

Sarah Mayer Public Comment - Group 1

From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 11:45 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Caird Property / Chuck Lande

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Greg Moss <greg.moss123@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 4:03 PM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>; Supervisor Das Williams <SupervisorWilliams@countyofsb.org>; Laura Capps <lcapps@countyofsb.org>; Joan Hartmann <jHartmann@countyofsb.org>; Supervisor Nelson <Nelson@bos.countyofsb.org>; Steve Lavagnino <slavagnino@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Caird Property / Chuck Lande

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 Supervisors:

Congratulations on talking action to create new housing in our community. There is no doubt we need it. As a real estate professional for nearly all my adult life, I am pleased to see that you are acting with urgency.

With that in mind, I continue see more and more progress in rental housing construction over the past few years, we also need homes for sale. So many employers I speak with have great concerns over recruiting and retaining their employee talent in the county as they mature, marry and start a family. We need more for sale housing.

That is why I am writing this note. To urge you to include the Caird Property in your first rezoning program. The 800 plus homes will be for sale and a good diversity of single family and different types of Multifamily, allowing first time buyers as well as some move up buyers to create home in our county. And the plan includes 200 affordable homes.

This is an ideal plan and one of the plans that must be included to meet the housing shortage we face here in the county.

I have reviewed the conceptual plan, and it is beautiful. I have seen the work Chuck Lande has done here and around the state and it is outstanding. And I respect Ron Caird and his family for their dedication to farming and their desire to move out of the urban environment and continue to farm.

I whole-heartedly urge you to include the Caird Properties in your program.

Thank you for your willingness to listen and take input, making our community better.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Moss
805-886-6125

SOURCE: <https://sbcopad.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9375e0705e864eada0ff535c23ba99ac>

RECEIVED

2024 MAR 11 P 12: 18

RHNA RQMT 5664
 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
 South County 73.1% 4142
 North County 26.9% 1522

<u>SITE ~ 1 MILE FROM GOLETA BOUNDARY</u>	<u>UNITS</u>
OCEAN WALK	70
DEVEREAUX	125
OCEAN ROAD	540
GLEN ANNIE	1000
GIORGI	1253
SCOTT	300
CAIRD 1	192
CAIRD 2	76
CAIRD 3	390
TATUM	331
SAN MARCOS GROWERS	796
SUMIDA GARDENS	300
EKWILL	218
MONTESSORI	345
MTD (1.2 mile)	333
OCEAN MEADOWS	38
PATTERSON PLACE	24
GALILEO PLACE	27
TOTAL	6358
Required by RHNA	4142

153.5% GOLETA SHARE

<u>OTHER SOUTH COUNTY SUBREGION</u>	<u>UNITS</u>
Biltmore	40
Miramar	20
Polo Villas	40
Van Wingertden 1	3
Van Wingertden 2	180
Bailard	172
TOTAL	455
Required by RHNA	4142

11.0% OTHER SOUTH SHARE

TOTAL SOUTH COUNTY SUBREGION	6813
Required by RHNA	4142

164.5% TOTAL SOUTH

NORTH COUNTY		
SUBREGION		UNITS
Santa Maria Area		
Foster Rd		61
Key Site 26		228
Pending Site KS-17		88
Element Church		30
Key Site 10		172
Vintage Ranch		28
Halsell		5
Key Site 1		160
Key Site 3 PRI		8
Key Site 3		119
Los Alamos Area		
Legacy Estates		59
Bell St Mixed		4
Sage Brush Junction		8
Price Ranch		69
Lompoc Area		
Apollo Way		302
Constellation		48
Alexander 1		17
Fong 1		14
Brisa Encina		49
Dfong 2		9
TOTAL		1478
Required by RHNA		1532
		96.5%

**PLEASE ADVISE ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS
THE SOURCE WAS PAD INTERACTIVE MAP**

WILL GO TO PRESS WITH THIS MARCH 18

MARK PRESTON

**Self Employed
Special Projects**

162 Kingston Ave Apt D

Goleta CA 93117

preston.mark7@gmail.com

805 403-3706

Sarah Mayer

From: nancigardiner@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 11:52 AM
To: PAD LRP Housing Element; sbcob
Subject: Comments for Board of Supervisors Workshop, March 19 - Deep Concerns about Plans for Goleta

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 and Planning Commission,

We are the Gardiners, Kirkman and Nanci. We've lived in Goleta since we were newlyweds in 1980. We lived through the Goleta "no growth" period, and worked for nearly a decade to own a 1-acre piece of property in Rancho Embarcadero that we were not allowed to build on because no water meter was possible, because the water district controlled all the growth. We finally were able to build after 5+ years of fighting for that right. To build ONE HOME ON ONE LOT. Yes, unbelievably that's how it used to be.

Though we felt things were truly overly controlled then, imagine that in contrast to what has now happened in Goleta in the last decade or so. Building everywhere. And unfortunately, much of it is taken up by UCSB or SBCC students, rather than the working families who need it so desperately, and who this new proposed housing is supposedly for.

