

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: Maia <Maia@impulse.net>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 3:27 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: IV Master Plan comments submitted for the record, Board of Supervisor's Hearing, March 2016

DATE: March 14, 2016

TO: Members of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

RE: The County Planning Commission's website materials
for The Isla Vista Master Plan dated March 2016

Dear Board Members,

We have lived in Isla Vista for many years and are all community volunteers because we love Isla Vista and want our town to thrive. We are writing to submit our comments on the Hearing tomorrow regarding the Isla Vista Master Plan and are commenting here as active "stakeholders" since at least 2009 (some of us long before that) through 2016.

While we appreciate proposals for more bike paths, more native plantings, more street trees, and the potential inclusion of Isla Vista community members in, for example, choosing the agency which would be carrying out any future parking capacity studies, we must also respond here with our strong objections to many elements of the Isla Vista Master Plan *as a whole*:

1. Our community-wide concerns, stated at the previous hearing in September, 2015 (and before that) have not been addressed and are once again being swept aside by means of an artificially narrowed agenda, attempting to limit the proceedings to parking and a single zoning issue. On the County planning website, there are 15 attachments posted which are part of the agenda and background for the IVMP hearing. Therefore, we are responding to the whole of these materials.
2. The current Master Plan online document (Attachment #4) is erroneously dated "March 2016" since the entire contents are far out of date, in some cases, decades out of date. (The previous online and paper documents also called IVMP were virtually identical but dated September 2015)
3. IVMP documents lack clear and comprehensive indexing to enable the readers' navigation, study and comparison, instead of presenting an obstacle. Also, these documents have different numbering systems making comparisons extremely difficult. (Eg, the online edition uses consecutive numerals while the paper edition uses a section-based number system)
4. Similar to the September Master Plan hearing, there has been another incidence this round of not enough time allowed and poor noticing. First by the County choosing FINALS WEEK for the hearing date. Second, by an official notice arriving by email on Thursday March 8. The agenda for the 3/15 hearing was posted online on 3/10, *just two working days before the hearing*. Also, no one I am aware of has received any notice by mail, as promised at the last hearing.
5. Any and all changes to designation and use of parks and open spaces in Isla Vista would violate Ordinance

980618.003. (See below) We are of the strong opinion that no zoning changes to any park lands should take place as per:

"Ordinance No. 980618.003 of the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, the "Park Protection Initiative Ordinance," was enacted by the voters of the District in 1998. The Ordinance prohibits the sale or transfer of park and recreation real property owned by the District, or any interest therein, except with the approval of both, two-thirds (2/3) of the members of the Board of Directors of the District, and two-thirds (2/3) approval by the voters of the District."

(A 2008 attempt to contravene this ordinance was voted down by more than 2/3 of the citizens of Isla Vista.)

6. The Open Spaces and Parks section of the March 2016 IVMP (the fourth of 15 posted attachments) appears to be a duplicate of the previous one, with the same no longer relevant references to, eg, a community center in Estero Park, plans for building housing/commercial "amenities" in Estero park, etc.

As for AnisqOyo Park, we object to any plan to move the amphitheater and/or to run a paseo through the pond/windmill, whether or not such changes are defined as "enhancements".

We object also to the many other references to changes pertaining to various parks, including the re-designation of all OS (Open Space) to OS/REC, allowing recreation equipment and other developments.

(Eg: Changes to AnisqOyo are listed as High Priority on p.5-7 of Attachment 4 (IVMP doc 157 pp), "AO Park acquisitions" given as a goal p.5-7 (Ibid)

7. This IV Master Plan continues to ignore the limitations on growth of a current Stage III Drought declared by the Goleta Water District which is still fully in effect as of this date, March 14, 2016.

8. This IV Master Plan ignores recent substantial increases in population in the surrounding areas and the continuous increase in student enrollments which increase population numbers in Isla Vista which we are NOT equipped to handle in terms of human services and parking. The IVMP emphasizes building as many housing units as possible within Isla Vista boundaries, ignoring the drawbacks of such an intensive "build-out" in an already obviously over-burdened area lacking in funds to provide social and ecological services for these added citizens.

9. The IV Master Plan ignores the need for an Emergency Evacuation Plan: our community is over-crowded and the streets are difficult for large vehicles to pass through. There are very few entrances/exits, all on the northern side of the Isla Vista "box". Who will be liable for damages and loss of lives in the event of a disaster?

10. The IV Master Plan recommends narrowing of streets and a build-out right up to the curb-line which would add to the untenable navigability of Isla Vista streets for emergency vehicles in the case of major fires, earthquake, or other disasters.

11. The Parking Program outlined (in a separate attachment, 3/16 online version) in effect, limits beach access parking by not addressing it at all, which was the original reason for the IVMP's rejection by the California Coastal Commission.

12. The IVMP illustrates and recommends building heights which are 2 or at most 3 stories tall, and yet several 4 + story buildings were built with County Planning Commission knowledge but without our community's input or approval.

13. Every four years there is a major turnover of the student population (80+ percent of IV population) which means that the community previous to 2008 (referred to in the IVMP) is long gone! Therefore, current community members from the last 8 years are those who ought to be heard now, and deserve to have objections

and suggestions responded to.

Thank you,

Maia Maia
Cara Yoshizumi
Bob Sumner
Michael Bean



This email is safe. www.avast.com