

THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

Cynthia M. Rodriguez

Agenda Related Items - Meeting of May 21, 2019
Supplemental Packet Date: May 21, 2019

2:30 P.M.

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically a minimum of two—one available on the Thursday preceding the City Council meeting and the second on Tuesday at the meeting. The Thursday Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk Department, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)). Both the Thursday and Tuesday Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or other services in conjunction with this meeting, please contact the City Clerk Department at (805) 449-2151. Assisted listening devices are available at this meeting. Ask City Clerk staff if you desire to use this device. Upon request, the agenda and documents in this agenda packet, can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist City staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.



Public Works Department
MEMORANDUM

2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard • Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
Phone 805/449.2400 • Fax 805/449.2475 • www.toaks.org

TO: Andrew P. Powers, City Manager
FROM: Clifford G. Finley, Deputy Public Works Director
DATE: May 21, 2019
SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 7.C. (Amendment to Exclusive Franchise Solid Waste Agreements)**

As requested by a councilmember, the Public Works Department is providing the attached historical residential solid waste rate summary.

DPW: 850-20\etm\H:\Council\2019\052119\Amendment to Exclusive Franchise SW Agreements\supplemental memo.docx

2019 MAY 21 PM 2:16
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7C
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019



HISTORICAL RESIDENTIAL SOLID WASTE RATE SUMMARY

Year	2009	2010 ¹	2011	2012	2013 ²	2014 ³	2015 ⁴	2016	2017	2018	2018 ⁵	2019
Residential Rate	\$27.28	\$28.28	\$28.65	\$29.05	\$29.05	\$28.76	\$29.27	\$29.60	\$30.01	\$30.83	\$32.35	\$33.52
% Rate Increase		3.7%	1.3%	1.4%	0.0%	-1.0%	1.8%	1.1%	1.4%	2.7%	5.0%	3.6%
CPI (%) ⁶		1.6%	1.3%	2.4%	2.3%	1.0%	1.8%	1.1%	1.4%	2.8%		3.9%

¹ Added street sweeping services and a three percent franchise fee increase to the solid waste contract.

² Rate freeze negotiated in 2013 franchise agreement renewal.

³ One percent rate reduction negotiated in 2013 franchise agreement renewal.

⁴ 50 percent decrease to CPI annual adjustment and a one percent increase in franchise fee as negotiated in the 2013 franchise agreement renewal.

⁵ One-time mid-year five percent rate increase to cover increased costs incurred by waste haulers and facilities due to China National Sword recycling import policy.

⁶ CPI for current year rate adjustments is based on previous year ending in August.



Community Development Department STAFF REPORT

2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard • Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
Planning Division • Phone 805/449.2323 • Fax 805/449.2350 • www.roaks.org
Building Division • Phone 805/449.2500 • Fax 805/449.2575 • www.roaks.org

TO: Andrew P. Powers, City Manager
FROM: Mark A. Towne, Community Development Director
DATE: May 21, 2019
SUBJECT: **Item No. 7.G. - Request to Allow Concurrent Processing of Development Applications in Conjunction with a Zone Change; Location: Conejo Creek Southwest Park, Paige Lane. Applicant: Conejo Recreation and Park District (Z 2019-70298)**

The following new paragraph was added to the Resolution (Attachment #1) for this item:

“WHEREAS, the Conejo Creek Southwest Park site is comprised of five (5) Assessor Parcel Numbers including 677-0-110-325, 677-0-110-335, 677-0-110-365, 677-0-110-275, 677-0-110-295; and”

2019 MAY 20 PM 3:32
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7G
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS DECLARING INTENTION TO CONSIDER A ZONE CHANGE AND ALLOWING CONCURRENT PROCESSING OF ENTITLEMENT APPLICATIONS FOR LAND LOCATED AT THE CONEJO CREEK SOUTHWEST PARK ON PAIGE LANE (Z 2019-70298: CONEJO RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT)

WHEREAS, on May 21, 2019, the Thousand Oaks City Council received a report from the Community Development Department regarding a request by Conejo Recreation and Park District to consider a zone change and development entitlements for land located at the Conejo Creek Southwest Park on Paige Lane; and

WHEREAS, the Conejo Creek Southwest Park site is comprised of five (5) Assessor Parcel Numbers including 677-0-110-325, 677-0-110-335, 677-0-110-365, 677-0-110-275, 677-0-110-295; and

