

From: [april reid](#)
To: tristan.lanza@hcd.ca.gov; Paul.McDougall@hcd.ca.gov
Cc: [Andy Newkirk](#)
Subject: Objection to Kenwood Village in Goleta, CA
Date: Sunday, October 15, 2023 10:45:19 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.

 [moreanimals.pdf](#)

Dear California Housing and Community Development:

The following is intended as a response to the ridiculous arguments made by the property owner regarding the Kenwood Village property located in Goleta, CA:

THE CITY COUNCIL ADMITTEDLY PICKED SITES, INCLUDING KENWOOD VILLAGE, BASED ON HITTING A TARGET NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS REQUIRED BY THE STATE AND THE COUNTY OF SANT BARBARA, EVEN IF THE SITES WERE NOT GOOD SITES TO BUILD ON, SUCH AS KENWOOD VILLAGE. THE PROPERTY OWNER WANTS TO PUT A SENIOR FACILITY NEXT AT KENWOOD VILLAGE, WHOSE ENTRANCE IS CALLE REAL, A NARROW, DANGEROUS ROAD WITH ONE LANE IN EACH DIRECTION, SO IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO EVACUATE SENIORS IN THE CASE OF A FIRE

The City Council picked sites such as Kenwood Village off of Calle Real to include in their list of sites to rezone to high density housing because they had to hit their target numbers imposed on them by the State and the County of Santa Barbara. One City Councilmember stated, “[S]taff had a mandate to hit a target, knowing that if they failed to do that landowners would be able to go ahead and pursue developments without city approvals (the builder’s remedy).” In other words, the City Council picked sites so they could submit the sites to the State and hit the target number of housing units to avoid the Builder’s Remedy. The City Council did NOT bother to determine whether the sites were good sites to build on or whether there were better sites that could have been chosen. Councilmember Richards stated, “I want to acknowledge, (pause) we heard a lot of speakers talk about safety concerns of Calle Real. And I certainly acknowledge that. I... I know that I personally don’t enjoy riding my bike on that area. I know that cars go very fast. I know it is dangerous. I know there have been multiple accidents and even deaths on that.” Apparently, it did not matter to the City Council what issues there were with a property. The site could have been located in a swamp, on top of an active volcano, in the middle of an endangered species wildlife preserve or in a site with protected animals, like Kenwood Village, as long as the property owner was willing to agree to build high density housing on the site. In the case of Kenwood Village, the property owner suddenly announced AFTER all the City Council public hearings were concluded that he wants to build a senior living facility on the property with 214 housing units, a separate senior day

care with additional seniors and 70 additional, separate houses. However, there are issues with placing a senior facility on the property next to a narrow, dangerous road with one lane in each direction, including evacuating seniors in the case of an emergency. The property owner admits, “[T]he mobility the residents is much lower than those who would reside upon the remainder of the Kenwood site.” Further, the property owner stated, “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 Friendship Manor. 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.” In the case of Kenwood Village, the site is not a good site to build on due to many factors, including the narrow, dangerous one lane road wherein many fatalities and injuries have happened.

The property owner has already carelessly caused TWO FIRES on the property. WHAT WILL HAPPEN WHEN THE PROPERTY OWNER OR SOMEONE ELSE CARELESSLY CAUSES ANOTHER FIRE ON THE PROPERTY AND THE EMERGENCY VEHICLES CAN NOT GET THROUGH TO KENWOOD VILLAGE IN TIME DUE TO THE NARROW, ONE LANE DANGEROUS ROAD IN ORDER TO TO SAVE THE SENIORS, ESPECIALLY SINCE THE PROPERTY OWNER STATED MANY OF THE SENIORS NEEDED ADA FACILITIES, SO IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR THEM TO EVACUATE ON THEIR OWN. ARE THE STATE EMPLOYEES, THE CITY COUNCIL AND/OR THE PROPERTY OWNER GOING TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE AFTERMATH OF A POTENTIALLY FATAL FIRE? I DOUBT IT.

THE CITY VOTED ORIGINALLY FOR 284 HOUSING UNITS BECAUSE THEY NEEDED THE NUMBERS. THE CITY JUSTIFIABLY LOWERED THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS ON KENWOOD VILLAGE DOWN FROM 284 TO 190 AFTER PUBLIC COMMENTS BECAUSE THEY KNEW THE PROPERTY WAS NOT A GOOD PLACE TO BUILD AND THE ENTRANCE ROAD, CALLE REAL, WAS DANGEROUS, AMONG OTHER REASONS. THE CITY COUNCIL KNEW THEY NEEDED NUMBERS AND THEY WOULD NOT HAVE LOWERED THE NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS ON KENWOOD VILLAGE IF THEY FELT THE SITE WAS A GOOD PLACE TO BUILD, EVEN WITH ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC

The property owner arrogantly stated, “I own 10 vacant acres of infill in Goleta that I’ve had slated for development for nearly SIXTEEN years now. In July, the City did a unanimous straw vote to change zoning on my property to RH (20-30 units/acre) or almost 300 unit (sic) (284 to be exact) after 16 years of trying to get it built (only because they are being ‘forced by the state’. After the neighbors came out and complained, the City chose to place an arbitrary cap of 190 units on the project so they could still meet the RHNA but limit the project to the minimum number of units under their RH zoning (20/acre). Mine is the ONLY parcel with this

cap that is being rezoned. Now I'm stuck with 190 units (no more, no less, and no flexibility). Does the HCD see this is reasonable or disingenuous?" To be clear Kenwood Village was picked for high density housing because the City Council needed the numbers to satisfy the State and the County of Santa Barbara. IN FACT, COUNCILMEMBER KYRIACO ASKED THE CITY STAFF IF THEY HAD THE NUMBERS TO SEND TO THE STATE WITHOUT INCLUDING KENWOOD VILLAGE AND THE STAFF SAID THE CITY COUNCIL DID NOT HAVE THE NUMBERS.

