

From: [april reid](#)
To: tristan.lanza@hcd.ca.gov; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov; [Andy Newkirk](#); john.buettner@hcd.ca.gov
Cc: [april reid](#)
Subject: Kenwood Village is no longer proposed for very low/low density housing
Date: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 8:52:09 AM

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.

 [Alkerletter.pdf](#)  [FriendshipManor.pdf](#)

Dear California Housing and Community Development:

THE GOLETA HOUSING ELEMENT PLAN CLAIMS KENWOOD VILLAGE WILL PROVIDE 95 VERY LOW HUSING UNITS AND 95 LOW HOOSING UNITS. THE PROPERTY OWNER AT KENWOOD VILLAGE DOES NOT SEEM TO INTEND TO INCLUDE VERY LOW AND LOW INCOME HOUSING ON THE PROPERTY ANY MORE, OR AT LEAST VERY MUCH OF IT, SO THAT WILL BE A VACANCY OF ABOUT 190 VERY LOW/LOW HOUSING UNITS THE CITY COUNCIL PROMISED IN THEIR GOLETA HOUSING ELEMENT PLAN

Goleta's Housing Element Plan for Kenwood Village at 7264 Calle Real is INACCURATELY classified as 95 very low income units and 95 low income units for a total 190 units. The City of Goleta recommended 190 units for the property; 95 very low income and 95 low income. However, the property owner has just announced he wants to put 284 units on the property. He wants a 214 unit senior living facility called Friendship Manor. (This would be the second Friendship Manor in Goleta.) The property owner also would include an elderly day care. Further, the property owner wants to include 70 housing units for his own employees and maybe for the employees of the new Friendship Manor. Unfortunately, it is my understanding Friendship Manor is NOT a very low/low income facility. In fact, Friendship Manor offers large, individuals studio apartments with buffet style meals, utilities, a heated swimming pool, 24/7 laundry, a convenience store, a library with Wifi, a Theater, a Conference room and a Community Kitchen. In addition, I doubt the 70 employee housing units the property owner intends for his own employees would be considered very low/low income unless he does not pay his employees vey well, which would not surprise me. Even so, 70 employee housing units does not add up to the 190 very low/low housing units promised in Goleta's Housing Element Plan. (See attached letter from the property owner and the Friendship Manor home page for the current senior living facility.)

THE GOLETA CITY COUNCIL FULLY INTENDS TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS ON THE PROPERTY FROM THE RECOMMENDED 190 BACK UP TO 284

Many of the people I have been communicating with are wise to the way this process will work. The City Council's only concern is getting the Housing Element Plan approved.

However, they do not want to upset their constituents, especially since many people showed up at the City Council meeting. So, for example, at Kenwood Village, the maximum number of housing units, before bonus density, is 284. The City Council's plan was/is to lower the number of housing units to the low end of high density, i.e 190, to try to make them look like they are accommodating the public while getting their Housing Element Plan passed. Then, the City Council knows that the property owner would simply threaten to sue/sue to get the number of housing units back up to 284. (And yes, the property owner just threatened this, as we the public predicted). The last step will be that, once the State approves the lower number of housing units at 190, the City Council will claim they do not want to be sued, so they will quickly, voluntarily and secretly increase the number of housing units back up to the originally proposed 284 probably in a closed session meeting, As they intended all along. They will then shrug their shoulders and pretend there was nothing they could do when, in reality, that was the plan the entire time. Fortunately, members of the public saw this charade coming a long time ago!

THERE ARE MANY ISSUES/PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW, ATTACHED LETTER SENT TO THE CITY BY THE PROPERTY OWNER

The property owner at Kenwood Village is requesting the City Council raise the number of housing units back up to 284 from 190!!!!!!!!!!!!!! No one I have spoken to is surprised. As part of the 284 units, the property owner wants to have at least 214 plus housing units be part of Friendship Manor, a seniors congregate living facility. The remainder of the units, 70, would be housing for people including his own employees, presumably for the office he has miles away on David Love Place. In addition to all that, he wants a senior day care. Some of the issues are as follows:

1. Regarding traffic, the property owner is now suggesting we have high volume traffic both coming and going at Kenwood Village at the same time on the small, dangerous Calle Real road. We will have employees of Friendship Village, attendees of the senior day care and visitors of the senior living facility and the houses driving to the property. Then, we will have people, including the employees of the property owner driving from Kenwood Village to their jobs miles away. How many additional DEATHS/injuries are acceptable at this dangerous, tiny road?
2. The property owner does not mention how to deal with the multiple animals, including protected animals, on the Baker Lane side of the property, which is on the opposite side of the property from the protected creek. Obviously, many animals use this property as their habitat. There is NO wildlife corridor, so ALL the land animals are going to DIE. How many DEAD animals are acceptable? By the way, the property owner claims on his Nextdoor page, "[M]y favorite thing about living in Winchester Canyon is: the wildlife, bobcats and all." That is clearly a joke since he is fine with killing off tons of animals!

