

Rezone

Sarah Mayer Public Comment - Group 1

From: David Ross <davidnross9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 8:45 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Proposals

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

I am concerned about the housing proposals: 3,000 units between Patterson, Turnpike, Hollister and the 101. That's probably 10,000 additional people that will be living in LESS THAN ONE SQUARE MILE. That would ruin the character of the neighborhood of single-family homes where I own my home and live.

David N Ross | DavidNRoss9@GMail.com

Sarah Mayer

From: David Ross <davidnross9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 8:52 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Proposals

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

I am concerned about the many housing proposals for the Santa Barbara / Goleta area. Will we have enough water? Lake Cachuma was nearly empty a couple of years ago, and State water is not reliable.

David N Ross | DavidNRoss9@GMail.com

Sarah Mayer

From: Dawn OBrien <mercurydm@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2024 5:51 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: "Affordable"housing

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors,

Our resources are taxed beyond breaking, traffic is congested and our quality of life is compromised.

What are you thinking?

Building affordable housing is a myth here. - it isn't possible. Just look at Santa Barbara's failed efforts.

It would appear that the contractors, builders and developers are calling the shots - with no conscience.

Stop 🏠 packing people in - you're ruining our town - period.

Thank you for your considerations -

Sincerely,

Dawn

Sarah Mayer

From: William Vasquez <willvasquezvmg@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2024 8:09 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Paula Perotte
Subject: Stop Glen Annie development plans!

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear SBCBOS,

Please remove Glen Annie from the list of proposed sites for new housing! I just read another Newshawk article which shows that things are clearly moving forward from the county's perspective on assessment of Glen Annie for redevelopment.

We cannot stress enough how important Glen Annie is to our community.

It serves local high school team events, serves as one of the only event-locations that is "nice" here in Goleta, is a core recreation facility as well. And there is no more room for thousands of people - and their cars!! Have you been to the site in the morning as school come in?

If allowed to go through, this will significantly diminish the quality of life we desperately want to preserve.

Lastly, the county owns so much land - bring in infrastructure to areas that are sparsely populated!! It's a long term solution, someone please take a leadership position here.

Thank you,

William Vasquez
7880 Rio Vista Dr

Sent from my iPhone

Sarah Mayer

From: Paula Bortolazzo <p.bortolazzo14@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2024 5:50 PM
To: PAD LRP Housing Element; sbcob
Subject: Glen Annie Golf Course

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it concerns, I am writing to you to express my concerns about the SB County's proposed rezoning of Glen Annie Golf Club for housing units. My concerns are outlined below:

- 1) Impacts on City of Goleta services and infrastructure, including additional police, road infrastructure, (which is currently equal to a 3rd world country) huge traffic impact, and school services within the city of Goleta. The state is trying to pass a proposition that will be taking money away from counties. We are already severely back logged in terms of infrastructure spending. Cathedral Oaks Blvd. as well as other roads are full of cracks and potholes and continue to get worse each week. The sewer system in the area is already compromised. The existing infrastructure was not built to handle so many people. At what point are the very serious infrastructure deficiencies going to be assessed before we keep building?
- 2) Geological concerns in reference to the increased weight of development on an already moving hill and potential impacts on current housing below the hill. Tee boxes continually slide and undulate on course as well as compromised irrigation pipes on a constant basis already due to current earth movement.
- 3) Open space of the current golf course provides a vital wildfire break for the City of Goleta neighborhoods below and Dos Pueblos High School, as well as more affordable recreation for our community. Quality of life matters.
- 4) Traffic, safety, and noise impacts of development on Cathedral Oaks, Glen Annie Road, and corresponding overpass. Adding additional traffic to some of the most high volume intersections in the City of Goleta seems reckless. Safety concerns on one of the most used corridors by bicycle and pedestrian traffic concerns me. Noise on an already congested traffic corridor presents health and quality of life concerns for residents whose homes are near Cathedral Oaks Rd. and Glen Annie Rd.
- 5) Water Rights and where does the water to support this additional development come from as Glen Annie Golf Club primarily uses reclaimed water. We will be in a dire water situation within a few years of low rainfall.
- 6) If Kenwood Village and Heritage Ridge have both yet to even break ground how do we account for the potential impacts of these developments already approved. This is the cart before the horse. Infrastructure must be considered.

7) What precedent would this set for other areas North of Cathedral Oaks in western Goleta. Specifically the adjacent large tracts with agricultural water rights such as the property on Northgate and Cathedral Oaks and further to the West side of the Evergreen terrace apartments? Please don't make us the next Oxnard. It is crazy to put Goleta on the path of over building and assuming even more infrastructure needs in the face of existing infrastructure deficits. It can never be undone. 9) It is simply unfair that Goleta is bearing an enormous burden from the County and City housing plans. It makes those of us living here angry and feeling unrepresented. Are we not also entitled to enjoy some modicum of the beauty and open spaces that wealthier enclaves seek to protect? 10) Glen Annie is one of two affordable full size golf courses in the Goleta/SB area. Sandpiper is far more expensive and thus not something most can play regularly. The majority of courses in the area are private with membership fees in the many thousands. Without Glen Annie, middle class golfers will be left to fight for tee times at the SB muni course. Doesn't this seem a bit biased towards the wealthy? We pay a pretty penny for property and other taxes, can we keep this gem of a course for our quality of life? I don't play golf, by the way. For these reasons, I vehemently oppose the proposed rezoning of Glen Annie Golf course for housing units. I will also continue to withhold a vote for any local politician who votes in favor of such rezoning. I will vote on this as a singular issue for our city and county.

I hope you will listen to your constituents and not support rezoning of Glen Annie Golf Course.

Sincerely,
Paula Bortolazzo

Sarah Mayer

From: Kate Newell <KNewell@espererholdings.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2024 12:52 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: laura@lauracapps.com
Subject: Rezone of San Marcos Growers

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Please direct this email to the entire Board.

To The Board,

Please allow this email serve as my adamant contestation to the rezoning of the San Marcos Growers property. I live in the area and know that the development of the property to 2,000 apartment units would be devastating to the area.

The potential issues are as follows:

- Increase in traffic; affecting the bus schedules; emissions in the area
- Increase in crime; safety of children and elderly in the area
- The fire department (Station 13) already cannot handle emergencies in an efficient and timely manner; this will only get worse with an additional 2,000 units; With the release of AMR and the County taking over the contract in July of 2024, the situation will only get worse
- Water availability and increase in costs to residents; our water resources are limited
- Increase in property taxes due to the impact on schools and municipalities
- Already a dense area; working class area with multiple people in homes and cars on streets in order to survive in the area
- Detriment to the soil that is rich in nutrients; there are other plots of land that would be more suitable for apartments; i.e. More Mesa

There are far better areas to develop than in this area. It is being targeted as it is a working class area and those are the typical targets for development. No one recognizes that these are the areas that we need to protect as they are the machine that keeps Santa Barbara vital and profitable. It is a shame that this is not recognized. I have worked for very prestigious developers in town and they were always mindful of the land and the impact on the community. I understand the Macy's development, but this development of San Marcos Growers is haphazard and irresponsible simply trying to meet a State requirement.

Should you have any further questions, please contact me at 805-698-2532.

Regards,
Kate Villar Newell

Kate Newell
Director, Facilities & Property Management

3820 State Street, Suite B, Santa Barbara, CA 93105

• Cell: 805-698-2532

KNewell@espererholdings.com



ESPÉRER



Sarah Mayer

From: Bell, Allen
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 8:50 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Alamilla, Breanna
Subject: FW: Housing Element /site 11 glen annie rezone

Hello Clerk of the Board:

Please forward the attached comment letter on the Housing Element Update rezones to the Board of Supervisors.

Thanks,



Allen Bell
Supervising Planner
Planning & Development
Long Range Planning Division
123 E. Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
805-568-2056
abell@countyofsb.org
<https://www.countyofsb.org/160/Planning-Development>

From: Henry Sander <sander2116@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2024 6:35 PM
To: Bell, Allen <abell@countyofsb.org>; Bill Cushman <wcushman@cox.net>; Alamilla, Breanna <alamillab@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Fw: Housing Element /site 11 glen annie rezone

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for your response to my and other letters of concern regarding site 11 glen annie. Your Official response in master letter #2 basically says that the report addresses many of these concerns and we are generally correct but there are 2 reasons we are going to recommend to the Supervisors to rezone this agricultural land to dense housing .

1. There are no other choices that can accommodate this volume of housing that the state is demanding. So we have a problem and this is our only viable choice so these concerns should be ignored.

Seems like poor reasoning especially since you have not notified ag owners that we will convert your land to dense housing if you apply because the state says build baby build. I own ag land and yes I am > than 300 feet from this massive project and no notification of this right or that glen annie is proposing this even reached my door. Yes law says 300 feet but do you really feel that you have done all you can to notify ag owners and concerned parties of this solution you propose.

Basically your saying we have no other options on the table but we forgot to notify the thousands of ag owners who might be interested, including me 1000 feet away. Kudos to Glen Annie for finding out your potential solution and somehow convincing you that reason 2 should convince the supervisor's that these concerns are mitigated enough to

vote for this massive project . We accept the clear cut negative effect to Goleta despite the fact this area has already done more than its share of adding so called affordable housing.

2.The golf course may not be economically viable and the whole recreational ,youth activity ,wildlife issues can be ignored.I'm sorry but that has not been in any way established in fact and I as a CPA am insulted that you take that into your reasoning without any financial input to the general public.If this is true let's see the #s.Please establish that fact to the Board and the public before you use it as a primary reason to pick this solution.

Surprisingly, The golf course recently increased their prices 30 to 50% and made everyone pay for a cart even if you didn't want one.Play decreased but is picking up.Do you think establishing lack of economic viability might be an influence on that.Perhaps you should have economic viability be reviewed by experts like a CPA before you use it as a key reason for changing people's lives in the area **Please share my thoughts with planners and the board**.Also please tell me and others what you are basing the lack of economic viability you quote as a reason for the rezone.