WHEREAS, the Thousand Oaks Municipal Code [Sec. 9-4.2802(d)] provides that City Council may allow for concurrent processing of entitlement applications in conjunction with a zone change; and

WHEREAS, the applicant also requested that the City Council allow concurrent processing of entitlement applications along with the proposed zone change.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Thousand Oaks as follows:

Section 1: It is the intention of the City Council to consider a change of zone from "Single-Family Residential" to "Public, Quasi-Public and Institutional Lands and Facilities Zones" in conjunction with development of an existing park site with park amenities on a 14.28-acre parcel of land (Exhibit A); and

Section 2: The applicant may file any necessary entitlement applications to be processed concurrently with this zone change request; and

Section 3: This matter is hereby referred to staff for processing and to the Planning Commission for public hearing and recommendation back to the City Council pursuant to Sections 65353 and 65354 of the California Government Code.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of May, 2019.

Robert McCoy, Mayor
City of Thousand Oaks, California

ATTEST:

Cynthia M. Rodriguez, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Office of the City Attorney

Patrick J. Hehir, Assistant City Attorney

APPROVED AS TO ADMINISTRATION:

Andrew P. Powers, City Manager

TO: Andrew P. Powers, City Manager
FROM: Tracy M. Noonan, City Attorney
DATE: May 21, 2019
SUBJECT: **Item No. 8.A. – Municipal Code Amendment to Amend Certain Sections of Title 5 Regarding Camping and Prohibition on Sitting and Lying in Certain Public Places**

The City Attorney's Office requests that a change be made to the proposed ordinance to add additional language to Thousand Oaks Municipal Code section 5-8.09 – Prohibition on Sitting and Lying in Certain Public Places. We recommend adding the following subsection and renumbering the remaining subsection as below:

5-8.09 (c)(4) – No person shall be permitted to sleep in a public place between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. unless there are no sleeping spaces practically available in any shelter or if there does not exist any viable alternative to sleeping in a public place.

5-8.09 (c)(5) – No person shall be permitted to sleep in Open Space as defined in Section 5-8.08(b)(4) at any time.

2019 MAY 21 PM 2:02
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 8A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

From: Kay Yue <Kay@markscpas.com>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 4:57 PM
To: Cyndi Rodriguez <CRodriguez@toaks.org>
Subject: Ref: RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457 Project at 3801 Mark Towne

To City Clerk Cynthia Rodriguez
Attn: Mark Towne, Planning Director

From: Homeowner at 3803 Bridgeview Lane

I'm the homeowner at 3803 Bridgeview Lane, right at the corner of Reino and Maurice Drive. I'm against the rezoning as the morning traffic has affected our daily life and it's going to become worse if it comes another 47 homes right in front me. If you get police report from local office, you will notice the accident happens a lot at the cross corner of Reino and Maurice. The road condition, can't afford another 47 homes right around it. I would be scared in the midnight from noise caused by those accidents right in front of my house. My house is at high risk position that cars would run into it. Please have a tour and see how it looks at the intersection of Reino-Maurice. I'm absolutely against the rezoning idea.

Sincerely,

H. Kay Yue, CPA

Marks & Associates

23801 Calabasas Road, Suite 2026

Calabasas, CA 91302

Direct: (818) 639-7683 Email: Kay@markscpas.com

Tel: (818) 591-7560 / Fax: (818) 591-7208

2019 MAY 20 PM 3:05
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

From: Gary Koppenjan <gary.koppenjan@yahoo.com>
Subject: Proposed Change to General Plan and Project at Reino Rd. & Maurice
Date: May 19, 2019 at 3:45:32 PM PDT
To: "rmccoy@toaks.org" <rmccoy@toaks.org>
Cc: "aadam@toaks.org" <aadam@toaks.org>, "ejones@toaks.org" <ejones@toaks.org>, "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, "bengler@toaks.org" <bengler@toaks.org>
Reply-To: "coastalwriter@yahoo.com" <coastalwriter@yahoo.com>

19 May 2019

Mayor Rob McCoy and Council
Thousand Oaks City Council
2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Sent Via Email

RE: Opposition to Proposed Project at Reino Rd and Maurice Dr.

Dear Mayor McCoy,

For the city council's consideration, I would like to express my opposition to the General Plan Amendment, and Concurrent Processing for Residential Project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457).