3. The property owner has not even provided the public with the secret drawings/plans he had drawn up to present to at least one of the City Councilmembers which I mentioned in past e-mails. To date, the public has not had the opportunity to view the drawings/plans. The property owner also has not disclosed what agreements, if any, he came to with the two City Councilmembers during the secret meetings that took place during the five months PRIOR to the first public meeting of the up-zoned housing units in July 2023 wherein the City Council worked in private without any known input from the public, except for the Kenwood Village property owner.

4. The property owner has repeatedly stated he is not a developer and he does not have a developer. Then, after one of the City Councilmembers admitted that the property owner did have a developer, the property owner is now admitting, "I spoke to a few builders about this (meaning his plans). I find it hard to believe the property owner had original plans completed years ago and he never dealt with a developer until a few weeks ago. This is absurd.

5. The property owner is as shady as I have always thought. He complains he never had the chance at the public meetings to disclose his plan to put a senior living facility on Kenwood Village. He states, "I was hoping to introduce this concept to everyone at the final July 31 meeting as multiple times Council and Planning Commissioners suggested that they 'ask the property owner' how the different zoning options would affect the project, but, alas, I was never invited to speak even after it was suggested." The property owner does NOT need an invitation to speak. He clearly knew about the plans before the last meeting or he would not have stated he hoped the City Council would call on him to discuss the senior living facility. If the property owner wanted to introduce the idea, he could have submitted a slip to speak during the meeting, as he is aware since he has submitted slips multiple times in the past. Instead, he did not speak at all during the second and third meetings. This just shows how secretive/shady the property owner is that he did not disclose his idea to the public when he had the chance!!

6. The property owner ridiculously claims he "was respectful of the community (with none of their input) and I feel I can do this again under a design that allows for the 284 units." So, the property owner has no intention of getting any input from the neighbors. (I was born into the house I live in 55 years ago. I am much more familiar with the area than the property owner, who did not even know about many of the animals, including protected animals, that live on the property which I see basically every day.) He clearly thinks he knows better than the neighbors surrounding Kenwood Village what is the best for the area that he does NOT live in. Maybe that was part of the secret conversation he had with two separate City Councilmembers, one meeting for each Councilmember, that did NOT include the public! Is this the person we want to be in charge of building on the property? Keep in mind, contrary to his inaccurate statements, he did NOT even mow the entire property, which caused TWO

brushfires, one of which almost burned my house down. Despite the damage, to this day, he still has not mowed the entire property on more than just a few times in over a decade and a half, as evidenced by statements at the City Council meetings by others, including a retired fire chief or captain and pictures taken throughout the years I have submitted to the City Council public website.

BONUS DENSITY/SUPPORTING A HOUSING CAP ON THE PROPERTY OF 190 RATHER THAN THE ORIGINALLY PROPOSED 284 HOUSING UNITS.

The property owner does not believe that the cap of 190 housing units on Kenwood Village, down from the original 284 units, is acceptable. Rich Foster stated the property owner “says he doubts the cap is supportable so it should be 284. Of course he did not mention that if the courts tossed the cap, using the Friendship Manor units he could ask for a 50% bonus density increase, Do you feel like the Mayor and City Council Members have sold out El Encanto Heights?”

WATER

As previously stated, Goleta literally just came out of a NINE YEAR drought. There have been many very long term droughts in Goleta since we only have one water source. This includes fines for people because the lack of water was so drastic. THERE IS NO ADDITIONAL WATER FOR MORE HOUSING. Goleta still has not even given out any new water permits yet. Even if Goleta Water District gives out permits soon because we happened to have a few good months of water, that does not mean there will be sufficient water in the future. IS THE STATE GOING TO SUDDENLY PROVIDE GOLETA WITH SUFFICIENT WATER FOR EVERYTHING, INCLUDING THE ADDITIONAL HOUSING?

