

**From:** [april reid](#)  
**To:** [Lanza, Tristan@HCD](mailto:Lanza,Tristan@HCD)  
**Cc:** [april reid](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Objection to including Kenwood Village in Goleta's Housing Element Plan  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 29, 2023 7:41:09 PM

---

[Stateattachments.pdf \[1drv.ms\]](#) [Stateattachments3.pdf \[1drv.ms\]](#)

RE: OBJECTION TO HIGH DENSITY HOUSING AT 7264 CALLE REAL (A.K.A. KENWOOD VILLAGE),  
IN GOLETA'S HOUSING ELEMENTS PLAN

Dear State Housing and Community Development:

I am objecting to Goleta, California's inclusion of 7264 Calle Real, a.k.a. Kenwood Village in their Housing Elements Plan due to the following reasons:

THE DISPROPORTIONATE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING UNITS PROPOSED IN MIDDLE AND LOWER INCOME COMMUNITIES IN SANTA BARBARA COUNTY IS RACIST AND CLASSIST.

FURTHER, THE INEQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING UNITS IN DISTRICT 3 OF GOLETA AS OPPOSED TO THE OTHER DISTRICTS IN GOLETA DUE TO LACK OF REPRESENTATION ON THE CITY COUNCIL IS UNJUST.

Goleta, CA has recently been broken up into 4 separate districts for purposes of City Council representation. DISTRICT 3 IS BEING ASKED TO BARE THE BURDEN OF THE VAST MAJORITY OF GOLETA'S 1,126 PROPOSED HOUSING UNITS, I.E. 90 MORE HOUSING UNITS THAN THE OTHER THREE DISTRICTS COMBINED, ASSUMING THE CITY AND STATE AGREE TO KEEP KENWOOD VILLAGE AT THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS THE CITY COUNCIL PROPOSED, 190 HOUSING UNITS, WHICH IS THE LOW END OF HIGH DENSITY. HOWEVER, IF THE CITY OR STATE INCREASE THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS AT KENWOOD VILLAGE TO THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF UNITS ALLOWED, 284, THEN DISTRICT 3 WOULD HAVE 184 MORE HOUSING UNITS THAN THE OTHER THREE DISTRICTS COMBINED.

According to Mr. Rich Foster, who wrote a lengthy e-mail to the State on or about August 16, 2023, the following is a list of how the Goleta City Council distributed the proposed housing units throughout the 4 Districts in Goleta, CA.:

84 proposed units- District 1

288 proposed units- District 2

608 proposed units- District 3, including Kenwood Village (Assuming Kenwood Village is kept at the 190 units the City Council proposed, which is the low end of high density. However, it is highly likely the number of units will be increased back to 284 housing units, the maximum

number of high density units for the property.)

146 proposed units- District 4

It should be noted that District 3 is the only District that does not have a Councilmember representing its interests in the Goleta City Council. Goleta has 1 Mayor and 5 City Councilmembers. Prior to 2022, every City Councilmember represented all of Goleta. Then, in 2022, Goleta was divided into 4 separate districts. The vote for Councilmember for Districts 1 and 2 took place in 2022. However, the vote for District Councilmember for Districts 3 and 4 will not take place until 2024. At this moment, District 1 and 2 have their own Representatives. Further, District 4 has a Councilmember that lives in the District according to a newspaper article the Councilmember wrote. Further, the Mayor is obligated to represent the entire city of Goleta. District 3 remains unrepresented and does not have a Councilmember protecting its interests, so the City Council voted to propose a significant number of housing units in District 3. As a result, District 3 alone has more proposed housing units than all the other Districts combined.

The distribution of high density housing should be distributed as equitably as possible. Goleta City Councilmember Stuart Kasdin stated in an article he wrote for the Santa Barbara Independent on August 16, 2023, “[C]onsidering both sides of Highway 101, of all the low-income sites, 91 percent are in western Goleta (districts 3 and 4). . . Goleta’s northeastern section (District 1), filled with upscale, single family housing, was largely exempted from rezoning. There was zero rezoning for housing that qualified as low income in Northeast Goleta.”