I am concerned both about the process to change the General Plan as well as the practical impact of high density housing, traffic and parking in the area.

Philosophically, I believe that developers wishing to change the General Plan, which was developed with significant input from the community, should meet a high bar, including 1) demonstrating a compelling community interest and 2) a significant consensus from those most affected. I do not believe either criteria is met here.

I am also concerned about the impact of high density housing will have on traffic and parking along Reino Rd. Just past the Albertson's, the road narrows considerably and there is already a great deal of cross traffic coming from the retail center and adjacent neighborhoods. When I drive by each morning, I also see lots of kids on bikes exiting Maurice onto Reino on their way to middle school. Further, I do not believe the project has adequate parking space to accommodate the friends and guests of 47 new units. Where would they park?

While we would like to see more housing in Thousand Oaks, this is the wrong project for this parcel. This is a beautiful corner of Newbury Park at the edge of the Santa Monica Mountains. The developer knew they had a commercially zoned property when they obtained the parcel and should not have any expectation for change.

2019 MAY 21 AM 10:32
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

I encourage you to oppose this change to the General Plan and project, and not play *let's make a deal* with the number of units that would be acceptable. I think the developer is proposing an extremely high number of units knowing that the number would be reduced. This is a red herring and the City should avoid getting sucked into a false win-win deal.

Thank you for your consideration and your ongoing service to the community.

Sincerely,

Gary Koppenjan

Newbury Park, CA

19 May 2019

Mayor Rob McCoy
Thousand Oaks City Council
2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Sent Via Email

RE: Opposition to Proposed Project at Reino Rd and Maurice Dr.

Dear Mayor McCoy,

For the city council's consideration, I would like to express my opposition to the General Plan Amendment, and Concurrent Processing for Residential Project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457).

I am concerned both about the process to change the General Plan as well as the practical impact of high density housing, traffic and parking in the area.

Philosophically, I believe that developers wishing to change the General Plan, which was developed with significant input from the community, should meet a high bar, including 1) demonstrating a compelling community interest and 2) a significant consensus from those most affected. I do not believe either criteria is met here.

I am also concerned about the impact of high density housing will have on traffic and parking along Reino Rd. Just past the Albertson's, the road narrows considerably and there is already a great deal of cross traffic coming from the retail center and adjacent neighborhoods. When I drive by each morning, I also see lots of kids on bikes exiting Maurice onto Reino on their way to middle school. Further, I do not believe the project has adequate parking space to accommodate the friends and guests of 47 new units. Where would they park?

While we would like to see more housing in Thousand Oaks, this is the wrong project for this parcel. This is a beautiful corner of Newbury Park at the edge of the Santa Monica Mountains. The developer knew they had a commercially zoned property when they obtained the parcel and should not have any expectation for change.

I encourage you to oppose this change to the General Plan and project, and not play *let's make a deal* with the number of units that would be acceptable. I think the developer is proposing an extremely high number of units knowing that the number would be reduced. This is a red herring and the City should avoid getting sucked into a false win-win deal.

Thank you for your consideration and your ongoing service to the community.

Sincerely,



Gary Koppenjan
Newbury Park, CA

From: brightenlanehoa <brightenlanehoa@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 9:32 AM
To: Cyndi Rodriguez <CRodriguez@toaks.org>
Subject: Upcoming May 21st meeting

Please deliver or relay to Mr. Mark Towne

Attn: Planning Director Mark Towne

Reference: Initiation of General Plan Amendment, and Concurrent Processing for Residential Project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457)
Applicant: Cohan Family Partnership

This email is to express support for the change in zoning from commercial to residential. At the same time, I state a concern for the density of the project which is likely to adversely affect traffic flow in our area. There are two principal issues. First, while the current plan complies with the required number of parking spaces for the residents of the project, the eventual total number of vehicles of the residents might exceed that required number. This exact situation has taken place in our Brighten Lane HOA and we constantly struggle with illegal parking. Second, unless one "lives" the current traffic flow in our communities, it's not possible to appreciate the issues with which we are confronted despite any traffic review implying differently.

In conclusion, I strongly prefer a residential buildout over commercial BUT I would like to see a reduction in the project's density as a compromise.