I apologize for my curt words but master paragraph 2 does not address our concerns.

Henry

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "PAD LRP Housing Element" <housingelement@countyofsb.org>

To: "Henry Sander" <sander2116@yahoo.com>

Cc:

Sent: Thu, Feb 8, 2024 at 3:14 PM

Subject: RE: Housing Element /site 11 glen annie rezone

Dear Henry,

Thank you, we have received your comment on the 2023-2031 Housing Element Update Draft Program EIR. I have forwarded your comment to the project planner, Hannah Thomas. The County will provide a written response to comments, which will be available in the Final Program EIR, once released.

Thank you,



Breanna Alamilla

Planner II

Planning & Development

Long Range Planning Division

123 E. Anapamu St.

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

805-568-2042

alamillab@countyofsb.org

<https://www.countyofsb.org/160/Planning-Development>

From: Henry Sander <sander2116@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2024 2:08 PM

To: PAD LRP Housing Element <housingelement@countyofsb.org>; hartmann@countyofsb.org;
janelle@vote4osborne.com; Frank T. Troise (SoHo) <ftroise@sohocap.com>; joanhartmann2020@gmail.com

Subject: Housing Element /site 11 glen annie rezone

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Attn:Hanna please pass on to decision makers

I own an agricultural 40 acre zoned parcel near Glen Annie golf course.I apologize for late comment but I have never been notified of any new development near glen annie golf course despite being close to it and impacted by it.

I object to the steps that lead to potential rezoning of glen annie golf course to any dense housing zoning despite the fact that I ,and all my AG zoned neighbors would follow suit by asking for the same kind of rezone.This would result in a windfall for all of us but my desire for the quality of life here exceeds the desire for profits.My objection is for the following reasons.

1.Infrastructure

A. Traffic/Road conditions despite being better than some areas will undoubtedly be adversely affected.

1. Glen Annie exit is already over a quarter mile long and often is backed up to the highway with new residences added very recently along with big box shoppers at Camino Real Market Place and Market Place Village, located near the exit. This causes the right lane of 101 to stop and this spills over to the left lane causing accidents as well as a slow down to 101 our only highway North.

2. Cathedral Oaks road is 1 lane road going thru the area and is often heavily impacted with Dos Pueblos High School traffic. Current proposal has 3 or 4 entrances coming off Cathedral Oaks. For safety this will require 1 to 4 more stop lights on this road. You will now have to project 3 to 6 stop lights between Glen Annie road and Brandon road where you have 1 grammar school and with these new residences surely 2 grammar schools in the neighborhood. This is on the only road in Goleta where you can drive for miles without stoplight traffic and enjoy the scenery to the North. Please don't ruin this alternative to highway 101 which currently only has 2 stoplights from Fairview all the way to Winchester Canyon.

3. The Northwest end of Cathedral Oaks is now closed forcing all traffic down Winchester Canyon Road. Therefore using Winchester Canyon Road as a possible solution to Glen Annie exit problems is very much in question. We can't just expect the City of Goleta to solve Santa Barbara County problems with housing..

B. Water.

My water bill from Goleta water district has increased from 200 to 300 a month in 2010 to 600 to 800 a month currently to supply mainly the residence and a < 1 acre small orchard. Costs to go to an AG meter are 60k to 100k. Thus I can't plant orchards or trees on my land without a commercial activity. How can you say you are willing and able to add thousands of residences when I pay 13.53/ to plant fruit bearing trees on my existing AG land. You can't give thousands of HCF to this project when your stopping existing residences from planting trees at a reasonable cost. I let many trees die in past drought due to cost and do we all think we will not have another one. Potential farmers and tree nerds are priced out now.

C. Wildlife.

Best part of western Goleta is the wildlife on the North side of Cathedral Oaks. It is totally different on the south residential side. I regularly see Roadrunners/Bobcats /Coyotes/King snakes/Frogs/Deer/Rabbits/Hawks/Kestrels/Turkey Vultures/Song birds/Crows/Honey bees/Canadian Geese/Ducks/Egrets/Heron/Swans on my property and you see paths and flight patterns directly from Glen Annie Golf course because of the water source. Do you really want to ruin the outstanding ecosystem that exists right in your back yard.

D. Recreational activities.

One of my fondest memories of playing golf at Glen Annie is seeing 5 high school girls and guys running across the 5th fairway to the clubhouse to play golf. I at first said you can't do that but then the parent in me said what a great opportunity that is for them. I wish I had the same experience as a high schooler looking for a fun form of good exercise to do after school. SB Municipality can not handle the demand of all 3 high schools as well as a younger children wanting to try golf out. Ocean Meadows is gone so where do kids go?

Not to mention the many old guys walking this affordable public course. This fun activity keeps us healthy and vibrant members of society. I for one would play less than half as many rounds if this course didn't exist. County/Coastal Commission stopped a proposed course 3 miles north to curb development. How is this different. Even if you don't play golf your neighbor probably does..

In conclusion, Please don't open this can of worms because it is an easy solution to a difficult problem. This county has many acres of uninformed Ag owners where smaller less impacting developments can happen. The simple answer often are not the best answer. Do all Ag owners know you would entertain residential rezones to please the State. I sure didn't. Have you really tried your hardest to find potential housing sites that would be more welcome in this county. Let's keep Goleta the goodland.

Concerned County Resident in Goleta



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Sarah Mayer

From: Carl Hein <cwhjsd59@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 4:39 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: high density housing at San Marcos Growers property

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

We are very concerned about the proposed high density building in our Sungate Ranch neighborhood. Our housing area is off S. San Marcos Rd., and we would be very strongly affected by any huge development near our homes. This would be a very dangerous location, as it would be nearly impossible to exit our two streets onto S. San Marcos Rd. in case of an emergency. Evacuation in the occurrence of a fire, for instance, would be extremely dangerous and probably impossible. Please take the safety of all of us into consideration. Do not put high density housing in this hard to evacuate location.

Carl and Sue Hein

Sarah Mayer

From: P B <pbzjunk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 5:03 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Now that we're in compliance with state requirements to increase housing, please consider this:

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Government officials,

Most of the approved housing since we hurried to be in compliance of State requirements has had very little affordable housing for those who are low income, and have been built without adequate parking, as the State allowed.

But now that we've done what was required, let's have a moratorium on further building permits of such grand scale, and assess for a time just what these new projects have done to our traffic situations, and to reducing housing needs of the public.

It's not likely that all the people who are currently in need of a place to live, will find what they need and can afford in these new buildings. Instead, to fill them, people from outside our area will need to be attracted to moving here, so population will increase, but places to park their cars won't be provided. How many of these people will be content to ride bicycles to the supermarket with their children?

Related to this, the city of Santa Barbara, and possibly the entire county, is trying to force people to quit relying on cars, and to take bicycles or buses. Our bus routes are completely inadequate for this pie-in-the-sky goal, especially considering the composition of Santa Barbara's increasing elderly population, currently at 20%. The California Department of Finance projects that about one in four (23.1%) Californians will be 65 or older by 2040.

You won't be convincing enough of the younger but not physically fit citizens, together with the elderly, or those with families, to start riding bicycles to do their grocery shopping, to make worthwhile all of the restricted driving we are facing now. We've added more bike lanes, but reducing 2 lane streets to one lane. We've added bump-outs and islands, which make it harder for fire trucks to get around. With the increased population after all these newly approved projects are built and occupied, these situations will make Santa Barbara much less pleasant.

Please stop and wait a bit before allowing any more huge housing projects. And think instead about designing a bus system that serves the public as close to the way San Francisco's system does, as possible. The most people there have to walk from one bus to their destination is probably 3 blocks. Then you can get people to abandon their cars.

Patty Bechstein

Sarah Mayer

From: Kim Peters <peters001@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 10:04 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Planned housing development
Attachments: 2024-MAR 26-HARRY SLOAN LETTER.pdf

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

I am a homeowner in Sungate Ranch and I agree with Harry Sloan's assessment. The proposed housing developments near Sungate Ranch pose severe congestion, safety, environmental risks and strain on water and electricity resources, and I oppose the current proposals.

Kim Peters MD

Sent from my iPhone

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Harry Sloan <sloans5@verizon.net>

To: sloans5@verizon.net <sloans5@verizon.net>

Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2024 at 03:08:35 PM PDT

Subject: Fw: Rezoning of parcels in Southern Goleta

March 23, 2024

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

As a homeowner at Sungate Ranch I sincerely appreciate the Board having developer's present draft plans at the Supervisor's meeting as it provided a sobering revelation of the housing projects being proposed for southern Goleta. It was important to see the sheer number of units that could be dropped onto the last remaining farm-oriented neighborhoods in the Hollister southern corridor of Goleta. 4203 units with a potential for 4203 or more cars and 6000 - 10,000 estimated new residents all packed within a two-mile radius? WOW!!!

Because of this potential impact I believe the rezoning vote scheduled for April 1st should be postponed until "Builder's Remedy processes are defined and a CEQA review can take place.

1) **"Builders Remedy" process knowledge.**

We understand how this loophole is being used to circumvent local control to build freely. However, there must be an existing framework for this process with milestones, reviews and approvals necessary to consider environmental concerns and detrimental impacts to the existing infrastructure. Unfortunately, no one seems to be able to explain this process and the requirements, milestones and reviews/approvals that are necessary to manage and move through this process in an orderly fashion. It seems that most are throwing up their hands in frustration thinking there is nothing to be done, no rules and no control. If not done already, the Planning commission should take time to acquire knowledge or experts to define and manage this process and make sure it is followed and the community protected. Communication of this process to all stakeholders would also be appreciated. The Commission should delay any approvals on "Builder's Remedy" projects until this process is understood and can be managed. This will help avoid potential lawsuits and wasted time while protecting the Commission's ability to professionally manage these projects and not be intimidated by the rapid pace being pushed by developers. Anything less might be considered professional negligence and a breach of public trust by some.

