

**From:** [Gillian Fennessy](#)  
**To:** [Gillian Fennessy](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comments on New Zoning Ordinance  
**Date:** Monday, December 09, 2019 3:17:35 PM

---

**From:** april reid <[aprilreid@live.com](mailto:aprilreid@live.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 08, 2019 8:31 PM  
**To:** Anne Wells <[awells@cityofgoleta.org](mailto:awells@cityofgoleta.org)>  
**Subject:** Public Comments on New Zoning Ordinance

Dear Mayor Perotte and City Councilmembers:

I am writing this letter regarding various issues in the New Zoning Ordinance, including but not limited to 17.01.040, implementing a sunset clause for the use of the old Zoning Ordinance; 17.30.120, requiring a minimum of a 100 foot buffer for creeks and 17.38.040, increasing the parking spaces for parking for multi-unit developments with two or more bedrooms.

Specifically, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify certain statements that were made by Mr. Ken Alker in his most recent letter posted on December 3, 2019 and in his testimony to the Council on December 3, 2019. I strongly believe that everyone should be able to comment on the issues affecting Goleta. I have not commented on some of these issues before and I would never have mentioned them if Mr. Alkers had not made certain statements. However, after hearing some of the statements presented by Mr. Alker to the Council, I feel it is incumbent upon me to set the record straight.

Mr. Alker stated in his December 3, 2019 letter regarding the previous City Council, "The planning commission that reviewed Kenwood Village liked it, and the council members who were serving at that time, some of whom are still here, liked it. It is a good project, and I don't want to be forced to spend large sums of money and hundreds of hours and time to redesign it." Even if the former Council did like everything about the Kenwood Village development, which I have heard is not the case, I would humbly suggest that it is the opinion of the current members of the council whose views are relevant since you are the people who were most recently elected to the Council by the people of Goleta. However, to the extent that the opinions of any former council members who no longer sit on the Council are relevant, I was informed by a senior ranking employee of the City of Goleta that the former Council had issues with both the building of 27 triplexes on the property, as well as the waiver of the 100 foot barrier to build next to El Encanto Creek. So, it is likely Mr. Alker would have needed to make changes to his development plan even if the former Council was still in office. If, for some reason, it is necessary to determine what the former Council felt about the Kenwood Village Project, and whether they would have made any changes to the project, I am sure there are videos of comments the former Council members made that could be reviewed. There are also current members of the Council who sat with the former members of the Council who could shed light on the former Councilmembers' opinions. However, I

would submit that it is the current members whose opinions of the Kenwood Village project are relevant.

Mr. Alker also indicates in his December 3, 2019 letter that there should not be a sunset clause for the use of the old Zoning Ordinance. In Mr. Alker's letter, he states, "The last water moratorium lasted from 1972 to 1996; that's 24 years. No new allocations were made during that time. Our current water moratorium started in September 2014 and a recent vote at the Goleta Water District has extended it through at least October 2020. That will be over six years, and there are no guarantees it will be lifted in 2020, or for that matter, 2021. Even if it is lifted in 2020, there is no guarantee that the additional processing that will be necessary for Kenwood Village will result in entitlements by December, 2021." The fact that the moratorium could last years or decades is precisely the reason there should be a sunset clause. The values of the residents of Goleta can change significantly in years and decades. For example, in the past few years, the concern over climate change, protecting endangered species and other issues has increased significantly. The idea that a developer can still use the old Zoning Ordinance after 5, 10 or 24+ years is disturbing. It is imperative that developments reflect the values of the City of Goleta at the time the development is approved, not decades in the past.

