of accidents at or near that intersection:

- On October, 28, 2008, the Santa Barbara News Press printed an article stating, "[A]uthorities said Monday that" a man "was traveling east on Calle Real near Baker Lane when his vehicle went off the right shoulder, hit a tree and rolled onto its roof." . . . "[H]e was pronounced dead at the scene." . . . "[T]he area near the crash scene has been the site of several fatal incidents including two people killed in a car crash."

-On or about April 26, 2020, the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Office reported that they responded to the "area of Calle Real at Violet Lane on a report of a bicyclist that had been hit by a vehicle. The victim and the suspect were both traveling eastbound on Calle Real when the suspect's vehicle struck the victim." . . . "[T]he victim was confirmed deceased prior to the deputies' arrival."

-Meanwhile, at the accident scene (listed above), a sheriff's patrol vehicle, blocking the road at Baker Lane was struck by another vehicle, whose driver is suspected if being DUI.

In addition, at the last meeting, the City Council mentioned that certain developers/owners had a good reputation in the community for the projects they built. If that is something that is important to the City Council, then the property owner of Kenwood Village should be seriously scrutinized for his lack of attention to the Kenwood Village property. To the best of my recollection, all the previous property owners were very diligent about mowing the entire vacant property. However, ever since 2009, there is documentation that the property owner has not taken care of the property. He has consistently allowed the weeds to grow extremely tall, and rarely mowed the field, even after he had been repeatedly asked to mow the field. There have been brush fires that started on the property and the property owner has even received a warning for not mowing the field. Affordable housing should not mean substandard housing. If the property owner can not even take care of an empty field, then how can he be trusted to build quality housing on the property. If he can not take care of a vacant field, he should not be rewarded by being allowed to build

housing on the property. Even worse, the last I checked, the property owner wants to charge an HOA fee to the homeowners/renters to take care of the exterior portions of the property. Can the City really make sure the exterior of the property is taken care of after the property owner receiving the HOA fees, especially since he is not taking care of the property now? The issues with mowing the vacant property are detailed in the attached documents. They are as follows:

-My mom lived at 15 Baker Lane, Goleta, CA. 93117 since 1966 until her death on February 2, 2012. It is my understanding my mom went to at least one City Council hearing regarding Kenwood Village, if not more. She wrote notes for her presentation at the hearing, most likely for the June 22, 2009 hearing, though your records should have the exact date. The note my mom wrote regarding weed abatement is as follows: Number 4 on the list states, "[I]t is past the deadline for weed abatement and this property hasn't been cleared as the Bishop ranch has been. As we all know about the fires I don't want this area to burn".

-On November 14, 2013, KEYT News Team wrote an article about a brush fire behind my home. The picture that was published shows the weeds were grown taller than the firefighter fighting the fire. The article states, "[I]nvestigator's believe someone smoking marijuana in an open field may have started a brush fire in Goleta Thursday afternoon". The blaze was "behind homes along Tuolumne Drive and Baker Lane near Calle Real." . . . "[O]ne acre burned. A power pole was damaged." "[S]ome homes along Baker and Tuolumne were evacuated as a precaution." I was one of the resident that was evacuated. Further, the power pole that was damaged was right next to my rental property at 17 Baker Lane.

-On June 20, 2016, I e-mailed the property owner regarding mowing the weeds on his property. I wrote, "[F]urther, you can't even bother to take care of the property as it is. When there was a fire on your property at the back of 17 Baker Lane in November 2013, and my rental house almost burnt down, the news took pictures of the site of the fire. The pictures showed that the weeds were over a feet taller than the firemen. Then, a few days ago, one of my neighbors had to complain about the weeds again just so you would mow part of the property. If you can't take care of the property before anything is built, why should anyone believe you would take care of the property when you are building on it?"

-In or about June 2016, I contacted the Fire Department to complain about the weeds on the Kenwood Village property. I was told that the Fire Department issued the property owner a warning the prior year because the weeds were too tall.

-On August 29, 2016, I e-mailed to the property owner a Complaint of garage and weeds on his property behind my house at 17 Baker Lane. The e-mail stated in part "[T]here is a lot of weeds, trash and garbage gathering up. One of the neighbors even mentioned it. If you own it, please clean it up." . . . "I am talking about the property between the fence on 17 Baker Lane after the property slopes down, where the property becomes level the the(sic) rest of your field." The property owner did not mow the field until my next door neighbor stated at a City Council meeting when the owner was present that the weeds were overgrown gain.

-On September 4, 2019 and December 8, 2019, I wrote a comment to the City Council, in part, to object to the weeds still being tall. By that time, I had learned there had been TWO FIRES in the field, one on the other side of the field near the creek in addition to the one right behind my rental property at 17 Baker Lane, Goleta, CA. I also stated "the vast majority of the Kenwood Village property is once again overgrown and taller than most human beings."

-To this day, the weeds on the vast majority of the property are taller than most human beings. I took pictures of the field with my camera and I am in the process of having them developed, which will take about two weeks.

Please do not change the zoning to allow the property owner to build a housing monstrosity on the property.

Thank you.

April Reid- owner

15 and 17 Baker Lane

Goleta, CA. 93117