2) **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.** This is the safety mechanism that can be used to restrain "Builder's Remedy" projects thereby allowing an impact analysis on existing infrastructure and the environment to be conducted. Normally these projects would work through appropriate supervisor/community oversight entities and reviews to ensure they meet housing goals while not overwhelming existing infrastructure both public and private. The nature of existing neighborhoods would also be considered. The advent of the "Builder's Remedy" certainly causes new concern in this mix of building projects. This dated, only recently used provision, basically throws out all the regulatory reviews painstakingly enacted over the years to ensure building is effectively managed in a way that truly meets community needs.

Any of these individual projects could individually trigger a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review but ***certainly all of them together absolutely require this review be conducted.*** We are talking 4203 units, potentially 4000+ cars, and 4000-10000 people all added into Southern Goleta within a 2 mile corridor without any big picture infrastructure/environmental review or reasonable planning being conducted.

There is a reasonable possibility of significant effect on the environment due to the unusual circumstances created by this massive rezoning undertaking in such a small area. Additionally, there will be significant cumulative impacts from the housing projects allowed by this rezoning and the simultaneous rezoning by the Cities of Goleta and Santa Barbara around this area.

CEQA reviews can be triggered by projects that change/contradict local codes, policies, and existing general plans. The ***"Builder's Remedy" circumvention of these certainly puts those projects in this category making a CEQA review mandatory.*** All public entities such as the Planning Commission are responsible for considering CEQA when undertaking such a project.

CEQA lawsuits can be initiated by anyone that has an environmental concern with a project. From an environmental point of view, this amount of people, cars, and new buildings will certainly have an effect on the local environment, and someone will inevitably initiate this suit. With this in mind, the Planning Commission, as a responsible public entity should launch this review as a proactive measure to protect the public.

Potential Impacts. There are many potential impacts to the community from this rapid expansion but below are the biggest that must be addressed. CEQA would allow time for these to be investigated.

1) **Traffic.** The intersection at Hollister and Turnpike is already heavily congested. This is especially true for an hour 4 times a day when students at San Marcos High are walking to and from school in the morning or going to lunch. A large number of students lunch at Turnpike Plaza across from the school. Of course they walk to get there. This

increased, usually disorderly, pedestrian traffic coincides with the normal work commute schedule of area residents with most cars attempting to access 101. Traffic analysis of this area will validate this pedestrian activity, the potential dangers to students/pedestrians, and the general congestion bottlenecks 4 times per day. Traffic able to access 101 directly through alternate routes will not compound the pedestrian/auto traffic at Hollister and Turnpike and there are options available for this (See list in rezoning section). Avoiding the intersection will help minimize the danger of pedestrian/auto accidents especially when dealing with students who do not regularly follow normal pedestrian rules. Evacuation of the area in an emergency will also be easier with multiple ways to access to 101 without going through this busy intersection. The Planning Commission needs to stand firm on this traffic problem erring on the side of safety. We all know what overbuilding northern Goleta has done to the Storke/Annie and Hollister intersection which is only getting worse. Add the foot traffic caused by the corner location of a high school and it is easy to see what a problem this could be at Hollister/Turnpike.

2) **Parking:** We all know that parking will be an issue as it always seem there are more cars than parking spots. These excess cars will be lined up along residential streets impacting existing neighborhoods.

3) **Character of the Neighborhood/Open Space.** Southern Goleta is the last remaining area that reminds us of what Goleta once was. The presence of tractors on Hollister, the open fields with crops and the magnificent views of the mountains will be replaced by concrete and 3 story housing. Once lost, this is never coming back. Farmland along Hollister should not be rezoned to maintain this character. There are many parcels that can be developed (see rezoning section list below) without destroying this last vestige of Goleta's farming past as viewed from Hollister.

4) **Mountain views.** The San Marcos property at one time was considered a protected view corridor by Goleta. This was stated by a city representative during a Planning Commission meeting concerning a proposed cell tower at the Frontier building that I attended. The proposed tower for the Frontier property on the west corner of the San Marcos parcel was stopped by the Landscape Committee of the Planning commission to preserve these views. Maintaining property values and quality of life are legitimate concerns of existing residents and reasonable efforts should be made to accommodate these folks. Three story units on the San Marcos property will obliterate any existing mountain views.

5) **Water.** With all the rain we received the last two years folks have forgotten what a scarce resource this is. Water use projections with the new building should be considered. We will have a new drought cycle in the future. We always have.

6) **Electrical use.** The current electrical grid is strained. The Southern Goleta area already has a high number of power outages ranging from minutes to hours. The threat of rolling blackouts to manage scarce power resources capacity is also a constant reality. Records may exist quantifying these instances for the curious, but as a resident

of the area who endures these outages along with the associated backup generator noise from the Frontier building, they seem very frequent. This is with existing demand! The impact of all these new electric-only units and potential electric car charging stations, should be studied and appropriate infrastructure improvements made in both electrical generation and transport before overwhelming its ability to supply reliable power.

7) **Air Quality** Cumulative effect of new cars, stalled traffic waiting at intersections along with the increased traffic along 101 projected with the freeway widening projects being completed.

8) **Biological Resources (Maria Ygnacio Creek/San Jose Creek/Goleta Slough State Marine Conservation Area)**. Impact to these protected waterways should be considered.

Rezoning Decision. If Rezoning decisions are not postponed then properties should be selected that make the most sense from a traffic reduction standpoint, mainly avoiding the busiest, most pedestrian used intersection in southern Goleta - the Hollister and Turnpike intersection. The best choices include the following parcels and together they still represent a substantial amount of new housing units. San Marcos is *not* recommended as it resides next to the Turnpike/Hollister intersection.

Montessori. Can access Hollister directly staying out existing neighborhoods behind the property and allowing easy access to less congested Patterson and 101.

Giorgi. Direct access to the underutilized 217 that then feeds to Hollister and 101. City of Goleta is considering significant traffic improvements in this area already.

Tatum. Can access Turnpike directly and thereby 101 while avoiding the busy Turnpike/Hollister intersection.

St Athanasius Church. Has direct access to Hollister and then to 101 via less used Patterson.

MTD. On the North side of 101 therefore no impact to Hollister/Turnpike corridor.

These sites do not add to the Turnpike/Hollister intersection congestion as they use alternate routes to access major highways including 101. They also do not destroy prized mountain views along Hollister while maintaining the farming character of Goleta as viewed from Hollister.

This letter is respectfully submitted to communicate the views of myself as well as many others that currently reside in the Turnpike/Hollister area. We realize these concerns may not be new but want to make sure they are summarized and provided to the Planning Commission in a clear, professional manner. There is a lot of negative emotion in the community as we are facing a major change to our way of life and feel the potential building plans are out of control. As a community we are potentially overbuilding and still not fully addressing affordable housing needs just adding more quantity and making developer's rich. The residents have to live with the final results.

We are concerned that all this building will destroy the very things that made living here desirable when we committed to buying a home in this area.

Respectfully,

Harry Sloan

Sarah Mayer

From: Betsy Sales <betsy@serafin.com>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2024 10:38 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Rezoning of San Marcos Growers

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing today to express my complete dissatisfaction with the rezoning process of San Marcos Farm. As a home owner of the residential community that will be MOST affected by this fast-tracked change, I am surprised, shocked and completely disappointed that we have NEVER been contacted by a Board member, San Marcos Farm or the developer to educate us on what is proposed. I am in complete shock that this rezoning effort is being fast-tracked with only a simple notice that I received 4 days prior to the meeting to discuss. This will GREATLY affect our community and access and egress to our homes which is already severely compromised with the current traffic.

I urge you to begin a better education process which would involve listening to the community to better understand our concerns. Please slow this process down as it will greatly affect the quality of life for the members of this community.

Mary Sales

Sarah Mayer

From: Carl Hein <cwhjsd59@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2024 12:30 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Proposed housing

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

It is very important that any housing built in our area has roads connecting them directly with main roads—Turnpike, Patterson, and Hollister—and not onto the small San Marcos Road. It is imperative that access is not permitted to be taken through our small community! That would endanger all of us in case of an emergency. They must not cut through our area by linking with Oak Ridge Rd. It is already difficult enough to get out of our driveways at times. It is unimaginable to consider traffic barging through our small community. We are 88 years old, and this is our retirement home! We chose it for its access to grocery and drug stores, and the quiet and calmness of the area. Please do not take this away from all of us.

Sue and Carl Hein

Sarah Mayer

From: Lisa Call <lisacall@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2024 12:43 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps
Subject: Goleta Building Projects

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

March 29, 2024

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

I have been a homeowner at Sungate Ranch for 28 years, and live adjacent to the San Marcos Growers property. We had an informational meeting at Sungate last night where about 20 residents expressed their concern about the scope of the new housing projects slated for our area.

I sincerely appreciate the Board having developer's present draft plans at the recent Supervisor's meeting as it provided a sobering revelation of the housing projects being proposed for southern Goleta. It was important to see the staggering number of units that could be built on the last remaining farm-oriented neighborhoods in the Hollister-Turnpike area. 4200+ units with a potential for 4000 or more cars and 6000 - 10,000 estimated new residents all packed within a two-mile radius? WOW!!! Because of this potential impact I believe the rezoning vote scheduled for April 1st should be postponed until Builder's Remedy processes are defined and a CEQA review can take place.