Sincerely,

Richard Ermolovich, 594 Clearwater Creek Drive - Brighten Lane HOA

2019 MAY 20 PM 3:05
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF TUNICAMUNDA AND OAKLAND

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

From: Leanne Tapper <cypresspta41@gmail.com>

Subject: Agenda Item 9A - oppose the zoning proposal for the residential project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457)

Date: May 20, 2019 at 12:14:51 PM PDT

To: rmccoy@toaks.org, aadam@toaks.org, claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, Bob Engler <bengler@toaks.org>, eijones@toaks.org

Dear Mayor McCoy, Mayor Pro Tem Adam and City Council Members,

I am writing you once again regarding my opposition to the rezoning request from Mr. Albert Cohen for the residential project located at 3801 Maurice Drive in Newbury Park. I have attached my petition (currently with 480 signatures) here: https://petitions.moveon.org/p/N_acE

I implore you to listen to your constituents and vote NO tomorrow on Mr. Cohan's request to change his zoning on this lot from commercial to residential. There are too many already living in this already congested area. We cannot afford 200 more. Parking is already impacted and we have had three major accidents (one last week) in the last six months at this corner.

I went to our HOA meeting with the Mr. Cohan's representative Mr. Tim Gallagher, who was pretty condescending and stated that this, "wasn't his first rodeo," and that, "Mr. Cohen will get his way one way or the other." This didn't sit well with me or any of my neighbors.

There is not one resident in this area that I know of that actually supports this plan. **Please consider our pleas and vote No.**

Thank you,
Leanne Tapper
Newbury Park Resident

2019 MAY 21 AM 10:32
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

FOR: INCLUSION IN TUESDAY 5/21/19 SUPPLEMENTAL CITY COUNCIL PACKET

2019 MAY 20 PM 3: 35

TO: THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL; CITY CLERK

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

FROM: Kristen Henson (501 S. Reino Rd PMB 357, Newbury Park, CA 91320)

RE: May 21st Agenda - ITEM 9 : Allocation Approval ("Pre-screening"); Initiation of General Plan Amendment, and of Concurrent Processing for a Residential Project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457) Applicant: Cohan Family Partnership (Continued from February 26, 2019)

OBJECTIONS TO HEIGHT VARIANCE AND CURRENT DEVELOPMENT DESIGN:

A.) THE CURRENT PROPOSAL is CONTRARY to the stated CITY GOALS and GENERAL PLAN POLICY

The core goals of the City as officially defined in city documents are to : "Maintain and enhance the present high quality, semi-rural single family residential character of Thousand Oaks Planning Area,"¹ AND "Maintain and preserve existing neighborhoods through the application of appropriate zoning and development controls."

THE GOAL OF THE CITY IS NOT TO MAXIMIZE TAX REVENUE AT THE EXPENSE OF HOME VALUES AND THE CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNITY.

B.) PARK PLACE VILLA PROPOSAL IS OUTSIDE OF ALREADY IDENTIFIED POTENTIAL NEW HIGH DENSITY HOUSING SITES

City staff already identified a number of potential sites for new high density housing along the 101 corridor and nearby areas. Non residential sites identified as potentially appropriate for new housing were: near Oaks Mall, Westside Properties, and the former Kmart site. The Nazerbekian site, Westside Properties and Kmart sites would provide 19 acres of new housing. A maximum density of 30 units per acre would yield 570 units.²

¹ *Amendments to the General Plan Land Use Map and zoning for seven sites (LU 2017-70594/Z 2017-70622)*, Towne, Mark (Community Development Director), April, 2018 (p4)

² *Initiation of Amendments to Land Use Element and Zone Changes at Various Locations (LU 2017-70594/Z 2017-70622)*, Towne, Mark (Community Development Director), January 9, 2018 (p4)

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

C.) HIGH DENSITY

While arguments are being made that the City needs more high density residential, on April 24, 2018, the City Council actually approved LOWERING density in seven areas and reducing housing capacity by 1088 units.

This proposed zoning change is not just from commercial to medium density residential, which would be consistent with the medium, low and very low density zoning nearby, but would convert it to HIGH HEIGHT HIGH DENSITY residential, which is typically only seen in areas along the 101 corridor within 1 mile of the freeway. This unsightly patchwork development would be approximately two miles deep into the heart of lower height lower density residential neighborhoods.

If current residents wanted to live in high density areas, that is where they would have purchased, rather than spending their savings to live in this picturesque low/medium density community.