In Mr. Rich Foster’s August 16, 2023 letter to the State, he has proposed multiple alternative sites in other districts besides District 3 that the City could propose for rezoning which would be more suitable for high density housing than the 9.84 acres at Kenwood Village. Further, if the City insists on keeping the vast majority of housing in District 3 and they want to include agricultural land, like at Kenwood Village, they can include the nearby 14.4 acres at Shelby located at 7400 Cathedral Oaks. Unfortunately, the City Council is refusing to even consider the Shelby site even though it is well suited to high density building and the owners are interested in building on the site.

SOME PEOPLE CLAIM THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY’S DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING UNITS IS RACIST AND CLASSIST

Regarding The County of Santa Barbara, the Supervisors are proposing the vast majority of the housing units be built in Goleta, while completely ignoring upper class communities like Hope Ranch and Montecito, where the celebrities live. In Newshawk, an on-line newspaper in Santa Barbara County, Goleta City Councilmember James Kyriaco stated, “The county’s approach acts like an exclusionary housing policy, benefiting wealthy and well-connected areas. No sites

are proposed in Montecito, Summerland or Hope Ranch. Meanwhile, the Goleta Planning area is expected to accommodate 89% of the total rezones. In the past eight years, Goleta has built more than 1,300 housing units and another 322 are in the pipeline.”

In a letter the Goleta City Council sent to the Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors, the entire Goleta City Council wrote, “[W]hat is distressing about this process is that Goleta has been doing its part to address our regional housing crisis, completing more than 1,300 new units of affordable and workplace housing in the past decade, significantly outpacing other south coast communities during the same time period. Should rezones be required, new sites in more affluent, white, and larger-lot underutilized sites in Montecito and Hope Ranch, for example, will expand housing equality opportunities and protect the disadvantaged communities located in Old Town.” The letter also asks for the county to reconsider its proposed sites for new housing, and to consider agriculture land only as a last resort.

Goleta City Councilmember James Kyriaco stated in a Noozhawk article on March 5, 2023 regarding Goleta, “[W]hen you have a proposal that takes 5,664 units along the unincorporated South Coast and you put three-quarters of them on the borders of one city and of those sites they provide more than 100% of the low-income housing, and more than 100% of the moderate-income housing for the entire region, you need to re-examine your priorities.”

Journalist Joseph Molina wrote in Noozhawk on February 27, 2023, “[a]bout two-thirds of the 4,500 potential housing units on the South Coast identified by the county- and mandated by the state- border the city of Goleta. In contrast, none of the county’s proposed rezones for housing are in Montecito or Hope Ranch. While there are thousands of service jobs in Montecito and Hope Ranch, no housing is proposed for those workers near these jobs. Neighborhoods such as Hope Ranch and Montecito are segregated, leaving people of color and lower income in concentrate locations such as the Goleta Valley. Isolating the more affluent neighborhoods from the regional Housing Needs Assessment exacerbates segregation by income group.”

I would propose that the Housing Element for Goleta (and Santa Barbara) consider equality their Housing Element Plan.

#### THE CITY COUNCIL LARGELY FAILED TO FULLY INCLUDE THE PUBLIC/COMMUNITY IN ITS LATEST HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN

In the State’s March letter rejecting Goleta’s Housing Elements plan, the State suggested the City “engage the community, including organizations that represent lower-income and special needs households, by making information regularly available while considering and incorporating comments where appropriate.” However, this did not happen. The City worked

in secret on the Housing Element Plan for five months. Even worse, the City apparently asked the Kenwood Village property owner to develop drawings/plans to increase the number of proposed housing units from 60 to 284. (Kenwood Village is currently split between agricultural land and single family housing.). The property owner then shared these drawings/plans with at least two of the City Councilmembers two months before the surprising announcement of the increased number of housing units at Kenwood Village was made to the public on or about July 14, 2023, when the City posted its entire Housing Element Plan.