I am concerned that I will be surrounded by dense housing and will lose my **current mountain view**, which is lovely. The San Marcos property at one time was considered a protected view corridor by Goleta. This was stated by a city representative during a Planning Commission meeting concerning a proposed cell tower at the Frontier building that I attended. The proposed tower for the Frontier property on the west corner of the San Marcos parcel was stopped by the Landscape Committee of the Planning commission to preserve these views. (Thankfully!) Maintaining property values and quality of life are and should be legitimate concerns of existing residents and *reasonable efforts should be made to accommodate these folks*. **Three story units on the San Marcos property will obliterate any existing mountain views and change our quality of life in a very negative way.**

I am also concerned about the water requirements for ALL of this building. With the rain we received the last two years folks have forgotten what a scarce resource this is. Water use projections with the new building should be considered. We will have a new drought cycle in the future. We always have.

I am also concerned about electrical use. The current electrical grid is strained. The Southern Goleta area already has a high number of power outages ranging from minutes to hours. The threat of rolling blackouts to manage scarce power resources capacity is also a constant reality. Records may exist quantifying these instances for the curious, but as a resident of the area who endures these outages along with the associated backup generator noise from the Frontier building, they seem very frequent. This is with existing demand! The impact of all these new electric-only units and potential electric car charging stations, should be studied and appropriate infrastructure improvements made before overwhelming its ability to supply reliable power.

The Air Quality Cumulative effect of new cars, stalled traffic waiting at intersections along with the increased traffic along 101 projected with the freeway widening projects being completed. We have many homes that back up to San Marcos Rd and there is already traffic noise and exhaust from the current traffic. I can't imagine

having hundreds of residents just across the street at the San Marcos Growers. **Lack of parking, increased traffic, and decreased air quality should be real factors that need to be considered for our quality of life. Could we all escape in the event of an emergency?**

If Rezoning decisions are not postponed then properties should be selected that make the most sense from a traffic reduction standpoint, mainly avoiding the busiest, most pedestrian used intersection in southern Goleta - the Hollister and Turnpike intersection.

The best choices include the following parcels and together they still represent a substantial amount of new housing units. San Marcos is not recommended as it resides next to the Turnpike/Hollister intersection. Giorgi gives direct access to the underutilized 217 that then feeds to Hollister and 101. City of Goleta is considering significant traffic improvements in this area already. Tatum. Can access Turnpike directly and thereby 101 while avoiding the busy Turnpike/Hollister intersection. St Athanasius Church. Has direct access to Hollister and then to 101 via less used Patterson. MTD. On the North side of 101 therefore no impact to Hollister/Turnpike corridor. These sites do not add to the Turnpike/Hollister intersection congestion as they use alternate routes to access major highways including 101. They also do not destroy prized mountain views along Hollister while maintaining the charm of the farming character of Goleta.

This letter is respectfully submitted to communicate the views of myself as well as many others that currently reside in the Turnpike/Hollister area. We realize these concerns may not be new but want to make sure they are summarized and provided to the Planning Commission in a clear, professional manner. There is negative emotion in the community as we are facing a major change to our way of life and feel the potential building plans are out of control. As a community we are potentially overbuilding and still not fully addressing affordable housing needs just adding more quantity and making developer's rich. The residents will have to live with the final results. **We are concerned that all this building will destroy the very things that made living here desirable when we purchased a home in this area.**

Respectfully,

Lisa Call

Sarah Mayer

From: Lori Rafferty <lraf@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2024 6:13 PM
To: sbcob; Laura Capps; Joan Hartmann; Supervisor Nelson; Steve Lavagnino; Supervisor Das Williams
Cc: Lori Rafferty
Subject: public impact on Housing & Re-Zoning

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello County Supervisors,

As one who is from a 4th generation farming/ranching family (Ventura County but SB resident since 1977), please do not rezone any agricultural land. Once done, it can NEVER EVER be recovered and gone for all ages will be beautiful open space, agricultural jobs with culture and heritage, and the necessary and beneficial effects of greenery and plants for food and recreational sources, not to mention landscaping for our environment.

Remember the song by Joni Mitchell "Big Yellow Taxi" ...

*Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you've got 'til it's gone?
They paved paradise, put up a parking lot.*

*They took all the trees, put 'em in a tree museum
And they charged the people a dollar and a half just to see 'em
Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you've got 'til it's gone?
They paved paradise, put up a parking lot.*

I realize there is tremendous pressure on you to comply with State mandates for housing (which are sadly not taking into account water availability, droughts, climate change, geography, etc. etc.), and it appears you are doing that but what is being offered on the table now are too massive of projects with way too much density that want to happen seemingly all at once and would like rezoning, and with no legal guarantees the developers will do what they say.

I've read if all of these projects were fully approved now, that the supply would be way over what the State is requiring this go around. Why would we do that when we have no guarantees from the State that they (or us) can meet increased H2O demand, that they would help fund the huge costs associated with Cities and Counties having to spend billions on new or larger infrastructure projects just to serve this influx of new housing, things that would be needed like more roads, water delivery systems, sanitation & waste water treatment capacity upgrades, flood water management, transportation services, traffic management, police and fire protections, electrical and gas system utilities, more food markets and delivery services, schools and etc. etc. And... don't forget the impact of more UCSB housing!

It's way too much, too fast and with too many unknowns.... and would result in over development, especially with market rate units.

Are we looking seriously enough at the BIGGER PICTURE here???

My suggestions are as follows, maybe I'm crazy, maybe not:

- only approve 25% of each project, or come up with different percentages based on the individual characteristics of each site which will collectively limit the overall impact on existing areas.

- "The majority of the rezone proposals came in the areas of the county right outside the City of Goleta. These included six sites within a mile and a half area in the Eastern Goleta Valley.", quoted from the recent Independent article. This is WAY TOO MUCH DENSITY for this small area in eastern Goleta Valley!!!
- approve not more than 20-25% of any requested rezoning from agriculture to housing, if any at all. The larger the parcel, the smaller the %.
- get the builders to sign fully enforceable contracts/letters of intent to do what they say they will do after final negotiations are agreed upon, particularly pertaining to the number of affordable units.
- how will people with existing and current employment be guaranteed to get first choice? and not outsiders or real estate investors?
- note that in other areas of the Country, homeowners are getting dropped from their insurance policies when increased density happens in their neighborhoods because increased density means increased fire hazards, flood hazards, crime issues, etc. Who will control the rising cost of insurance? and that potential burden now placed on existing homeowners? or reimburse them for the decrease in their property values?
- ask the State to guarantee, in writing, the availability of water. I've heard this for more than 15 years now: if everybody who had water allotment agreements with the State all came to the table at once and demanded their allotment, the State would be over-drafted at least 5 times. It's just paper water. How can our existing water supply even handle more people?

Be strong during this time, you have the power to say NO in a lot of areas, particularly rezoning.

Please, and don't be remembered for being the ones who don't know what we've got until it's gone.

Sincerely,

:) Lori Rafferty

Sarah Mayer

From: susan bryant <bryantsb7@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 9:29 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: susan bryant
Subject: Public comment for BOS April 30 hearing (reference Richards Ranch keysite 26/rezoning site 18)

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

County clerk, please distribute the following public comments to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration during their April 30 housing hearing.

Dear Supervisors,

Please refer to my March 24 email to the Planning Commission regarding Richards Ranch (County keysite 26, rezoning site 18) in which I referred to the review process for the Richards Ranch project as an anomaly and timing problematic.

During the March 27 hearing, Commissioner Reed recommended and all commissioners concurred that keysite 26 be referred to the Board of Supervisors for further review rather than for rezoning at that stage.

I am sending this email assuming you will discuss this further in your April 30 hearing.

As you are aware, Richards Ranch invoked Builder's Remedy in the County and asked for rezoning through this housing process while concurrently processing their application for annexation/pre-zoning into the City of Santa Maria.

Orcutt residents' experiences of more than two years working on this project are listed chronologically at the end of this email with appropriate links (2022 DEIR, 2023 LAFCO review, 2023 editorial, and 2024 PRDEIR).

Based on our experiences and information documented below, I ask you to consider the following:

Find a reasonable way to protect the CDFW-designated monarch butterfly habitat.

Find a reasonable way to build decent housing while protecting the monarch butterfly habitat. (See "Alternative 2: Tree Preservation and Reduced Housing Density" in referenced PRDEIR.)

Find a reasonable way for the City to provide supplemental water within the County to accommodate the project's conceptual commercial plans. The City clearly stated in their PRDEIR that: "Annexation is not a prerequisite for the use of supplemental water supplies; supplemental water could be provided at the discretion of the City of Santa Maria."

Find a reasonable way for the County to accept the completed City DEIR as it relates to this County site (due out end of summer, beginning of fall). It can be acknowledged that Richards Ranch has already spent quite a bit of money for this DEIR.

Overall, because all three entities (Richards Ranch, County, City of Santa Maria) have been involved in some way with this project for three years, is there a reasonable way for all to now collaborate to develop this property? And, in that process develop something that will enhance our Orcutt neighborhood rather than exploit it?

HISTORY

DECEMBER 2022

Prior to Richards Ranch invoking Builder's Remedy, the Orcutt community spent much time and effort submitting comments during the public comment period for that annexation's draft EIR. (Original Richards Ranch Annexation Draft EIR December 22, 2022

(<https://www.cityofsantamaria.org/home/showpublisheddocument/31603/638073162287570000>).

The final statement in my submission of comments during the public comment period for this 2022 DEIR was:

"I support the development of affordable housing. All housing, "affordable" or high-end, should be designed to enhance the environment, residents, and neighboring communities.

Sites can be developed with respect for residents and their environment. The statement here is a small example: "These mature windrows of eucalyptus trees have been preserved as part of the Orcutt Community Plan to provide the potential habitat for nesting and roosting for a variety of birds including raptors (such as red tailed hawks); as well as providing a major visual resource for the area."

MARCH 2023

Following that DEIR release, LAFCO held a study session review (LAFCO March 2, 2023, Business Item No. 4 Richards Ranch DEIR Comments (<https://www.sblafco.org/files/582ae31c6/Business+Item+No+4+-+Richards+Ranch+DEIR+Comments.pdf>)). My comments submitted at that time hoped for collaboration as well as preservation of monarch butterfly habitat.

