

de la Guerra, Sheila

Public Comment - Group 4

From: Cecilia Brown <brownknight1@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2019 1:45 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: Comment Sep 10 Agenda Item D1 Patterson Ave Holdings Appeal
Attachments: Friends of the Eastern Goleta Valley ltr.doc



#1

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 accept Friends of the Eastern Goleta Valley comment regarding subject appeal at the attachment.
Thank you,
Cecilia Brown

FRIENDS OF THE EASTERN GOLETA VALLEY

September 8, 2019

Re: Patterson Ave Holdings New Office Appeal Case No. 18APL-00000-00022

Dear Chair Lavagnino and Supervisors;

Traffic issues have been the cornerstone of project appeals for this small and constrained site in 1998, 2002 and now Mr. Bradford's appeal in 2019. "A clear and present danger." is how 1st District Planning Commissioner Michael Cooney described the potential traffic impacts of this project at a planning commission hearing last year.

Just what are the traffic impacts? We don't know because traffic impacts have been inadequately addressed in the traffic report, but need to be in light of the number of accident statistics provided by Mr. Bradford as well as two additional accidents not included in these statistics as reported by Kathleen Werner, my neighbor, in her email that follows below.

We don't believe that you have enough information to make Finding 2.1.3 that "streets and highways will be adequate and properly designed to carry the type and quantity of traffic generated by the proposed use." And also to make Finding 2.1.5 that "the proposed project will not be detrimental to the comfort, convenience, general welfare, health and safety of the neighborhood and will not be incompatible with the surrounding area."

For those of us who live in the neighborhood and frequently drive the section of Patterson adjacent to this project safety is a great concern. We believe there will be additional safety impacts with the proposed project. How could there not be? The project will have to deal with cars coming from South Patterson overcrossing, those from the northbound 101 off ramp 100ft to the south, and any cars using the driveway 60ft from the next door project. To use Patterson Ave., project traffic will have to merge with all this traffic, crossing 4 lanes of traffic to get into the lane to make a u-turn to go southbound or cross 3 lanes of traffic to get into the lane to make a left turn to go westbound on Calle Real.

The traffic study only provides information on how long a car has to wait at the traffic light. There are other considerations. We believe it is important to have peak hour traffic counts at the Patterson/northbound ramp and at the Patterson/Calle Real intersection that include

1. turning movement counts,
2. maximum northbound/southbound queues between intersections, and
3. the gap in time in north and southbound traffic flow there is to allow project traffic to make turning movements.

The information above would help inform what level of additional traffic, if any, could safely access Patterson.

Further, this project is a “shell” building, undefined as to its future uses. Other than the purported use described in the project description and traffic report as a professional or commercial office building upon which traffic numbers are based, it is a guess as to the actual number of trips the project will generate. There could be more: Mr. Bradford has provided contemporary occupancy standards for office buildings. It may be possible that parking is not adequate; there must be no spillover parking in the adjacent neighborhood. And the condition applied to apparently reduce car trips, Transportation Demand Management, has no “teeth.” Lastly, there may be several unintended consequences with a shell building which has been described to me as “a problem” by staff in a recent conversation.

For all of us who live in this neighborhood and travel on a daily basis the most unusual road configuration in the county, traffic safety is of increasing concern. We request that the BOS get the necessary traffic impact information in order to make the most informed decision about this project. The project needs to be more than just a well designed building. It must meet other criteria to be the right “fit” in our neighborhood. There are uses for the site; it may just be that what is being proposed is not the right one.

Thank you for considering our comments,
Cecilia Brown
For Friends of the Eastern Goleta Valley

EMAIL FROM KATHLEEN WERNER

From: **kathleen werner** <kemily.werner@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Aug 20, 2019, 2:05 PM
Subject: Another rear-ended accident at Patterson/Calle Real/101
To: zorro j. brown <Zorrojbrown@gmail.com>

Hi Cecelia,

We had our oil changed today at Toyota in preparation for our Oregon road trip tomorrow. When I picked up the car I was talking to the service manager Chris about getting rear ended the other day. He told me that the same thing happened to him and his fiancée last week. The person who rear ended him was a young guy who just wasn't paying attention. We spent a few minutes bemoaning how awful this section of Patterson is. I wonder how many of these accidents happen here???

Just wanted to share with you.

Take care,
Kathleen

de la Guerra, Sheila

From: Ravid Raphael <r Raphael@twodancers.net>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 12:22 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Patterson Avenue Holdings New Office Appeal, Case No. 18APL-00000-00022

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 Clerk of the Board: Please distribute this to each BOS member.
Thank you

September 8, 2019

Board of Supervisors
County of Santa Barbara

Re: Patterson Ave Holdings New Office Appeal Case No. 18APL-00000-00022

Dear Chair Lavagnino and Supervisors:

I ask you to uphold the appeal by Paul Bradford of the Patterson Holdings project at 80 N. Patterson.

As a neighbor who frequently drives in this area, I am concerned about the adverse traffic impacts that the proposed development at 80 N. Patterson will have on my family and my neighbors. Already there are problems in the area with 8 traffic accidents reported to CHP in the last year and a total of 16 in the last 5 years. The recently added traffic volume from the Tree Farm on N. Patterson has likely contributed to this increase. Vehicles exiting the proposed site have a short distance to access the farthest two left turn lanes (of four lanes of traffic) particularly the furthest most lane to make a U-turn at Calle Real. Additionally, drivers exiting the 101 North off ramp when attempting to make a right turn from two lanes to head north on Patterson will have to be alert not only to the traffic coming from their left, heading south, but also vehicles to their right exiting the site which may be attempting to cross into 3 or 4 lanes. The Traffic and Circulation study by Associated Transportation Engineers from November 16, 2018 and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies referenced in the Board Agenda Letter dated June 4, 2019 do not adequately address these issues.

An important aspect of the project is that it is not clear what its intended use will be and the number of trips such use would generate. The site is constrained in its location and size. The proposed size of the building should be reduced and conditions put on the types of uses in order to decrease traffic from the site and thereby lessen the likelihood of a further increase in traffic accidents. This would make our neighborhood safer.

Sincerely,

Ravid Raphael
5546 Berkeley Rd.
Santa Barbara 93111

September 9, 2019

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

2019 SEP -9 PM 2: 14

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
CLERK OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

RE: Patterson Ave. Holdings New Office Appeal Case No. 18APL-00000-00022

Dear Board of Supervisors:

I am a neighbor of this referenced project and I am very concerned about the new commercial development proposed for this highly constrained site. The commercial development of 6,723 gross square feet for a new office building will create a significant safety impact in the area. The findings for approval of this project as described in Attachment 1 of the Memorandum dated July 2, 2019, do not include an adequate assessment of the circulation constraints for this site. The findings for denial also described in Attachment 1 are more appropriate for this project based on the lack of traffic information and the CHP Traffic Collision Report presented by Mr. Paul Bradford.

The Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) Traffic and Circulation Study dated November 16, 2018 provides Level of Service (intersection) information for the subject development. This information does not address adequacy of the roadways to safely accommodate the project traffic. There is no assessment of the Patterson Avenue road way to allow motorists to cross up to four lanes of traffic to make a u turn at the intersection of Patterson Ave. and Calle Real in order to travel south and west. This assessment is necessary to make the findings 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3.

2.1.1 The site for the subject project is adequate in terms of location, physical characteristics, shape and size to accommodate the density and intensity of development proposed.

2.1.2 Adverse impacts will be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.

2.1.3 Streets and highways will be adequate and properly designed to carry the type and quantity of traffic generated by the proposed use.

Vehicles traveling south will require a u turn at the Calle Real Patterson Ave. intersection. Vehicles making this u turn and those traveling west on to Calle Real will need to cross up to four lanes in order to make that turning movement. To make a finding for consistency with Subsection 35.82.080.E.1 of the County Land Use and Development Code for a Preliminary or Final Development Plan the review authority shall first make findings for the following 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. Based on the lack of information contained in the ATE Traffic and Circulation Study for this project, the identified findings cannot be made for the project.

In addition, finding **2.1.5 The proposed project will not be detrimental to the comfort, convenience, general welfare, health and safety of the neighborhood and will not be incompatible with the surrounding area** also cannot be made since there is no spatial assessment of the distance of the proposed driveway and the actual

intersection described nor assessed in the ATE Traffic and Circulation Study. The driveway is located just south of an existing driveway and these traffic movements will most likely be a significant safety problem with the addition of project traffic. This design feature of Patterson Avenue has not been assessed and as such the ATE Traffic and Circulation Study is inadequate to assess the Santa Barbara County/City of Goleta Traffic Impact Thresholds as well as the above findings required for approval of the project. This development will create a safety impact to the surrounding area.

Furthermore, the exemption from CEQA based on Section 15303 does not address Significant Effect.

c. Significant Effect:

A Categorical Exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstance.

The Patterson Ave. roadway design in the area of this proposed project is an unusual circumstance and must be assessed. Having limited vehicular ingress/egress to the site creates difficult and potentially unsafe traffic movements in the area. It is also not clear how traffic coming from Patterson Ave. south would access the proposed development and that should be included in the Traffic Circulation Study.

My family and neighbors utilize the Patterson Ave. roadway on a daily basis and safety is a concern that needs to be addressed for this project site. I request that these irregular traffic conditions be assessed and this project be resubmitted by the applicant.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Cindy Poire

5137 Calle Asilo

Santa Barbara, CA 93111 email: cjpkindall@gmail.com 805-683-4724