Unfortunately, the public was given only a limited time to review the new Housing Element Plan. It should be noted that the rezoning of Kenwood Village changed dramatically before the latest Housing Element Plan was announced, likely due to the secret drawings/plans developed by the property owner and shown to the Goleta City Councilmembers.

Further, The Councilmembers made significant revisions to their Housing Development policies, such as completely changing their analysis of the criteria they would use to chose sites for high density housing without informing the public of this change. For example, the number of housing units for most of the properties was unexpectedly and significantly increased without any warning to the public. The public was not given the opportunity to accurately and completely object/comment on the changes. This includes the significant changes to Kenwood Village, including that the public was not shown the new drawings/plans to review. As a result, the City Councilmembers simply disregarding the arguments against the high density housing at Kenwood Village by the public, who made arguments/objections based on the old criteria, not knowing that the property owner submitted new, secret drawings/plans that the City Ciunclmembers were working from. For example, at one of the meetings, one of the City Councilmembers suddenly suggested major changes to Kenwood Village. The Councilmember suggested the proposed high density housing for Kenwood Village should be placed next to the existing single family housing at Tuolumne and Baker Lane, while the proposed single family housing should be built near the apartments and Calle Real/Highway 101. This is exactly the opposite of how the property owner drew the original drawings/plans when the property owner was proposing only 60 housing units on the property. To date, even though the Housing Element Plan has already gone to the State for review, and I have requested the drawings/plans, the City has not released them or explained what is in them.

#### POSSIBLE NATIVE AMERICAN BURIAL SITES ON/NEAR THE PROPERTY

It is possible there are Native American burial sites on Kenwood Village property, as well as the other sites proposed by the City of Goleta. Mr. Frank Arredondo, (a.k.a. Keen-Sku-Mu), a member of the Chumash Indian Tribe, stated in a July 31, 2023 letter submitted to the City Council, he has “referred to my own personal maps of recorded sites and found 8 archaeological sites located on or adjacent to the parcels. Since the location of Archaeological sites are protected under federal law and not available to the public, I am only able to provide

you with the site designation.” Kenwood Village was listed as 1 of 14 sites that may be referenced as 1 of the 8 sites on or near an Indian burial site. Further, when I e-mailed Mr. Arredondo, he said he could not tell me if Kenwood Village was 1 of the 8 sites, but he could say that there had not been an Archaeological study on the Kenwood Village property yet. If Kenwood Village is located on or near an Indian burial site, he should not be allowed to build on the property. (See attached letter from Mr. Frank Arredondo of the Chumash Indian Tribe.)

#### KENWOOD VILLAGE IS PARTIALLY ZONED AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY

The Kenwood Village land is partially zoned agricultural land, though the property owner insists it is zoned commercial. Previous owners successfully grew pumpkins and tomatoes on the property. There is no reason the land can not be used for prime agricultural purposes, as it was previously.

In addition, as stated above, the Goleta City Councilmembers stated they only wanted to rezone agricultural land as a last resort and they even admonished the County of Santa Barbara for recommending rezoning too many sites zoned agricultural land. In a February 27, 2023 Noozhawk newspaper article, it states the full City Council signed a letter to the County of Santa Barbara indicating, “[T]he letter asks the county to reconsider its proposed sites for new housing, and to consider agricultural land only as a last resort.” The article goes on to quote Goleta City Councilmember Luz Reyes-Martin as saying, “the community has a long history of standing up to property owners who want to build housing on agricultural land, citing the Ellwood Mesa Preserve.” Further, City Councilmember Stuart Kasdin stated in a March 17, 2023 article in the Santa Barbara Independent, “[C]onverting agricultural lands should be a last resort, not the first option.” Despite this, the Goleta City Council has voted to rezone agricultural land on Kenwood Village, even though other properties that are not zoned agricultural land are available.