D.) HIGH HEIGHT

Instead of a high density residential development which conforms with current heights in the neighborhood, this proposal exceeds the existing residential height by an entire story. Currently Brighten Lane across the street is appx 25 ft high. These substantially taller structures would negatively impact the views and therefore the values of countless homes in the area, creating a huge eyesore that is totally out of character with any of the development nearby.

According to City documents: “[I]n some areas the proposed apartment building may exceed the current height of the Albertson’s structure.”³

³ *Allocation Approval (“Pre-screening”); Initiation of General Plan Amendment, and of Concurrent Processing for a Residential Project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457) Applicant: Cohan Family Partnership (Continued from February 26, 2019) Towne, Mark (Community Development Director), May 21, 2018 (p7)*



Newbury Rd. next to 101 Freeway. High height vs 2 story “residential height”. Is this “exceptional architecture” ?

E.) DOES NOT MEET THE RHNA TARGETS

This development “will not help the City meet its RHNA (Regional Housing Needs Assessment) targets,”⁴ therefore there is NO need to allow variances for high height development.

F.) WHERE DO EXCEPTIONS STOP IN THIS PATCHWORK DEVELOPMENT MODEL?

Not only is this Patchwork Development model unsightly and destructive to property values, but once zoning changes and variances are made, it establishes a disturbing precedent for further intrusive development that erodes the character and appearance of the community. Where do the exceptions stop? Does that mean low density and open space areas will be gradually eroded and rezoned to pack in as many three story apartments as the city can

⁴ Ibid, p9

whenever a developer wants? Over time, as one exception after another is made, the entire character of the community will be changed.

G.) THE REALITY OF HOUSING IN CA

The current traffic study and evaluation of this development are predicated upon outdated and totally unrealistic fairy tale models. The reality of housing costs and the shared economy means **this is an era of not just of multigenerational occupancy, but of multiple families and paid guests occupying the same housing unit.** It is not uncommon to see 8 or more people living in a three bedroom housing unit. 47 units does not add 94 cars, but more realistically would add more than 140 vehicles given that many units will be occupied by 3 or more driving individuals and the majority of people use their garages not for cars but for storage.



EVEN THE BEST LANDLORD HAS LITTLE CONTROL OVER “GUESTS” OR ABILITY TO PROHIBIT A TWO BEDROOM UNIT FROM BEING OCCUPIED BY 8 or even 10.

At a nearby high density townhouse development where we owned, when the fire alarm went off in the middle of the night, we lost count after 120 people came out of the 6 townhouses adjacent to ours (each valued at appx \$500K) ! **That was more than 20 people per townhouse and is the ugly, unsafe reality of high density housing in California.**

The streets were consistently crammed with cars that had to bumper bash to get in and out of their parking spaces.



Behind The Collection, Ventura Co.

H.) TRAFFIC DANGERS and FIRE EVACUATION

Currently the alley behind Albertson’s slated for the apartment building driveway is crammed with semi trucks doing grocery deliveries. Add to that all the extra traffic from the proposed complex and there will be accidents and substantial difficulty with ingress and egress. Furthermore, the additional traffic and parking congestion along Maurice Drive (which is where all the overflow parking presumably will end up) will make an already dicey traffic situation even worse. Obviously, in the event of another firestorm emergency, vehicle access and the ability to evacuate the neighborhood is a tremendous concern.



Albertsons deliveries in the morning



Proposed apartment garage entrance used by delivery trucks daily.

I.) PROPERTY VALUES

High height, high density and *de facto* high occupancy residential dwellings erode property values. Having an apartment building plopped down in the middle of medium and low density housing, blotting out the skyline and beautiful mountain vistas, along with all the resident and guest cars crammed up and down the street, will lower property values. Homeowners buy into this community because of its semi rural appearance, character and aesthetics. This complex would radically alter all three and betrays the homeowners who made the biggest investment of their lives purchasing their home based upon existing zoning. The homeowners along Walter Drive would be significantly impacted as much of their gorgeous views would be blotted out.



Camarillo near 101 Freeway blotting out the view

J) CYPRESS PARK USE

Currently, the small neighborhood Cypress Park parking lot quickly fills, with overflow parking during parties and athletic practices spreading up and down Havenside Drive and even all the way around the corner to both sides of Maurice Drive, creating traffic congestion for residents. High density housing can have a dramatic effect on neighborhood parks.

