

From: [Gillian Fennessy](mailto:Gillian.Fennessy)
To: [Gillian Fennessy](mailto:Gillian.Fennessy)
Subject: FW: Senior care housing
Date: Tuesday, September 17, 2019 9:13:41 AM

From: I <herseld@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 3:46 PM
To: Peter Imhof <pimhof@cityofgoleta.org>; Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org>;
kkimbell@aklaw.net; dev.vrat@csun.edu
Subject: Senior care housing

Hello Peter and Anne

I want to thank you for clarifying and explaining to the commissioners certain obstacles in the zoning ordinance which have blocked me from providing senior care housing.

As you know and understand I have been stuck in a difficult position for 43 years, it is much too long. However, I now have a glimmer of hope. They say hope dies last.

I believe the majority of the commissioners want to see changes in the zoning ordinance to make senior care housing possible. They want something realistic which work economically.

Before the hearing I met with some of the commissioners and told them about the obstacles that I have been confronting. They believe the policies need changes to make senior housing feasible.

For two years I have been trying to get the operators of senior care projects to join with me to build senior care homes. They all rejected my request due to the onerous City policies. As I have explained before no operator can make it if the policies provide only 6 seniors per house.

Last month Mary and Lisa met with two operators of senior care facilities. I believe they learned that the operators need certain numbers of seniors per house to work for them. The number 14 works. Just like the previous ordinance 35-292.a.4. which allowed 14 seniors per house.

We also offer this language for your consideration:

"Supportive Housing. Housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population as defined in California Government Code, Section 65582, and that is linked to an on-site or offsite service that assists the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. A minor conditional use permit (Planning Director approval) may be required for the on-site or offsite building that provides the support services (kitchen, lounge, recreation room, etc.). In addition to the Target Population, Supportive housing and services may also be occupied by all elderly persons regardless of income (i.e. no income restrictions)."

First this proposed language does not alter the State definition of "Target Population." It merely adds "market rate senior housing" in addition to those in the target population.

"In addition there is a serious issue with the existing limitation of six (6) seniors in a household. Six (6) seniors in a single family home is not an economically feasible prospect, and as a result, to our knowledge this has not been utilized at all in the City. In order to enable senior housing in the R-1 zone, the limitation of six (6) seniors per house must be revised to raise it to a maximum of fourteen (14) seniors, as it was in your previous Ordinance No. 292.A.4 or to replace it with a limit per house depending upon the number of square feet in the house for each senior. We

suggest 300 square feet should you prefer that approach."

The State never said number six should be the maximum. Weston Harmer the operator has projects in San Diego and Orange County up to 20 seniors in each house.

Finally, I am encouraged that the majority of the commissioners do want changes in the draft ordinance and I am doubly happy that they left it to you to make it work.

Peter and Anne please do your magic!

Please let me know if I can be of any assistance.

Thank you.

Hersel