WHY IS EVERYTHING ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT SO SECRETIVE AND SHADY? MY GUT CLEARLY SAYS SOMETHING IS VERY WRONG. I HAVE LEARNED TO TRUST MY GUT.

April Reid
15 Baker Lane
Goleta, CA. 93117

Revised Adopted Housing Element 2023-2031 revisions posted October 2, 2023

**Ken Alker
Kenwood Village, LLC
81 David Love Place, Suite 100
Goleta, CA 93117
October 9, 2023**

City Council, Planning Commission, and city staff
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive
Goleta, CA 93117
vai email to: HousingElement@cityofgoleta.org

Dear City Council, Planning Commissioners and staff,

I greatly appreciate the many hours spent during the three workshops in July discussing the various zoning possibilities for the Kenwood Village project. In the end, I understand that the intention is to rezone the property for RH with a maximum of 190 units.

Council and Planning Commission were struggling with creating split zoning (RS vs. RM vs. RH) using the current split between the upper and lower portions of the property. I can't tell you how grateful I am that this was NOT done. Commissioner Chapman stated (at the July 20 workshop) that he supports using the design review process to address the architecture concerns rather than split zoning, Mr. Imhof stated (at the July 20 workshop) that Staff does not recommend split zoning and a Commissioner (at the July 31 workshop) stated that the property owner needs flexibility; all were on-point. The flexibility that will be necessary to create a project with higher density toward Calle Real and lower density toward the existing single family residences to the north and east cannot be achieved using the arbitrary split that now exists between the upper and lower portions of the property. Rezoning the entire property under a single zone will allow an architect to produce a much better project that is more cohesive to the neighborhood to make the project flow better against the existing densities to the north and east which do not match up in any way with the current zoning split.

I hope everyone is aware of the Friendship Manor (FM) project in Isla Vista. FM has been in operation as a senior congregate living facility since 1973. They operate from a dorm that was built in 1967 designed for young and able-bodied college students. You must be at least 62 years old to reside at FM. Due to seniors living longer and more frail lives, FM has a need to build a new purposely-built building with enhanced features to cater to senior needs. For instance, they need ADA bathrooms and ADA living spaces which both require slightly more space than they have in the existing dorms. They want to employ the latest green technology to save on operational costs and keep rents affordable. FM also hope to add space to accommodate areas for an adult senior day care and/or outside caregivers.

I go to church with residents of Friendship Manor and I have visited FM on multiple occasions. I am in touch with their manager and two of their board members. They have approached me multiple times over the years hoping that I could help them create the new Friendship Manor at Kenwood Village. In the past I had to say "no" because I had already created the 60-unit single family housing project with

which everyone is very familiar. After I was told in July that the City was considering rezoning the property for RH at approximately 284 units, I reengaged with FM to discuss how I could help them move their residents to a new project on the Kenwood site.

Friendship Manor's current project is 214 units on just under 2.5 acres. They feel that a refreshed version of their site would require 3-4 acres in order to expand the units to add the ADA features that they need for their residents. Such that no resident is left behind, the new project must accommodate at least 214 units. My thought was to put a new Friendship Manor along Calle Real and then surround it to the north and to the east with lower density homes that would accomplish my original goal of creating housing for my employees. Additionally, it would create housing for Friendship Manor staff. In this way, the highest density is along Calle Real and the lower density portion flows toward the existing single family houses to the north and east.

Because Friendship Manor is a senior project, the mobility of the residents is much lower than those who would reside upon the remainder of the Kenwood site. While 190 units can certainly be accomplished, FM consists of much smaller clustered units that needs much less land and can fit well onto the Kenwood Village site leaving space for much needed worker housing. While the FM concept with surrounding housing is a higher density project, this concept of a 284 unit project including 214 units for FM I believe will have a LOWER impact and fit better with the surrounding neighborhood than would a 190 unit project without Friendship Manor being involved. Creating an arbitrary cap of 190 units on a site that could accommodate 284 ends up with a larger impact than one that could be achieved with Friendship Manor.