#### BUILDING HIGH DENSITY HOUSING ON KENWOOD VILLAGE WOULD IMPACT THE HABITAT OF ENDANGERED SPECIES, WHITE TAILED KITES, GREAT EGRETS’ PROTECTED NESTS, MULTIPLE OTHER PROTECTED ANIMALS AND OTHER WILDLIFE IN GENERAL FOUND ON KENWOOD VILLAGE

The extensive wildlife on the Kenwood Village property, including protected animals, would be seriously harmed or killed if high density housing was built on Kenwood Village. In an article written by City Councilmember Stuart Kasdin in the Santa Barbara Independent newspaper on August 16, 2023, he wrote, Goleta’s rezoning both the Kenwood property and the Pacific Oaks properties (7190 Hollister and adjacent) would each impact endangered species habitat.

Further, in an e-mail from Katherine Emery, Ph.D., Executive Director of the Santa Barbara

Audubon Society, to the Goleta City Council dated July 31, 2023, Dr. Emery states of Kenwood Village, “[T]his property is also home to a variety of native species of special concern. White-tailed Kites (a State Fully Protected Species) and other raptors have been documented using this and nearby areas as nesting, roosting, and foraging sites. Under City and State policy, these species are protected and any areas containing them are considered ESH. Given the very high housing density enabled by this rezoning proposal, it is also hard to imagine how associated lighting, noise, pets, and biocides would not affect birds and other wildlife.”

In addition, one of my neighbors on Baker Lane took many pictures of various animals, including birds that were identified by an expert as a Great Egret, a Turkey Vulture a Red Tailed Hawk and a House Finch, all of which are Federally Protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. Further, the Great Egret’s rookeries (nesting colonies) are considered sensitive by the California Department of Fish and Game. These pictures were taken on the Baker Lane side of the Kenwood Village property, which is on the opposite side of the property from the protected El Encanto Creek. (See attached pictures of the Great Egret, the Turkey Vulture, the Red Tailed Hawk and the House Finch taken from my neighbor’s yard bordering the Kenwood Village property.) 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 multiple butterflies on the Baker Lane side of Kenwood Village. (Regarding any pictures of animals, please keep in mind that, unlike the property owner, who was given several months notice of the increased number of housing units proposed for the property, the public has only been given a very short time to date to prepare, including taking pictures of the animals on the property, waiting two weeks to get the pictures developed from my disposable cameras since I do not have a cell phone and getting the animals identified by an expert.) Therefore, I am sure I will be able to provide many more pictures of the various animals on the property in the future. I most likely would have had all the pictures I needed if I had been given as much time as the property owner to prepare.

In addition, building on the land will likely kill many of the land animals on the vacant property. I can tell from my security camera there are multiple land animals living on the Kenwood Village property, such as snakes, mice, skunks, rabbits, chipmunks, raccoons, squirrels, opossums, voles, moles and gophers. Even the Environmental Impact Report for Kenwood Village indicates that most of the animals I listed live on the property. (See attached picture of a snake on the Baker Lane side of the property and the Environmental Impact Report listing all the animals found on the Kenwood Village property at the time.) I am sure there are also many more animals that I do not see because they do not come onto my property. Even if the property owner agreed to re-home these animals, which is doubtful, there is no way he can re-home all of the multiple, various animals on Kenwood Village. Further, the land is surrounded by housing on three sides and a road on the fourth side, so there is no wildlife

corridor for the land animals to escape to outside of Kenwood Village. Building houses with paved streets would essentially destroy the habitat for the many land animals, as well as all the other animals. It would also hinder the birds of prey from finding much needed food.

It should also be noted that, according to the Environmental Impact Report, the El Encanto Creek contains animals, some of which are PROTECTED, such as Pacific Tree Frogs, Eastern Pond Turtles, Crayfish and Mosquito Fish. There have also been Great Blue Herons, Common Yellowthroat, Acorn Woodpeckers and raccoons seen at the creek. (A partial list of fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and Mammals seen at the El Encanto Creek, as well as on the Kenwood Village property is attached.). The types of animals on the property has increased since the Environmental Impact report was completed several years ago.

Kenwood Village is clearly used as a habitat for multiple land and air animals, otherwise the animals would not be on Kenwood Village.

THERE ARE ALREADY TOO MANY FATALITIES AND INJURIES ON CALLE REAL NEAR KENWOOD VILLAGE. ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC WILL ONLY CAUSE MORE FATALITIES AND INJURIES.

The traffic on Calle Real near Baker Lane is crowded and dangerous. It is my understanding the intersection 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 have attached newspaper articles regarding a small sample of the multiple accidents/fatalities on Calle Real near Baker Lane. I have also enclosed a picture of a bicycle with fresh flowers on it located on Calle Real wherein a woman riding the bicycle was killed.) During the investigation of the bicycle fatality, the intersection was so dangerous that a second accident happened wherein someone then hit one of the Sheriff's vehicles.

Further, Calle Real curves significantly 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. (See attached picture of the curve after Baker Lane going toward the 7-11 on Calle Real.). My parents and/or I have lived on what is now called Baker Lane for 57 years. I can attest that many of the vehicles on Calle Real drive as fast as the vehicles driving parallel to Calle Real on US 101, ie. at least 65 miles per hour, regardless of the posted speed limit. Though I am not an expert, I would submit that the vehicles coming around the curve at a minimum of 65 miles per hour may not all have the time/feet to stop before hitting any vehicles 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 if the property owner was allowed to build on Kenwood Village.

In addition, Glen Annie and Storke Road is the name of the US 101 Highway on/offramp closest to Kenwood Village and the entire area. The City Council has indicated that the

intersection of Hollister and Stroke Road, located near the Glen Annie and Storke Road on/offramp to Kenwood Village, is one of the most heavily trafficked areas in Goleta. Also, back when the Kenwood Village property owner was proposing 60 housing units on the property, a City of Goleta report stated that the US 101 southbound ramps at Storke Road would “exceed the City’s acceptable operating standard.” As a result of high density housing at Kenwood Village, traffic for the on/off ramp at Storke Road would be even more crowded/dangerous if there were a significant number of additional vehicles from Kenwood Village.

Finally, the significantly increased traffic from the site, as well as the many other proposed sites on Calle Real near Storke Road, will make it much more difficult for emergency vehicles to be able to reach their destinations to help people/save people's lives. In addition, if the roads/US 101 are too crowded, it will be even more difficult for emergency vehicles to reach their destination. This is especially concerning since Kenwood Village is surrounded by hills with brush, which is a wildfire hazard and the one lane road at Calle Real near Baker Lane is considered one of the most dangerous intersections in Goleta.

KENWOOD VILLAGE DOES NOT FIT IN WITH THE OVERALL DESIGN OF THE VASTLY SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING LOCATED IN THE ENTIRE AREA.

Kenwood Village is located in the El Encanto/Dos Pueblos area, which is a single family housing area with the vast majority of housing being single story housing, with some two story housing sprinkled in. There is one small corner of the entire area containing a small apartment complex, a 7-11 with a small gas station, two small restaurants, a bar and a liquor store.

Kenwood Village is surrounded on two sides by single family housing on Tuolumne and Baker Lane, which is a small, one block long PRIVATE street. One side is a road; Calle Real. The Fourth side is bordered by El Encanto Creek, a PROTECTED creek with many protected animals. On the other side of the PROTECTED Creek is the small corner with the apartment complex and a few small stores listed above. These stores are not all helpful to people trying to shop for a multitude of various items, including groceries, clothes and other items.

Further, there will not be enough parking at Kenwood Village to fit vehicles for 190, or 284, housing units, depending on how many units Goleta Councilmembers may approve. Baker Lane and the two streets next to Baker Lane on the other side of Kenwood Village are all PRIVATE streets. This leaves only Tuolumne for the overflow vehicles. Keep in mind that the Kenwood Village property owner and the City Council still have not released the secret drawings/plans for the increased number of housing units proposed for the property, which may include some information of any problems with all vehicles successfully parking on the Kenwood Village property.



AFFORDABLE HOUSING SHOULD NOT MEAN SUBSTANDARD HOUSING. THE STATE AND CITY SHOULD CONSIDER REPUTABLE OWNERS/DEVELOPERS WHEN DECIDING WHERE TO BUILD. SINCE THE PROPERTY OWNER PURCHASED THE KENWOOD VILLAGE OVER A DECADE AND A HALF YEARS AGO, HE HAS RARELY MOWED THE ENTIRE PROPERTY, LEADING TO AT LEAST TWO BRUSH FIRES, ONE OF WHICH ALMOST BURNED MY HOUSE DOWN. IF THE OWNER CAN NOT TAKE CARE OF THE VACANT PROPERTY, HE CERTAINLY CAN NOT BE TRUSTED TO BUILD QUALITY HOUSING. PLEASE DO NOT REWARD A CARELESS/NEGLIGENT PROPERTY OWNER BY ALLOWING HIM TO BUILD WHAT WILL LIKELY BE SUBSTANDARD HOUSING ON THE PROPERTY, DESPITE ANY EXISTING LAWS IN PLACE.

To the best of my recollection, all the previous owners of the property were very diligent about mowing the entire vacant property. However, ever since 2009, after the current property owner purchased the property, there is documentation that the property owner has not taken care of the property, despite the property owners claim that he has “current mowing practices.” The property owner has consistently allowed the weeds to grow extremely tall, and rarely mowed the property, even after he had been repeatedly asked to mow the property. There have been brush fires that started on the property and I was told the property owner has even received a violation for not mowing the property. 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? As such, 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? (Documentation of the vacant property with weeds taller than a human being are attached.)

The evidence that the property owner did not take care of the property for over a decade and a half are as follows:

1. 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 the Goleta City Council recordings of the meetings should have the exact date. The note my mom wrote regarding weed abatement is as follows: Number 4 on her list of issues 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”. Only after my mom’s comments at the City Council meeting did the property owner mow the property.
2. On November 14, 2013, KEYT News Team, a local television station, 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 Lane and Tuolumne were evacuated as a precaution.” I was one of the residents that was evacuated. Further, the power pole that was damaged was right next to my rental property at 17 Baker Lane.

3. 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?”

4. In approximately June 2016, my next door neighbor, Ed McGready, a retired either Captain or Chief with the Santa Barbara Fire Department, went to the City Council meeting and stated that the property owner never took care of the property. Only after that did the property owner mow a portion of the property in 2016. I am sure the City has video of Mr. McGready in their archives if you want to view it. As a retired Chief or Captain of the Santa Barbara Fire Department, I am sure he has a great deal of experience with the standards used to determine if a field/property is mowed sufficiently according to the law.

5. 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.”

6. I was expressly told in approximately 2016 that the property owner received a violation on the property from the Fire Department the year before because the weeds were too tall.

7. 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 on the Kenwood Village property since the time the current property owner owned it, one on the other side of the property from me near the El Encanto Creek and one mentioned above, which happened 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.”

8. I spoke to Chief Fred Tan of the Santa Barbara Fire Department on or about December 20, 2019, when the weeds were overgrown/tall again for a very long time. Chief Tan told me the property owner came in to talk to him about the weeds on the property. Why would the property owner bother to visit the Chief of the Fire Department to talk about the weeds in the field if there was no problem with the weeds, unless the property owner is claiming he just showed up at the Fire House to talk to the Fire Chief years after purchasing the property just for the fun of it for no reason whatsoever?

9. A few days ago, I took additional pictures of the Kenwood Village property from my backyard. Again, the weeds are taller than my fence. (See attached e-mails and pictures of the overgrown weeds taken throughout the more than decade and a half that the current property owner owned Kenwood Village and newspaper articles of the 2013 brush fire on Kenwood Village that almost burned my house down.)

In conclusion, please do not change the zoning of Kenwood Village to allow the property owner to build a substandard housing project on the Kenwood Village property.