As much as we love living in a town with proximity to a University, we have long noted that UCSB is getting out of control. Not only are they NOT keeping up with student housing needs, but they also seem to be continually overenrolling. What happened to that time when they were keeping to around 16,000 students? How did it increase to 25,000 as their new "guideline", even though enrollment is actually over that number? And honestly what is in place that will keep it from growing even larger? (I'll never forget a few years ago when Goleta homeowners received a letter essentially begging them to rent a room to a student.) The UCSB (and SBCC) impacts on our community are far-reaching, and again our point is that much of the newer housing in Goleta is taken up by UCSB students, not the families or individuals who truly need it. This is an important thing for you to realize, that no one seems to be talking about. *How would new housing be actually provided to those who need it, rather than it being filled by UCSB students?* This is a huge question that no one is addressing!

The Housing Element and proposed developments in Goleta to meet the State mandate are unfortunately ridiculous, at best. The potential impacts on the infrastructure (or non-existent infrastructure) are many. There is already a huge traffic issue in Goleta which would be made exponentially worse if the Glen Annie, Kenwood, and other housing

developments were to come to pass. Glenn Annie and Cathedral Oaks, Calle Real (near the 7-11), and even the intersection of Cathedral Oaks and Calle Real simply cannot handle the addition of that many residents and daily car trips. And that doesn't even begin to address the impact on the already overly impacted intersection of Storke and Hollister. (Also, are you aware that large areas of Cathedral Oaks at the West end of Goleta cannot even be driven on? Some areas are closed, and others are so pothole-ridden that they are undriveable.

Another serious issue is fire protection. As ones who have been evacuated many times, we know the real danger of fire in the West end of Goleta. We currently don't even have enough protection with the multi-year delay of Station 11 slated for Hollister near Ellwood. The addition of disproportionate amounts of housing just spreads that already-thin protection even thinner.

How did we ever get to this point with the State mandating a large number of housing units and then if we don't comply they use "builders remedy". It's shocking to realize this is where things are at. And how did we get to the point where "rezoning" is the proposed answer? *Zoning which is meant to protect from inappropriate or unsuitable use of a parcel of land.* Truly so sad, and unbelievable. (And the beginning of the slippery-est slope for years to come!)

We realize that the State and their mandates require that something be built, however, why is the majority of the answer to that mandate only in the West end of Goleta? It's perplexing and feels as though everyone in the County just wants to shove the unwanted developments out to the "messy garage" or something of that nature. Put it in Goleta, they won't care. Well, "they" do care, and some serious consideration needs to be given to the disastrous impacts of overbuilding in these areas of Goleta.

In conclusion, please please look closely at the impacts of these large developments on the West end of Goleta. There is a ridiculously disproportionate amount shoved into small concentrated areas, and West Goleta is taking all the brunt of it in an unfair allocation. The potential overcrowding (on top of existing overcrowding), the traffic concerns, the safety and fire concerns, and the population increase which affects schools and more, are all just "too much". That, and the true likelihood that many of the new units will be occupied by UCSB's over-spilling into Goleta all combine to make these plans not "the answer" everyone thinks they are. Not to mention the shocking strategy of RE-ZONING to make these problem proposals "fit"! (Can that really even be on the table?!)

Thank you for your hard work on behalf of the County. We have trust that you will do the right thing to at least attempt to protect us all from unrealistic, un-thought-through over-development that has not been carefully evaluated.

Sincerely,

Nanci and Kirkman Gardiner

(With regard to Item AR-13 on the agenda, and by way of info that may be of interest, we have been attempting to build an ADU on our one-acre property for an elderly friend to live in. As much as the State is supposedly “making things easier”, it took 14 months for us to get our permits (after two years of prepping), and we spent over \$22,000 in fees alone. We are doing a simple 800-square foot manufactured home. Just wanted to share that things are not as “easy” or “streamlined” as touted.)

Sarah Mayer

From: deborah holmes <deborahparkholmes53@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 11:45 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: Fwd: Glen Annie proposed development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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 Housing Element staff and decision makers,

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, traffic, and school services within the city of Goleta. How would these be provided and funded?

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.

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 ill advised. 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. Will the County provide sound walls for those residents to mitigate the noise impacts?

5) Water Rights and where does the water to support this additional development come from as Glen Annie Golf Club primarily uses reclaimed water. Where does the Goleta Water District stand on this proposal?

6) Impacts to nature in regards to local flora and fauna. The golf course was designed to accommodate the Red Legged Frog, how does that fit into any proposed development in this area?

7) 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. Wouldn't it be more prudent to wait until these areas have been infilled before considering the proposed zoning changes?

8) 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?

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning of Glen Annie Golf course for housing units.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Deborah Holmes
7910 Rio Vista Drive
Sent from my iPad