It should also be noted that Mr. Alker is continuously claiming to be concerned about the neighborhood. However, Mr. Alker does not even bother to voluntarily plow the field and remove the weeds unless he is forced to do so. I have handwritten notes from my deceased mom, Carole Cordero, who wrote prior to 2012 that the weeds on the Kenwood Village property were overgrown and that Mr. Alker did not mow the property until he was forced to do so. Then, on November 14, 2013, there was a brush fire on the property behind my rental house at 17 Baker Lane, Goleta, CA. 93117, which is located next door to my own house where I live. I already provided the Council with a picture of the Kenwood Village property taken during the fire as shown on KEYT's website. The picture showed the weeds on Mr. Alker's property were taller than the firefighters. Then, in early 2016, I was informed by a senior member of the City of Goleta that Mr. Alker previously received an official warning from the County of Santa Barbara to remove the weeds from the property because they were so tall they were considered a nuisance. Further, around June of 2016, I took pictures of the Kenwood Village property and the weeds were still tall. In fact, Mr. Alker did not mow the field until my next door neighbor stated at a City Council meeting that Mr. Alker and I both attended in mid 2016 that the weeds were overgrown again. Last year, the weeds grew high again. At that time, there were two fires in the field, one on the other side of the field near the creek and one right behind my rental house at 17 Baker Lane, Goleta, CA. During the fire behind my rental property, I spoke to a firefighter who said he did not know if the fire would burn down my houses and I needed to evacuate. He also told me there were kids who hide in the tall weeds to smoke, thereby starting fires. So, Mr. Alker's carelessness and indifference was partly responsible for almost costing me both of my houses. Even today, as of the writing

of this e-mail, though there is a patch of plowed land directly behind my two houses, the vast majority of the Kenwood Village property is once again overgrown and taller than most human beings. If Mr. Alker can not even follow the rules when the property is bare land, how can the residents of Goleta trust he will take care to build a 60 unit housing development with 27 triplexes and 20 duplexes? To the best of my recollection, prior to Mr. Alker purchasing the property, there has never been an issue with the previous owners keeping the field plowed.

Further, regarding parking for the new Zoning Ordinance, I would respectfully request that, under the Multiple Unit Developments section, the requirement for 2 spaces per 2 or more bedrooms be changed to either 2 spaces per 2 or more bedrooms or 1 space for each family unit within the overall unit, whichever is higher. (I am confident that the City Council can word this language better than I am able to do it now.) For example, Mr. Alker is requesting to build 60 total units on approximately 10 acres. This would consist of 13 single family houses and 20 duplexes. He is also proposing 27 triplexes, i.e. 27 houses x 3 family units inside each overall unit for a total of 81 family units. However, for all the 27 triplexes, he is only providing for 54 covered parking spaces. This means that for 27 family units (81 family units minus 54 covered parking spaces) 27 of the 81 family units will not have any covered parking spaces at all. Further, Mr. Alker is proposing 14 spaces for street parking that he claims would only be used by the residents of the triplexes. This would still not be enough parking for every family unit in the triplexes, i.e. 81 family units minus 68 parking spaces (54 covered parking spaces and 14 street parking spaces). This means there would be 13 family units in the triplexes that will not have any parking. Finally, Mr. Alker has also proposing 11 guest parking spaces for the entire 60 unit development, i.e. 1 guest parking space for every 5 units. Conveniently, Mr. Alker has proposed that all 11 guest parking spaces be used by the residents of the triplexes. However, even then, there would still be 2 family units in the triplexes who would not have parking, i.e. 81 family units minus 54 covered parking spaces minus 14 street parking spaces minus 11 guest spaces only equals 79 total spaces for the 81 family units of the triplex. Even worse, under Mr. Alker's calculations, in addition to not even providing even one parking space for every one of the 81 family unit in the 27 triplexes, if all the guest spaces go to the residents of the triplexes for their one and only parking space, Mr. Alker he does not provide any guest parking for any of the guests of the entire 60 unit development.

Some developers generally do not want to create parking spaces because it limits the number of houses they want to build on the property. Mr. Alker even admits in his development report that there is not enough parking on the Kenwood Village property, so he expects that the residents and guests will have to park in the surrounding neighborhood. Since there is no real parking on any street surrounding three of the four sides of the development, the residents and guests will most likely try to park on the one side of the development that does have parking, i.e, Baker Lane, as well as the streets that run parallel to Baker Lane on the other side of Baker Lane from Kenwood Village, i.e. Violet Lane and Daffodil Lane. It should be

noted that Baker Lane, Violet Lane and Daffodil Lane are all small, quiet, PRIVATE, one block long streets which were not built to sustain dozens or hundreds of extra vehicles stemming from a 60 unit development. Unfortunately, Mr. Alker will simply sell the units, take his money and leave the parking problems, as well as all the other problems that stem from a 60 unit development built next to a quiet, single family community, for others to deal with. The only way to ensure there is enough parking on the Kenwood Village project, as well as other developments, is to enforce it by law. Even though it may reduce the number of units that can be built on the property, developers should be required to provide sufficient parking for their own developments and not cause problems for the surrounding neighborhood.

Refusing to create sufficient parking for the development will not eliminate the problem. It will simply push the problem into the surrounding community.

It is admirable to take public transportation and other methods of transportation into consideration when determining how many parking spaces to enforce on any given development. The consideration of parking spaces for electric cars and alternative forms of transportation, such as busses and bicycles, is admirable and worth investigating. However, Kenwood Village is located in a large residential community far from most businesses and work sites in downtown Goleta and even farther from Santa Barbara. I was born into the house now listed as 15 Baker Lane over 51 years ago and lived next door to my great-grandmother, Elizabeth Baker Ford, who lived at the house now listed as 17 Baker Lane until she passed away in 1993, long before there was even a paved road in front of the houses or an independent street name for the houses, which used to have addresses listed as Calle Real, the closest paved road to the houses. As such, I can say with certainty that public transportation in the area of Kenwood Village and the surrounding area is not convenient.

Lowering the number of parking spaces to less than the number of units in a development, even if there are other forms of transportation theoretically possible will not necessarily alleviate the problem; it will only create problems for the surrounding neighborhood.

I should note I am the only resident of Baker Lane that has only one vehicle. Every other resident has at least two vehicles and most Baker Lane residents have three or more vehicles. As it is, the street is crowded most nights and my Baker Lane neighbors from across the street park their second and third SUVs in front of my house. On most weekend nights, the entire street is filled with vehicles and I can not even have my guests park in front of my own house. The idea of having to compete with the probably hundreds of residents of Kenwood Village, in addition to my current neighbors on Baker Lane, for parking in front of my own house on a PRIVATE street will be a nightmare forever. It is great that there are people at the meetings and on the Council who have been fortunate to not have any problems with parking where they live. However, Baker Lane, as well as the the two streets running parallel to Baker Lane, Violet Lane and Daffodil Lane, are small, one block, PRIVATE, quiet, single family houses that were not built to accommodate overflow parking for a 60 unit development with 20 duplexes and 27 triplexes when the developer decides not to provide enough parking for his own development.

In addition, Mr. Alker clearly is not concerned about the rare/endangered animals living in El Encanto Creek. Even though Mr. Alker's own Environmental Impact study indicates there are rare/endangered species living in the creek, Mr. Alker still plans on possibly contaminating the creek by applying to build closer than 100 feet from the creek, thereby endangering the rare/endangered animals Mr. Alker admits are living in the creek and the over 100 animals living on the land who use the creek as a water source.

Also, it is important to determine who we are allowing to build major developments in Goleta, CA. My mom, Carole Cordero, lived at Baker Lane from 1966 to February 2, 2012, when she passed away from cancer. Soon after my mom passed, Mr. Alker told me in person at a City Council meeting, in front of witnesses, that he believed my mom supported the Kenwood Village Project. However, a few weeks later, I found my mom's notes on the Kenwood Village Project which indicated she had been to the City Council meetings with one of our neighbors and she made it clear she vehemently opposed the project. My mom even cut out an article from the Santa Barbara News Press showing a picture of a violent car crash at the corner of Calle Real and Baker Lane. The article indicated that the intersection, next to Kenwood Village, was one of the most dangerous intersections in Goleta. I have already provided the Council with a copy of the article.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I apologize if I was not clear at the Council meetings. I have a lot to say and, as I am sure you can understand, it is sometimes hard to summarize a lot of information into a three minute statement.

April Reid- resident of Goleta