JUNE 2023

My comments in *The Santa Maria Sun* June 8, 2023, letters to the editor questioned why all couldn't collaborate. (<https://www.santamariasun.com/opinion/whats-really-behind-the-richards-ranch-annexation-proposal-14927083>).

JANUARY 2024

Especially important now and to the Orcutt community is the January 2024 PRDEIR (Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2022020194), January 2024 (<https://www.cityofsantamaria.org/home/showpublisheddocument/32026/638422079258730000>)), issued per CEQA guidelines "when significant new information is added to the EIR after it is released for public review."

New information regarding monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) and its overwintering habitat was revised in Sections 4.3, Biological Resources, and Alternative Analysis as stated below:

The Xerces Society and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) have identified the stand of eucalyptus trees along the southern side of Union Valley Parkway as a Western Monarch Overwintering Site (mapped as #2688, 7.63 acres). Further, the CDFW has indicated that this eucalyptus grove is an important inland overwintering grove of the monarch butterfly and that it has high conservation value (CDFW 2023). Based on this new information presented by CDFW, the City is revising its findings regarding the existing 7.63-acre overwintering site that is within the project site boundaries. Because of the new information provided, revisions to the recommended mitigation measures for the monarch butterfly are warranted. As well, the conclusion regarding the impacts following implementation of the mitigation measures requires revision. Development of the proposed project, or any project similar in density to the proposed project, would necessitate the removal of the overwintering habitat that exists on the project site. Removal of this habitat would create a significant and unavoidable impact that cannot be fully mitigated. The City determines that feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. Thus, residual impacts to monarch butterflies would continue to be significant and unavoidable with development of the proposed project or any project on the project site similar in density to the proposed project. These changes are included in the new Section 4.3, Biological Resources, which is included Chapter 2 of this PRDEIR.

Review and finalizing of that 2022 DEIR referenced above have taken longer than expected and I believe our comments have made a constructive difference. It is expected to be completed by the end of summer or beginning of fall this year.

Respectfully,

Susan Bryant
307 Mooncrest Lane, Orcutt

Sarah Mayer

From: lindsey coker <lindseyncoker@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 7:00 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Hollister Lofts

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Lindsey Haeberle,

A year ago, I moved into a house directly across the street from where the Hollister lofts would be erected. When I saw the development signs I cried. Finally, I moved my way out of section 8 and away from the nightmare of living among the low-income housing.

I have such anxiety from the trauma of living in the neighborhood of gang violence (Cacique and Volunterio) to the point where my young daughter at the time couldn't get from the car to the front door without the fear of our safety. Even after moving to another area of low-income housing (Oak Glen Drive) we had drug addicts and parties surrounding us. The drug busts that would expose my family to guns from the police and the times where I couldn't even enter my house because the drug addicts possibly housed a fugitive and the police were searching for him...I couldn't move my car to get to work when the police were arresting Matt Johnson or when the ambulance came time and time again to take away his girlfriend.

The domestic violence that happened right outside my house, a man choking his girlfriend!

My husband once opened the front door and a neighbor busted through and hid inside of my closet high in drugs..

My list is long and I refuse to subject my new born and my four year old to the violence. 7 years and two separate neighborhoods was enough to give me the worst anxiety if I even hear a voice outside. I was Afraid to leave, afraid to come home. I refuse to live my life this way again. So please find a different location to house these families.

Thank you

Mrs. Haeberle

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Sarah Mayer

From: BUSINESS MAIL <business.mail@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 11:52 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Board of Supervisors Rezone Hearing on 04/30/24

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

While our community may be unable to prevent the non-stop development in the Santa Maria/Orcutt area, we need to work together toward a common goal. New neighborhoods should benefit all residents. The development process should enable community members to identify the types of housing, services and infrastructure that should exist in their neighborhood. The process should value longtime residents' visions of neighborhood change and include the power of decision-making to community residents who have to live with the changes. A good community is a cohesive, safe, prosperous and happy place. It provides a good quality of life for everyone that lives there. The quality of life should be more important than stacking people like sardines for the sake of housing them. We are the constituents you represent.

I'm a native of Santa Maria who worked for the County of Santa Barbara prior to retirement. I selectively purchased my home in Rolling Hills Estates because it was a quiet and semi-private community with single-story, semi-custom homes and views of rolling hills. Rolling Hills Estate Homeowners are predominately older folks who take pride in our homes and community. Dauphin Street off Santa Maria Way was our only ingress/egress which kept our neighborhood safe and secluded. This all changed in the last three years due to all the new rezoning and incoming development on Santa Maria Way. That which includes, Skyview Development (58 homes), Skylight Development (49 homes), Santa Maria Studios (160 units), Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and U-Haul Storage and Truck Rental, all within a 3-block radius. Each development comes with its own significant impacts, from air quality, noise, added traffic concerns, to cultural and biological resources and so on. One might adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a proposed project, but these impacts do not go away. In fact, they multiply with each new development.

Vacant Property within the same 3-block radius, off Waller Lane and Santa Maria Way is currently proposed for rezone, to build 144 apartment units in 5 three-story structures named Magnolia Apartments. The proposed property sits high on a hill which if approved, will tower over communities of single-story homes. 144 apartments equal approximately 567 people (4 to 1 apartment), and approximately 288 plus vehicles (2 per unit). We would all be required to share Santa Maria Way which is not equipped with adequate traffic lights or stops signs. Magnolia Apartment overflow parking will take the form of vehicles lined up and down residential streets, blocking driveways and creating the same issues we see at the Montivavo Apartments on Rubel Way near Walmart. Mayor Patino can attest that she receives complaint calls from homeowners almost every day. Crime and loitering have increased, and property values have declined in that residential neighborhood. If this rezone is approved, Magnolia Apartments will sit directly across the street from Valley Christian Academy where a violator of Megan's Law could easily go undetected in a development of this size. Surely taxpayers and our children deserve better than this. In order to assure government efficiency and limit wasteful spending with having to overstretch limited resources such as our fire and police department

and in order to increase public safety, rezoning this property for higher density apartment development would be a disaster and should be **denied**.

The proposed rezoning to accommodate Magnolia Apartments may create an infringement upon an individual's protected right to privacy and adversely impacts public traffic safety. Development projects of this size come with significant inherent risk and, unfortunately, could pose a liability to the county.

I trust you will do your due diligence to represent our community in our best interest. Thank you.

Sincerely,
M. Nieto

Sarah Mayer

From: Steven Butler <steven.f.butler.sb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2024 8:19 AM
To: sbcob; tgaolson@yahoo.com; Villalobos, David; Mallory; HOWARD WALLACE; Steele, Jessica
Subject: Fwd: High density housing in mission hills

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear all,

In reference to my original email, attached, opposing high density housing right next to R1 residents, nothing has changed my mind. If anything, my opposition has grown significantly.

I am appalled that county funds from the state are given narrow guidelines to the point that to receive funds, do things like put in traffic circles on highway speed roads. Which we lost firefighters lives doing their job in lompop at the 246 traffic circle near the mission.

Frankly, I can go on with other simulator issues, but most likely not helping mine or anybody else's vote.

Thanks again for listening.

Steve

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Steven Butler** <steven.f.butler.sb@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Mar 20, 2024, 17:52

Subject: High density housing in mission hills

To: <dvillalo@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>

Cc: <nelson@bos.countyofsb.org>, Mallory <mauimari4life@yahoo.com>, HOWARD WALLACE <panther8912@msn.com>

Sirs;

We are opposed to high density projects up against R1 housing, which Mission Hills is 100% R1. Also, the location is surrounding the main access to Mission Hills, the lower track and the Los Berros grade school, which has a large amount of traffic in the morning and afternoon. That fire on Harris grade, few years back, at the same time school got out, was quite a large traffic jam. I do not want to see that again on a daily basis.

So myself, Steven Butler and my daughter Mallory Butler are opposed to this expansion.

We are at 1457 Calle Pasado.

Thank you.

Steven Butler
Malloy Butler

Sarah Mayer

From: Gary Newhall <gnsnewhall@verizon.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2024 9:55 AM
To: sbcob
Cc: Gary Newhall; Supervisor Nelson
Subject: Re: Comments and concerns - Proposed zoning change Magnolia Apartments Santa Maria

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors.

Please find below letter I sent to Bob Nelson on 3/31/2024 that I am resending, as I was advised this matter was going before the Santa Barbara County Supervisors at the upcoming April 30, 2024 scheduled meeting, addressing HEU Rezone Amendments.

Dear Bob Nelson and other Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors,

I was recently made aware of a zoning request change for Magnolia Apartments plans to build 5 three story apartment buildings on a vacant lot off Santa Maria Way and Waller Lane. If my information is correct, plans soon to be before you include a request for the addition of 144 apartment units, with only one parking space designated per unit.

While I do understand that additional housing is a priority for both the County of Santa Barbara and City of Santa Maria, I can't believe anyone would think it would be a good idea to drop this monstrosity right into an established residential neighborhood, and directly across the street from Christian Valley Academy Church and School.

As you all are doing your due diligence, I highly recommend you seek feedback from the City of Santa Maria on the negative impact of the Montiavo Apartments and surrounding residential neighborhoods.

This placement would be worse, as you would be dropping these units directly into an existing established residential community, without ample proposed parking that will result in another parking fiasco like what occurred with the Montiavo Apartments and the resulting direct negative impact on the neighborhoods across the street.

Santa Maria Way has a lot of building activity going on currently, the addition of a 5 story "Senior Housing" apartments close to Broadway/135 that I would imagine soon will have tenants, as well as a new DMV building being built at Santa Maria Way and Sunrise, the current underway development of Skyview Estates homes, as well as the yet to have ground broken, but upcoming PSHH residential development approved for the vacant Drive In site.

These all will add substantial traffic on Santa Maria Way, and there currently are no plans for the addition of another traffic signal.