I don't think a cap is a good thing, as proven here. Kenwood Village is the only property with a proposed maximum number of units that is less than the zoning will allow. The design element needs to be left up to the architect to produce what is good for the project and what is good for the neighbors. The currently proposed 60-unit project for Kenwood Village was designed with the surrounding neighborhood under consideration in that I put all of the higher density housing along Calle Real and created lower density housing to the north and east. I was respectful of the community (with none of their input) and I feel I can do this again under a design that allows for the 284 units. After a lot of consideration, I think a 190 unit project has its merits, and I will produce it if that is the only option, but I feel that the 284 unit option is better and carries less impact.

I was hoping to introduce this concept to everyone at the final July 31 meeting as multiple times Council and Planning Commissioners suggested that they "ask the property owner" how the different zoning options would affect the project, but, alas, I was never invited to speak even after it was suggested. What a great thing it will be for our community to get our seniors a new ADA compliant and energy efficient space that is out of Isla Vista and in Goleta. Plus, I can still build the homes I've been wanting to build for our local workers!

Please recall that at the first (July 20) meeting, a straw vote resulted in unanimous support from Council and the Commission for the staff recommendation to rezone Kenwood to RH with a maximum of approximately 284 units without split zoning and without a cap, all after nearly an hour of discussion. Council and Planning Commission - I respectfully request that you think over my idea and let staff know if you agree with removing the cap (as was voted for originally). Staff - I respectfully request that you seek opinions from Council and Planning Commission again. I am just as committed now to producing a

project that is good for the community and for the neighbors, but I need the leeway to produce something good without artificial limitations. Every time the project gets limited, the ability to be creative and flexible gets diminished.

Will HCD support a cap at the very lowest end of the RH spectrum being placed on a single parcel amongst all the rezoned parcels? Will this seem disingenuous? My understanding is that HCD treats an identical minimum and maximum threshold on a property as being a constraint because, "it provides a narrow/precise range that does not allow flexibility for proposals."

If a cap must exist, I suggest going back and reviewing the video from the third (July 31) meeting. After input from several neighbors and concerns of both density and additional traffic, Commissioner Kasdin introduced the concept of a 22-24 units/acre cap which, over the 90+ minutes of deliberation, ended with an arbitrary 190 unit cap on the project. If you consider that RH zoning dictates a minimum of 20 units per acre, and the site is about 9.86 acres, that dictates a minimum of 197 units, yet the straw vote came in at a maximum of 190. The maximum that can be built is LOWER than the minimum that can be built. This makes no sense. Does that mean the project can't be built? Even if you bump the cap to 197 this then means the project has to be 197 units, no less, no more; shoehorned with no flexibility. I spoke to a few builders about this and it makes the project difficult. Having no range where the lower and upper limits are identical is impractical which is why zoning has a broad range of units; a lower and upper end. By capping Kenwood there is no longer ANY wiggle room. This forces us to create a project with 197 units no matter what; there is no creativity left in the architectural and planning process and nowhere to go if we need a few more units for the project to pencil, or a few less for it to make more sense for the neighbors or the bank funding the project.

Additionally, I assume the acreage is being taken from an assessor's map, which the assessor tells us is not deemed to be accurate. If you have a cap that is so close to the minimum number of units and the acreage ends up larger, we are right back to a maximum that is less than the minimum. Instead of having a limit of 190 units (or 197 units), any cap that is applied needs to be based upon UNITS/ACRE as Councilmember Kasdin originally suggested. I would suggest using what he articulated at 22-24/acre, but at the very least, please change to units/acre and not a hard cap (assuming you can't just get rid of the cap altogether, as I've asked for above).

Also, please take note that on page 10-11 parcel 077-130-006 is shown as 9.85 acres rather than the 9.86 shown in table 10A-28 and on the assessor's map. This is probably a typo.

Finally, I'd like to point out that the latest Housing Element revision only calls out the 077-130-006 parcel for rezoning, but the project site also includes parcels 077-130-19 and 077-141-49 which accounts for another 0.61 acres. Please include these in the rezone so that the entire project has the same zoning.

I am available to discuss further at your convenience. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



Ken Alker



What does it Cost?

The cost of living at Friendship Manor include delicious buffet style meals, utilities and many amenities.

On site is a heated swimming pool, 24 / 7 Laundry Room, Convenience Store run by residents, Library with wifi, Theatre and Conference Room and Community Kitchen.

Call Patricia for more info regarding price and availability.

Scroll down for more

Contact Patricia here:

You are interested or have questions about our services? Send us an inquiry and we will contact you shortly.



Full Name:



E-mail Address



Cell or regular phone with area code: