

From: [Kristin Cothorn](#)
To: [Stuart Kasdin](#); [Paula Perotte](#); [Kyle Richards](#); [James Kyriaco](#); [Luz Reyes-Martin](#); [Andy Newkirk](#)
Cc: Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; tristan.lanza@hcd.ca.gov
Subject: Objection to rezoning to RH of the Kenwood Village Parcel
Date: Monday, October 9, 2023 12:17:07 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing to express my objection to the rezoning of the Kenwood Village parcel at 7264 Calle Real to RH.

I am a resident of El Encanto Heights at 7234 Del Norte Drive and have commuted along Calle Real for over 20 years. I understand that rezoning the Kenwood Village parcel to RH creates the means to allow a minimum of 190 units along Calle Real. I understand that 4 story buildings would be needed to meet these proposed densities for the Kenwood Village parcel while responsibly handling parking for 400+ (190 x 2.1) cars taking up the ground floor. Unfortunately this will cause untenable traffic and safety problems for current and future residents, while at the same time no choice but to drive to services.

There is absolutely no room on this unimproved frontage road to widen the bike path let alone the road, nor to implement safety improvements. The exclusion from RH of other, more suitable, parcels in more affluent neighborhoods combined with the State allowances of Builders Remedy and Bonus Density adds extreme pressure to maximize unit numbers (up to 280 or more) on the Kenwood Village site. Examples are given below. In short, zoning *is* the same as project approval.

It is not responsible or realistic to create a rezoning that dramatically increases the number of cars on the part of Calle Real while ignoring these safety and traffic issues. They are impossible to address, plain and simple.

I urge you to:

1. Please consider the traffic, safety, as you have at other sites, in rezoning the Kenwood Village parcel and rezone it to be RS/RM instead of RH.
2. Please maintain flexibility to meet affordable housing numbers by including more RH sites among those where infrastructure is available to handle it. (See examples).

As a commuter I know well the existing hazards faced by pedestrians and bicyclists along this unimproved stretch of Calle Real, at the Kenwood Village project parcel and onward out of the neighborhood. My son was never allowed to bicycle on this part of Calle Real.

The combination of an extra 400+ cars and the lack of transit and services within walking distance, all but guarantee gridlock traffic during work and school commutes, and during emergency evacuations in a fire-prone area. 100 foot flames could be seen from Del Norte and Glen Annie during the Gap Fire. Add to this the dangerous pull-out traffic from 400 more cars making a left turn onto Calle Real from the Kenwood Village project. I understand you must scramble to assign high densities to particular parcels but it is irresponsible to rezone without considering traffic and safety.

Under RH, there will be extra pressure placed on this parcel, in part because of the number of available parcels across Goleta which were excluded from the RH zoning. *These parcels generally have wider corridors and safety improvements to roads. They have more walkable services. Yet in assigning RM In ruling out these parcels for RH, traffic and neighborhood character were sited.* Traffic and safety conditions in El Encanto Heights along Calle Real are much worse, and yet these

very high density implications were not considered because the single family home neighborhood of El Encanto Heights is considered to be of low affluence. This is unjust and goes against State and City objectives for implementing affordable housing.

The exclusion of available sizable and smaller parcels in affluent areas from RH, indisputably ties the hands of the City in responding to future project impact studies. There great pressure from Builder's Remedy and Bonus Density programs that could make the number of units at the Kenwood Village parcel well over 190, upwards to 280 or more. A lot has been made of needing to "make the numbers". If these other (generally more suitable) parcels were also rezoned to RH, it would take the "numbers" pressure off of the Kenwood Village parcel.

For example, the parcel at 625 Dara Road is proposed for RM zoning with a density of 43 versus 127 units at RH. There were no reasons given for exempting this parcel (the only one in District 1) from RH - except for concern for the house *values and neighborhood character for current affluent homeowners*. These same concerns exist for El Encanto homeowners, however in this case, house values and neighborhood character were not considered worthy to even mention. Should you allow more affluent neighborhoods to essentially say to working class neighborhoods - don't worry about money. Home values are often used by elderly homeowners to fund their need for Assistant Living when the time comes. Aren't home values and neighborhood character for working class neighborhoods equally important as those in more affluent areas?

The parcel at 6470 Hollister Avenue is another well-accessible site passed over for RH zoning. With no apparent reason other than that staff were told to "look into it", which they presumably didn't. This is not responsive planning to meet community needs.

Everyone I know in our neighborhood understands the need for affordable housing. In fact better than more affluent neighborhoods. We are socioeconomically diverse. We just need plans that provide adequate infrastructure and services to handle the additional people. And this is, well, impossible at high density for the Kenwood Village site.

Thank you,

Kristin Cothorn
7234 Del Norte
Goleta CA 93117