The City Council originally voted for 284 units on the property because they EXPRESSLY stated they needed the numbers and the City Council did not have the State's required numbers without including Kenwood Village. This is the case even though the City Council knew the street next to the property, Calle Real, was dangerous. After the neighbors showed up to "complain" or express their concerns about Kenwood Village, the City Council lowered the number of housing units down to 190, the lowest number they could impose without losing the RH label they needed for their numbers. The City Council would not have put a cap on the number of housing units if they did not know Kenwood Village was not a good site to build on because they needed the numbers. The neighbors, including myself, "complained" about building high density on the Kenwood Village property because we, the people, who live near the site, knew it was a bad site to build on. The property owner has no idea the issues with the property since he does not live there. He even caused some of the issues by carelessly causing two fires on the property. The property owner is so arrogant that he did not bother listening to the valid "complaints", as he calls them, of the neighbors, who took time out of their busy schedules to attend three 5 or so hour long City Council meetings to voice their so-called "complaints" because they knew there were serious issues with building on the property. The property owner, who does not even live near the site, has the arrogance to think he knows what is best for our neighborhood with out listening to any input from the neighbors. He arrogantly claims, "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." This is a joke. Unlike the people who live in the neighborhood, the property owner does not know the issues with the property and he clearly has not intention of listening to the neighbors of Kenwood Village who do know the issues with the property.

THE PROPERTY OWNER KNOWINGLY PURCHASED AGRICULTURAL LAND AND HE KNEW HE HAD NO ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO REZONE THE PROPERTY

The property owner complains, "I own 10 vacant acres of infill in Goleta that I've had slated for development for nearly SIXTEEN years now." In fact, the property owner KNOWINGLY purchased split zoned property; part of it is zoned agricultural and part is zoned single family. The property owner knew or should have known when he purchased the property how the property was zoned and that he had NO absolute right to build on the agricultural property he knowingly purchased. He took his chances when he bought the property. It is disingenuous of the proper owner to assert he has been waiting to build on property he knew was only zoned

for agricultural purposes.

THE CITY COUNCIL HAD AGREEMENTS WITH THE KENWOOD VILLAGE PROPERTY OWNER FOR HIGH DENSITY HOUSING BEFORE THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF HIGH DENSITY HOUSING WAS ANNOUNCED TO THE PUBLIC. FURTHER, THE PUBLIC DID NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY COMMENT ON THE NEWLY PROPOSED REZONING FOR THE SPLIT ZONED PROPERTY

As stated above, after the City Council had their Housing Element Plan rejected for the second time, the City Council worked in private for months to determine which properties to rezone to high density housing. In the two previous Housing Element Plans, high density rezoning was only considered for the single family section of the property, not the agricultural section of the property. After the second rejection by the State, the City Council gave a mandate to the staff to hit their target number of housing units. As I stated more completely in previous comments, the staff, unbeknownst to the public, contacted the property owner and asked the property owner to develop secret plans/drawings for high density housing on the entire property, i.e. 284 units, which the property owner did. The property owner then showed the plans/drawings to Councilmember Kyriaco, who stated he did discuss the secret plans/drawings for rezoning with the property owner. Kenwood Village is surrounded on two sides by single family housing, Tuolumne and Baker Lane. It is surrounded on a third side by a protected creek, and then by a small apartment building. On the fourth side, it has a road, Calle Real. After the public comment section of the meeting was over, Councilmember Kyriaco suddenly suggested switching the placement of the housing that was included on the original plans/drawings several years ago, from placing the single family housing at the Tuolumne and Baker Lane section of the property and the duplexes and triplexes on the side of the property with the apartment building and a roadway to single family housing near the apartments and the road and duplexes and triplexes next to Tuolumne and Baker Lane. Did the Councilmember get this new plan from the property owner or did he just come up with it himself? Regardless, the public did not have the opportunity to comment on the suggested new drawings/plan for the split-zoned property. To date, the public still has not been given the drawings/plans shown to Councilmember Kyriaco. It should be noted that Councilmember Kasdin also had a meeting with the property owner about the increased number of units during the time the City Council was working in private to determine which sites to include in high density housing, though he did not view the secret drawings/plans. I do not know if the other two Councilmembers had meetings with the property owner and/or viewed the secret plans/drawings, but I would be surprised if they did not also at least have meetings with the property owner about switching the placement of the single family housing and the duplexes and triplexes for rezoning Kenwood Village to high density housing. After the discussions with the property owner, the City Council released the new proposal to rezoning Kenwood Village to high density housing to the public on July 14, 2023. As stated above, the public had no knowledge of the switch in the proposed rezone for the split zoned property so the public had

no chance to comment completely on the new proposed rezoning.

WILDLIFE

Attached are even more pictures of land animals living on the Kenwood Village property. The pictures include skunks, opossums and possibly voles, though I am not an expert in identifying voles. My next set of pictures hopefully will include pictures of squirrels. I'm sorry some of the pictures are blurry and some of the pictures did not develop at all, but all I have is a disposable camera which is not great for taking clear pictures.

April Reid
15 Baker Lane
Goleta, CA. 93117