Having lived next to what was meant to be a “neighborhood park,” we were shocked at the effect high height, high density housing had in our previous neighborhood, as the cute park outside our former townhouse **morphed from a place for children to play afterschool, to a big event, Coachella-like venue** packed every weekend and frequented not only by people from all over the city, but by people from all the county. At night after designated closing hours, organized sporting practices for hundreds (adults and children) illegally tapped into park power to run huge floodlights. A total lack of law enforcement occurred due to concerns over lawsuits. Gas generators roaring all day for bouncy houses, people pitching enormous wedding tents, holding booze filled events with live bands for 200-400 were commonplace. Trucks running over curbs and driving out onto the grass towing pig roasting spits, etc was routine. Disruptive big event noise from early in the morning until nearly midnight on the weekends during good weather made opening ones windows impossible because of the noise. Trash and filth were left everywhere.

PROPOSED SOLUTION:

To allow Mr. Cohan to develop the proposed site as 2 story apartments and 2 story townhouses at a maximum of 25ft in height in an architectural style consistent with adjacent Brighten Lane. This allows Mr. Cohan to make money, the city to gain tax revenue, prevents overcrowding, the destruction of views, and property value.

From: Maria Cellamare <thebestofbest1@yahoo.com>

Date: May 20, 2019 at 18:42:56 PDT

To: "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>

Subject: Proposed 47 unit development at Reino and Maurice

Dear City Council Member,

I am begging you to reconsider the allowance of Albert Cohen proposed development of the 47 unit development. I bought my existing home (after years of hard work) with the understanding that the land was to be used as a Commercial site and not as a multi-unit residential development. Moving from a high-density area and seeing the impact of such an area, it was one of my main concern when buying my current house. The high density and high height variance would destroy the characteristics of the area. The area is designated as a commercial area for a reason. Let keep it according to the original plans. I would like you, to put yourself in my shoes and really consider the impact a project like this would have close to your own residence. I hope that you really consider this when making your decision. I thank you in advance for your consideration,

Franco and Maria Mongelli

2019 MAY 21 AM 10:32
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

From: Julie Braden <bradenfamily4@roadrunner.com>

Date: May 20, 2019 at 21:13:40 PDT

To: claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com

Subject: Rezoning for vacant lot on Reino Rd and Maurice Dr. Newbury Park

Hi Ms. De La Pena -

I am asking if you would please vote no to change the zoning on the lot located and Reino Rd and Maurice Drive in Newbury Park. I am a homeowner in the Twin Oaks development that is adjacent to this property.

As a homeowner it is not in our best interest to have this zoning changed to residential. The rezoning will create an huge increase in congestion on this very narrow side street that is one of the only access points to our community.

We already experience a high volume of noise and congestion due to the Albertsons Shopping center and the other home developments that surround us. With the purposed development we are concerned by the "high density" proposal and the noise and volume of cars and people that this will create!

Please vote to side with the community! Please let our voices be the one that you hear when you cast your vote!! That is why we voted you to the City Council to be the voice of the people, to represent us, the community that many times gets squashed by developers and money and greed!!

Please do the right thing! And be our Hero!! Be our Champion!!

Thank you

Julie Braden

2019 MAY 21 AM 10:31
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

From: christine860@yahoo.com <christine860@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2019 12:39 PM
To: Cyndi Rodriguez <CRodriguez@toaks.org>
Subject: Reino Lot Development behind Albertans

Hi! We own a home in Brighton Lane. Just wanted to express that we would prefer something residential to anything commercial. The lower the density the better and condos would be preferable to apartments. I think the people that don't want apartments would choose them over something commercial if pushed to make a choice. They need to consider what it would be like to have a gas station or Starbucks Drivethru right there. Not good.

Thanks!