While most of these are being built within City of Santa Maria boundaries, any development on Santa Maria Way, such as the proposed Magnolia Apartments within County lines, will be felt by those in both City and/or County boundaries.

My recommendation would be to turn down the request for this zoning change and allow single family residential as currently zoned. It would be a much better fit and in my opinion be welcomed by the surrounding neighborhoods.

If you are looking for a lot that would make much better sense for this effort, look at the corner of Santa Maria Way and Miller, than sits next to the DMV building that is under construction.

If the Board of Supervisors do move forward with a vote in favor of this zoning change allowing for apartments (again, I am not in favor), I would recommend scaling back the size of allowable apartments and capping the height to two stories and include more parking, along with a requirement that an additional traffic signal be installed.

A suggestion on the placement of a new traffic signal would be on Santa Maria Way where the People Self Help Housing single family houses will be built or the area where the Mobile Home Senior Park exits, to provide them a safer exit route. A traffic engineering study based on forecasts for the coming impact of all these additions underway should provide recommendations for need and best placement.

I appreciate your consideration and hope the Board of Supervisors vote NO on the request to change zoning for the Magnolia Apartments being considered.

Sincerely,

Gary Newhall
3148 Rod Dr
Santa Maria CA 93455

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

Sarah Mayer

From: Adan Flores <cfv2@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2024 3:10 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Re: Housing Element update Rezone Hearing on April 30th

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Adan Flores and I live on casitas village. It used to be a good place to live. Unfortunately if you visit us at about 6:pm is almost impossible to find a parking spot. I oppose to the new construction development please do not approve.

Sent from my iPhone

Sarah Mayer

From: Kelly Soifer <kelly.soifer@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2024 4:50 PM
To: sbcob; Steele, Jessica
Subject: Re: 2023-2031 HEU rezone amendments

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and Ms Jesse Steele-Blossom,
I recently received a notice of public hearing regarding the HEU Rezone Amendments. I am unable to attend the Board of Supervisors hearing in Santa Barbara being held on May 3 due to work commitments, so I'm writing to you.

I have lived as a resident of the Forte Ranch condo community since June 1996. I live in the first building of the development that directly overlooks the MTD property on Calle Real located between Dexter Drive and San Antonio Rd. I looked up the Final Program EIR and it appears this piece of property has pending housing projects. While I have been told since 1996 that this property would eventually be developed, the notifications I've received more recently make me think this may actually be pending, so **I want to register my concerns about building on this property.**

Please understand that my concerns are not motivated by NIMBY-ism. In fact, I've benefited personally from being able to move into my unit due to an adoption of required affordable housing restrictions placed on the Forte Ranch development back in the early 90s. **However, I believe several retail changes in the surrounding area make the additional housing here unworkable.**

In the past few years, traffic has increased dramatically at the Turnpike offramps and especially at the Turnpike/Calle Real intersections. These increased traffic patterns are due to:

- **In n Out** (which is essentially ALWAYS completely full from noon till closing, 6 days/week)
- **newer Drive-Thru Starbucks, also constantly busy**
- **TWO hotels (Ramada and Extended Stay)**
- **TWO gas stations, one of which has a car wash and mini mart**

Please keep in mind that traffic is also very acute due to the presence of:

- **San Marcos High School**
- **Wake Center for Extended Learning**
- **County Health**
- **County Jail**
- **All the other County facilities**
- **expanded and updated businesses at the Turnpike Shopping Center:**
 - **Dave's Dogs**
 - **Kin Bake Shop**
 - **Dave's Drip House**
 - **Lighthouse Coffee**
 - **Von's**
 - **Fitness 19**

And we cannot forget that plans are moving forward on a new, even larger, **Chick Fil-A**, at the old IHOP, which will be directly across from the development.

My hope would be that the EIR would really take into consideration whether the streets in this area can manage the massive increase in traffic that has already occurred and will continue to increase if affordable units are built in this area. I'm not sure where people would even be able to park their cars!

Finally, I would request that **adequate means of egress** would be assessed before building is approved. I have already been asked to evacuate due to the fire danger twice in my time of living here. **And please let us not forget that this whole area was in the path of the painted cave fire in 1990. I just do not think that there would be the capacity for all the different entities and people traveling through and living in this area to be able to escape in face of the danger of wildfire. Adding housing on the MTD property on top of that would seem to guarantee disaster.**

I want to register an adamant "NO!" to any further development at this point unless traffic management is dramatically enhanced. Thank you for your consideration.

--

Kelly Soifer

Santa Barbara, CA

☎(805) 876-4361

"Dona nobis pacem"

Sarah Mayer

From: Andrea Mills <seagalsb@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2024 6:11 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Element Rezone Hearing April 30 and May 3
Attachments: Rezone Hearing Comments for 4.30 and 5.3 AMills.docx

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see my attached letter with comments regarding the upcoming Rezoning Hearing.

Thank you -
Andrea Mills

To the Board of Supervisors:

Re: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing April 30 and May 3

I strongly urge you to follow the lead of the Planning and Development Committee and NOT recommend the Bailard property for a rezoning.

There are good reasons for the original boundaries of the city, and the agricultural buffer that still exists. Changing those boundaries will create undue stress on the aging infrastructure of the city, especially in this already very high-density corridor, and set a dangerous precedent for continued expansion of the city's borders.

Of specific concern to me:

- the aging sewer system that is already giving our condo complex trouble, which the developer wants to directly tie into
- the additional burden on the water and power grid
- the increased amount of storm-drain runoff from newly paved over areas pushing our creeks to the spill-over point and flooding houses downstream
- the lack of outlets in case of emergency evacuation orders (I'm sure you have already heard numerous accounts of what this corridor was like during the Thomas fire evacuations)
- the addition of hundreds of cars in an area that already lacks sufficient parking
- the loss of agricultural land when food insecurity is a big issue affecting so many communities

Please vote NO on rezoning and allow the city of Carpinteria to develop their own solutions to the housing crisis. With so many industrial parks vacant and much of the utilities already in place, there are many simpler options that may be able to help provide the necessary units to meet the Housing Element requirements without risking the integrity of our infrastructure or the original city zoning plan.

Thank you for your consideration –

Andrea Mills

Owner

5976 Birch St. #4

Carpinteria, CA 93013

Sarah Mayer

From: Tabitha Bahu Elwood <azajoy@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2024 7:40 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing element update Rezone hearing on April 30th

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear County Board of Supervisors,

I am against this rezoning for myriad reasons. I live on Palmetto Way and when I return home after 8:00 p.m. there is no street parking. Sometimes there is not even parking on Villa Real and I must park across the freeway. The proposed units will make this parking situation grave especially on the third Wednesday of the month when the street sweepers come. It is already impossible to find a spot on Villa Real and I often have to park one of my cars at the Viola Fields during street sweeping. I live in a two bedroom in Villa Del Mar with my husband and two young adult daughters. We are a three car family and soon to be a four car family. Like most of the residents in this HOA we use our garage for storage which leaves us just the carport with 2 and soon to be 3 cars on the street. Most families are multi car families and the proposed units will be no exception. It is going to be a parking debacle if the rezoning goes through. I am against the rezoning because it will create parking issues, traffic issues and will ruin a bucolic view from the quaint park.

Sincerely,

Tabitha Elwood

Sarah Mayer

From: Connie Ferrer <connieferrer2@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2024 11:30 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Re: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing on April 30

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Having lived in this area since 1947 I have seen so much previously ag land be rezoned for housing and industrial uses and most of those losses have not led to affordable housing for those most in need. Carpinteria and the majority of Carpinterians have fought hard to preserve our small beach town and agricultural town status, and the vast majority of us say no to opening this door to development too. And if you have any questions, just drive up Bailard Avenue and see how little prepared it is to accomodate more housing, more traffic, more parking, and eventually, more water use. I and literally every single Carpinterian I know urge you to vote no to rezoning of the Bailard Farm land and any further development on Bailard Ave!

Sincerely,
Connie Ferrer and family
6590 Camino Carreta
Carpinteria

Sarah Mayer

From: Matt Michael <w.matthew.michael@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 7:39 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing on April 30th

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear County Board of Supervisors:

I am a homeowner in the Villa Del Mar neighborhood of Carpinteria, living very close to the proposed Bailard Avenue Multifamily Housing Project. This project will do serious damage to the quality of life for residents in the surrounding communities. As it stands, street parking is tight to say the least and an influx of a predicted 300+ new cars to this small area will turn it into a nightmare. There simply isn't enough space in our community to accommodate this housing development! Parking will go from bad to terrible and increased traffic puts the many school-aged children in our community at risk. Clogged streets will result from new residents and people circling nonstop looking for parking, and this represents a real menace to safety and will destroy the beautiful environment we currently enjoy. I urge you to follow the recommendation of the recent P&D hearing that gave a thumbs down to rezoning of the land. No rezone!

Thank you,

W. Matthew Michael

Carpitneria

Sarah Mayer

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 12:36 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: High density housing in mission hills

For BOS hearing of 4/30/24

From: Steven Butler <steven.f.butler.sb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2024 8:19 AM
To: sbcob <sbcob@countyofsb.org>; tgaolson@yahoo.com; Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>; Mallory <mauimari4life@yahoo.com>; HOWARD WALLACE <panther8912@msn.com>; Steele, Jessica <jsteele@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Fwd: High density housing in mission hills

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear all,

In reference to my original email, attached, opposing high density housing right next to R1 residents, nothing has changed my mind. If anything, my opposition has grown significantly.

I am appalled that county funds from the state are given narrow guidelines to the point that to receive funds, do things like put in traffic circles on highway speed roads. Which we lost firefighters lives doing their job in lomdoc at the 246 traffic circle near the mission.

Frankly, I can go on with other simulator issues, but most likely not helping mine or anybody else's vote.

Thanks again for listening.

Steve

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Steven Butler <steven.f.butler.sb@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Mar 20, 2024, 17:52
Subject: High density housing in mission hills
To: <dvillalo@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Cc: <nelson@bos.countyofsb.org>, Mallory <mauimari4life@yahoo.com>, HOWARD WALLACE <panther8912@msn.com>

Sirs;

We are opposed to high density projects up against R1 housing, which Mission Hills is 100% R1. Also, the location is surrounding the main access to Mission Hills, the lower track and the Los Berros grade school, which has a large amount of traffic in the morning and afternoon. That fire on Harris grade, few years back, at the same time school got out, was quite a large traffic jam. I do not want to see that again on a daily basis.

So myself, Steven Butler and my daughter Mallory Butler are opposed to this expansion.
We are at 1457 Calle Pasado.

Thank you.

Steven Butler
Malloy Butler

Sarah Mayer

From: Jan Bandeira <brookie960@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 4:05 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing project Bailard

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Santa Barbara County

I'm writing to say that the Bailard housing location would be a very poor choice. The density issue along with huge increase of auto traffic would be horrendous. Please choose a location further away from existing structures. Thank you, Jan Brooks

6359 Lagunitas Court

Carpinteria Ca 805-252-1956

Sent from my iPhone

Sarah Mayer

From: Laurel Allen <carpgirl9@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 4:31 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

County Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to voice my concerns and objections to the proposed Red Tail project in Carpinteria. I have lived in the adjoining neighborhood of Casitas Village for over 30 years and have seen the area grow. We are at capacity for traffic and parking, not to mention the impact that more housing would have on the ability of emergency vehicles to access the neighborhood. There is only One road for ingress and egress.

Paving over the existing organic farmland would impact the local organic food economy in Carpinteria, as well as the carbon imprint required to transport produce from elsewhere. There is also a major concern of the water usage necessary to complete and sustain this project.

Additionally, I urge that the sites located in the Central Zone that are outside the Urban/Rural Boundary be eliminated from consideration for rezoning. The existing boundary is an important planning tool for preventing sprawl and its associated impacts.

It is unacceptable to expand this boundary solely because it is inconvenient and restricts where high-density can be built. The whole point of County policy defining Urban/Rural Boundary is to prevent development that is inappropriate in this location.

Please take these issues into consideration.....and my heartfelt objection to the proposal.

Sincerely,

Laurel Allen

5931 Birch Street #3

Carpinteria, Ca

Sent from my iPad

Sarah Mayer

From: Sheryl Ford <sford048@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 4:53 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing on April 30th

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you with my concerns regarding the board's consideration to rezone the Bailard property to house 168 more residences.

Taken from the County website:

"Access. Currently, the applicant proposes to use the existing entrance to the site at the Pandanus Street / Bailard Avenue intersection.

Density Bonus. The applicant proposes 41 affordable units, approximately 29% of the base density (140 units), restricted at the lower income level (80% or less of the area median income for a household size suitable for the unit). Pursuant to State Density Bonus Law, the applicant is therefore eligible for up to a 50% density bonus (210 total units), up to three concessions, and qualifying waivers or reductions of development standards. The 173 total units proposed by the applicant represent an approximately 23% density bonus, less than the amount allowed under State Density Bonus Law. At this time, the applicant anticipates requesting two concessions and/or waivers related to building height and agricultural buffers."

I suggest all the board members take a ride to Bailard Avenue to see how crowded the angle parking is already. Most of the cars parked on Bailard are from residents who live at Casitas Village. They drive too fast on Bailard, and it is a real safety concern for young children, dogs, and cats who may be trying to cross the road. They would not have a chance. There should be speed bumps placed on Bailard.

With the angle parking it is tight to have two lanes of traffic moving without one driver having to slow down. "You'll probably find angled parking spots in high-traffic areas like cities and parking garages, though they're also common on one-way streets."-WikiHow

I have lived at VDM in a 3 bdrm. 1 1/2 bath for 13 years and will move if this plan is voted in.

It is not sustainable nor safe for Bailard to have 300+ more cars/trucks on this roadway. The builder needs to come up with another plan to route the proposed traffic.

I have lived at VDM in a 3 bdrm 1 1/2 bath for 13 years and will move if this plan is voted in. This neighborhood will deteriorate if this plan is voted in.

Thank you for your time.

Sheryl Ford
(818) 489-6027

Sarah Mayer

From: The Tree Amigos of Orcutt <thetreeamigosoforcutt@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 7:10 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Public Comment for Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors Meeting
Attachments: Tree Amigos 4-21-24 Letter.pdf

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Clerk,

I read in the Santa Maria Times that there is a special hearing concerning rezoning of Key Site 11 in Orcutt on April 30th and/or May 3rd, yet I do not find an agenda on your website for either of those dates. Would you please distribute my attached public comments to the Board of Supervisors in advance of the meeting concerning rezoning of Key Site 11, whenever that meeting is scheduled to occur.

Thank you,
Teri Schwab
The Tree Amigos of Orcutt

Sent from [Outlook](#)

April 21, 2024

Dear Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors and Santa Barbara County Planning Commission,

The Tree Amigos of Orcutt, a California 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation (Tree Amigos), objects to the rezoning of Key Site 11 from recreational open space to commercial and residential (157 apartments, grocery store, retail outlets and athletic fields, according to Orcutt Pioneer April 2024 <https://www.orcuttpioneer.com/general-8-6>). The site is incompatible for building because it is a creek-bed with much of the site in a flood zone and home to potentially protected plant and animal species.

Under the Government Code, the Santa Barbara County Planning Commission has a legal requirement to ensure that minimum environmental standards are met. The area of Orcutt surrounding Clark Avenue is under increased environmental threat due to increasing traffic, decreasing air quality, as well as lack of adequate protection of protected plant and animal species. Key Site 11 acts as a wildlife corridor for key species such as coyote and deer. The creek at the center of the site is subject to flooding, as well as potentially providing habitats for critically endangered species such as tiger salamander. Rezoning the space for commercial and residential use will lead to the detriment of the local environment, as well as increased traffic and lower air quality. It is also a site that is unsuitable for habitation due to its proximity to high levels of traffic, meaning that families who live on the site will be subject to worse health outcomes as a result of exposure to poor air quality.

Orcutt Ranch Clark Avenue LLC, owner of Key Site 11, and the "Splash and Dash Car Wash" on the corner of Key Site 11 appear to be owned by the same person (corporationwiki.com). In 2008, a proposed development was submitted for Key Site 11. It was on a much smaller scale than the proposed use of the rezoning. At that time the Splash & Dash Carwash was a derelict gas station. However, even at that stage the project was unable to meet air quality and traffic standards.¹

Since the opening of Splash & Dash Carwash traffic has exponentially increased in the area. Newly approved developments in adjacent key sites such as the Oasis Senior Center (700 yards away), will increase the traffic further in an area known for collisions. Rezoning Key Site 11 to allow for further development will violate air quality and traffic requirements and fundamentally change the nature/character of this tranquil, peaceful site.

Because of the environmental pressures on the space, we believe that Key Site 11 should be zoned for recreational open space or conservation use only. The preservation of the site allows for essential protections of animals and plants already under threat from building. If Key Site 11 was to be redeveloped, people residing in the area would be subject to high pollution, unsustainable traffic, and higher mortality rates due to the health impact of living near high traffic areas.

Thank you, and please enthusiastically deny this inappropriate rezoning request.

Ryan and Teri Schwab

The Tree Amigos of Orcutt, a California nonprofit corporation
thetreeamigosforocutt@msn.com

cc: Environmental Defense Center
Sierra Club, Arguello Group, Los Padres Chapter
Mark Chytilo, Esq.
Luis Oasis Senior Center
Rancho Maria Golf Club
Splash & Dash Carwash
Orcutt Ranch LLC

¹ See the attached letter excerpt dated April 9, 2008, to County of Santa Barbara Planning Commissioners entitled Mitigated Negative Declaration for English-Joseph Property Investments, Key Site 11, 07DVP-00000-00021, 07CUP-00000-00058, 05SPP-00000-00002, pages 8-11, under paragraph 4.3 Air Quality.

Michael Hays
Honorable Planning Commissioners
April 9, 2008
Page 8

Proposed Mitigation Measures

AES-1: The requirement of a minimum 50 foot landscaped buffer along the eastern boundary, while desirable to block view of the monstrous proposed development, will also block the view of the open space from that direction. This setback is not compliant with OCP DevStd KS11-16 requiring a 75-foot landscaped buffer. This policy inconsistency creates a significant visual and land use impact, and is grounds for mandatory project denial.

AES-2: As stated above, the mitigation measure requiring minimum 35 foot landscaped buffer along Clark Avenue with sufficient density to screen all parking areas from public view and to break-up and partially obscure building masses actually aids the complete loss of public view of the open space that is wiped out by this proposed development. Further, there is no mention of the median improvements on Clark Avenue that are identified in the Orcutt Community Plan.

AES-3: Should the proposed development be approved with no modification to the building plans, this mitigation measure is inadequate. The entire project should be screened from view from the residences to the south, not just the parking structure. Even with this measure, views of the open space will be lost and impacts will remain significant.

There is no measure for planting native species in the open space. There is also no measure for ensuring that the landscaping measures will be completed or that they will be maintained for the life of the development. There is no landscape plan in the MND and no performance standard to ensure successful mitigation. Therefore, the visual impact mitigation measures are inadequate. Visual impacts are significant.

4.3 AIR QUALITY

The Environmental Review Guidelines for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution and Control District, list the following criteria to be used when determining if a project has a significant environmental impact.

Operation of the project will:

- emit from all project sources, mobile and stationary, less than the daily trigger for offsets set in the APCD New Source Review Rule, for any pollutant; and
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) or reactive organic compounds (ROC) from motor vehicle trips only; and

Michael Hays
Honorable Planning Commissioners
April 9, 2008
Page 9

- not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and
- not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- be consistent with the adopted federal and state Air Quality Plans.

Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (revised November 16, 2000), page 10.

The MND states that the threshold for combined emissions does not exceed 55 lbs per day, and states that those calculations include the NO_x from vehicles. However this contradicts the *Guidelines* (supra) which clearly states that the total threshold does **not** include NO_x emissions from vehicles. NO_x from vehicles emissions are to be evaluated on their own to demonstrate that NO_x individually is under the thresholds.

The URBEMIS calculations provided in the MND have been altered from the actual URBEMIS report provided by Michael Hays (copy attached as Exhibit 2). The true numbers reflected in that report are NO_x 31.33 for operational (vehicle) emission estimates. This is well in excess of 25 lbs per day limit set by the County Thresholds of Significance. There is a handwritten note on the report indicating that the APCD instructed Mr. Hays (or his associate) to factor the emission calculations by 0.7 which coincidentally reduces the net calculations to 21.95, less than the threshold. When we contacted the APCD by telephone we were unable to receive corroboration of this 0.7 factor and in fact several air quality experts we spoke to were unfamiliar with this factoring and stated that the raw number should be used.

Mr. Hays sent us an e-mail regarding the URBEMIS report saying that the handwritten note was based on a conversation he had with someone at the APCD who told him to multiply the numbers by 0.7. He stated "however, it should be noted that even without the factor being used, the total amount of emissions from this project did not exceed the threshold to be considered a significant impact for air quality." Mr. Hays said that the **total** amount did not exceed the threshold. The NO_x however, did exceed the threshold and was the only factor brought under the threshold by multiplying it by 0.7. Scott Johnson, formerly of the Ventura APCD said that he had never heard of combining two factors, in this case the RO and NO_x numbers, to make the total be regarded as under the threshold. The numbers are recorded individually to ascertain impact for air quality. A copy of Mr. Hays February 7, 2008, e-mail is attached as Exhibit 3.

In addition to the above, there is no indication of how the raw calculations were achieved, whether the projected vehicle emissions included day trips to the picnic area. There was also no Michael Hays

Honorable Planning Commissioners
April 9, 2008
Page 10

calculation for possible emissions from gasoline powered gardening equipment for the proposed development.

The true raw calculations for vehicle emissions are clearly in excess of the threshold and there is no mitigation outlined in the MND to offset this significant environmental impact. The .7 factor applied is not explained and not supported by substantial evidence. Therefore the impacts of the project NOx emissions are significant Class 1. An EIR is clearly required concerning this proposed development on air quality standards alone.

*With the submittal of the "Recirculated" MND, the Impact Discussion section on page 8 was revised to reflect the findings of a **second** URBEMIS model run prepared by the APCD. The significant numbers in the second run showed ROC of 24.95 lbs per day (0.05 lbs under the threshold), and ROx of 21.66 pounds per day. It is interesting to note that when the actual model run is viewed, these numbers reflect the NOx and ROG figures respectively. (There are no ROC or ROx numbers indicated on the February 19, 2008, model run provided by the Planning Division. See copy of the February 19, 2008, model run attached as Exhibit 11.)*

The Tree Amigos have serious concerns over the propriety of the APCD preparing model runs for the developer of Key Site 11. Unless the APCD provides model runs for all developers in Santa Barbara County, which we have been advised they do not, there appears to be a conflict of interest and breach of fiduciary duty.

Regardless of the concerns noted above, a comparison of the first model run and the second, reveals significant differences. In the second model run, the NOx figure has been reduced approximately twenty percent (20%). According to Vijaya Jammalamadaka of the APCD this is due to the updated version of the URBEMIS program used and the improved vehicle fleet mix. However, the creator of the URBEMIS program, Tim Rimpo, advised us that this is not possible, new raw information had to have been used to obtain such a large difference.

It is also suspicious that the original figure was 31.33 – in excess of the 25 pound per day limit established by CEQA, and somehow the second run is 24.95 pounds per day – 0.05 pounds per day under the CEQA limit. It appears that both model runs were manipulated in order to bring this project into CEQA compliance. The first by the multiplication of the unexplained 0.7 factor, and the second by a new model run that is able to barely bring the project into compliance. These factors obviously need further examination and the preparation of an EIR is the only appropriate avenue. We respectfully request that an EIR be required of this project and that these suspect model runs be examined very closely by the appropriate authorities.

At this time the Tree Amigos have been unsuccessful in obtaining raw data information from the Planning Division. Multiple requests have been made for a complete copy of the first model run (only the first page has been provided), and there is currently an outstanding request for public Michael Hays

Honorable Planning Commissioners
April 9, 2008
Page 11

records. Once the complete file has been provided, the Tree Amigos will be in a better position to obtain expert review of the air quality with respect to the proposed project.

Greenhouse Gas emissions

AB 32 requires reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. While there are no thresholds yet, AB 32 creates a de facto threshold and any increase is a significant impact of the project. Unless the project is greenhouse gas neutral, there should be a significant impact finding.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The MND indicates “potentially significant impacts to the wildlife habitat of Orcutt Creek and the adjacent pond, both through direct removal of habitat and an increase in long term wildlife disturbance.” The mitigation measures include confining development to the north side of Orcutt Creek and replanting embankments with native trees and shrubs after grading. While the proposed project entails significant grading of the building site with the movement of 37,000 cubic yards of fill, the description is incomplete. It does not say whether the flood plain will or will not be filled. The MND states, “should portions of the flood plain be filled...” Thus it does not define the project with enough clarity to enable assessment of impacts. From a lay person’s standpoint if only minimal fill is to be imported as stated in the MND, the only place the majority of fill will come from to shore up the development will be from the lower banks leading down towards Orcutt Creek. The movement of this amount of soil will disturb the wildlife presently in the low lying areas of Key Site 11, removing them from the site permanently. Key Site 11 is home to various species of wildlife.

The MND further implies that no endangered species will be affected, however, until an EIR is conducted that fact remains unfounded. Attached as Exhibit 4 is a letter dated February 8, 2008, from Vince Semonsen, a Wildlife Biologist. Mr. Semonsen reviewed the MND and concluded that at the very least protocol level surveys are required due to the potentially significant impact the development may have on two species of special interest, California tiger salamanders, and California red-legged frogs, as well as on two additional species of special concern, the Western spadefoot toad, and the Southern Pacific pond turtle. Mr. Semonsen’s testimony makes clear that no protocol surveys have apparently been conducted on Key Site 11 to determine if these four species exist as residents or migrants on the site. He states further that the site is within the range of the California tiger salamanders and that California red-legged frogs are known to reside in Orcutt Creek just downstream of Key Site 11.

The introduction of a storm drain into Orcutt Creek at Key Site 11 will also further endanger all species, including those of special interest, at Key Site 11 and at all sites downstream from that location and the sensitive creek habitat itself. However, the Biological Resources section of the MND does not even state that a storm drain will be constructed into Orcutt Creek. This information is in the Geology Section, and omitted from the Biological Resources Section

Sarah Mayer

From: Qing L <liumichaelfamily@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 8:52 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing on April 30th

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear SB Bounty Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Bailard rezone from 2 homes to 168 homes. I encourage all board of supervisors including Mr. Das Williams to visit Bailard Ave and experience the already crowded street. There are two condo/apartment complexes on each side of Bailard Ave and parking is already a problem for each of these properties. It is impossible to accommodate any more homes. It is a working class neighborhood and I feel that it is an active act of discrimination against these hard-working people to make their living conditions even more crowded. Please vote NO to rezoning.

Sincerely,

Jenny Liu-Michael

6075 Jacaranda Way, Unit B
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Sarah Mayer

From: Kim Ishida <kimishida3@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 9:27 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Bailard housing project

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

I live in Casitas Village which will be greatly impacted if this project is approved. I am against rezoning as it will create traffic nightmare and pollution! Overflow of people and cars will add more congestion to this little town. No to rezoning! Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Sarah Mayer

From: Jean-Luc Bourdon <jeanlucbourdon@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2024 10:53 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Housing Element Update Rezone Hearing

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment against the Rezone for the proposed housing development under consideration located on Bailard Avenue within the Carpinteria community. Red Tail LLC's project to build 168 high-density dwellings at that location would be detrimental to the community and accomplish very little of the intended benefits.

The project is blatantly against the welfare of the general community.

The Bailard off-ramp and local roads are saturated with residents, business commuters (e.g., industrial zones), and recreational traffic (e.g., bluffs, trails, parks). Furthermore, the neighborhood includes large residential and industrial projects that have been approved but have not yet been built. Traffic will get worse, even without this project. Until they're built, we can't assess how bad it'll get. However, it is already clear that another residential development would oversaturate local resources (e.g., roads, parking). As such, this project would guarantee all the problems of an incompatible development.

The request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and the Coastal Use Plan.

The proposed use is wrong for the property, neighborhood, and general area. Bailard Avenue was initially built to accommodate through traffic, but the lack of parking in the area forced the City of Carpinteria to change parking on Bailard Avenue from parallel to angled parking. Parking is still insufficient, and the narrowed traffic lanes make Bailard a busy neighborhood street—no longer an avenue. Overall, the existing area's density doesn't provide the resources to add development.

The project is inconsistent with good zoning and planning practices.

The Carpinteria Valley Association will provide ample technical comments on this topic. I agree with those comments but won't duplicate them.

The current zoning proved its purpose.

In 2017, the entire Bailard neighborhood was evacuated for days as the Thomas fire circled it—from Ventura County to Montecito. The surrounding agricultural land protected our homes. The current zoning proved its buffering purpose.

Please don't allow the Bailard neighborhood to be re-zoned for a high-density tinderbox with insufficient access, saturated roads, and improbable fire protection.

Thank you for recognizing our neighborhood's unique needs, character, and limited resources. Thank you also for protecting it.

Respectfully,

Jean-Luc Bourdon
1006 Palmetto Way Unit A
Carpinteria, CA 9301
(805) 684-3005