Christine Conn
607 Clearwater Creek Dr.
(805) 358-8187

2019 MAY 21 PM 1:38
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

From: Cory Mallam <mallam1@verizon.net>
Date: May 21, 2019 at 13:41:31 PDT
To: claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com
Subject: Cohen Family Trust Re Zoning Meeting 5-21-19

Hello,

I am a home owner in the Sun Tree tract in Newbury Park with close proximity to the land behind Albertsons. I can't make the public meeting tonight 5-21-19 but want to email all of the council members to please vote NO to the re zoning to high Height, High Density Apartments on this parcel owned by the Cohen Family Trust. This type of building is typically only allowed near the freeway as our current city plan is laid out. This land would best serve NP as a strip mall, farmers market, park, daycare, restaurant, etc.... There are no other commercial parcels around this area. Where will future business build? We need this parcel to be kept commercial as the original city planner has it now. I'm sure Mr Cohen knew he was buying commercial land. Why should he get to make money off of devaluing our homes? Please vote NO to this rezoning.

Thank you, Cory Mallam

Home Owner, Small Business Owner and 40 year Resident

2019 MAY 21 PM 2:16
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019



City Council
MEMORANDUM

2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard • Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
Phone 805/449.2121 • Fax 805/449.2125 • www.toaks.org

2019 MAY 21 PM 2:00
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

TO: City Council
FROM: Bob Engler, Councilmember
DATE: May 21, 2019
SUBJECT: Item No. 12.A. - Update on League of California Cities Channel Counties Division Meeting – May 17, 2019

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive report.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

No Additional Funding Requested. Direct and indirect costs are included in adopted FY 2018-19 General Fund Budget.

BACKGROUND:

The League of California Cities (LCC) is an association of California city officials who work together to enhance their knowledge and skills, exchange information, and combine resources so that they may influence policy decisions that affect cities.

Founded in 1898 on the principles of local control and interagency cooperation, the LCC has grown from a handful of public officials to include the voluntary membership of 479 California cities. Today, the LCC and its member cities are working hard to strengthen the effectiveness of their advocacy efforts. The LCC's mission statement reflects this commitment to "restore and protect local control for cities through education and advocacy to enhance the quality of life for all Californians."

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS:

The LCC coordinates quarterly Channel Counties meetings to bring together local officials from San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Members discuss regional issues and coordinate legislative efforts. The recent Channel Counties Division meeting was hosted by the City of Paso Robles at the Allegretto Hotel. Councilmember Bob Engler and Legislative Affairs Manager Mina Layba attended the meeting.

TO COUNCIL 5-21-2019
AGENDA ITEM NO. 12A
MEETING DATE 5-21-2019

LCC Channel Counties Division Meeting
May 21, 2019
Page 2

- A. Welcome:** City of Paso Robles Mayor Steve Martin welcomed guests and provided information on special weekend events happening in the City.
- B. Division Chair Report:** Channel Counties Division Chair and Councilmember of the City of Grover Beach Mariam Shah announced that the next division meeting, hosted by the City of Moorpark, shall be held in Ventura County. The date of the dinner is September 27, 2019. During the meeting, the division will be entertaining nominations for new board members.
- C. Regional Public Affairs Report:** Channel Counties Division Public Affairs Manager David Mullinax discussed the LCC's continued efforts to dissuade the Governor about changing the Regional Housing Needs Assessment from a planning module to a production module tied to SB 1 funding. Currently the Governor's budget language still supports this policy. Due in part to the lobbying efforts of all member cities, SB 50, a transit-oriented development bill, is a two year bill. He thanked division members for lobbying their legislators.

D. Guest Speakers:

(Assemblymember Jordan Cunningham was the intended keynote speaker. Due to a family emergency he could not attend the dinner.)

- a. **City of Paso Robles Mayor Steve Martin:** The Mayor shared the outcomes of the City of Paso Robles Citywide Survey. Residents indicated three to priorities: (1) fix streets and roads; (2) maintain public safety; and (3) enhance economic development. Paso Robles' main industry is tourism and wineries. This contributes to 40 percent of the General Fund. With the increase of online sales and businesses moving out of state, there is concern regarding the financial impact to the area. The Mayor discussed partnerships with the local chamber of commerce and college to determine ways the City could diversify jobs and businesses in the area. The Mayor announced that the City would be developing 2000 new homes to support all income levels. He challenged division cities to find ways to support economic development such as increasing workforce housing as a model for the State.
- b. **LCC President and Mayor of Grass Valley Jan Arbuckle:** President Arbuckle thanked the division for inviting her to the dinner. It is her goal to visit all sixteen regions - she has already met with five other divisions. She shared her goals in leading the organization. She wants the LCC to be effective and engage in supporting the needs of cities. She had the opportunity to advocate in Washington

D.C. and Sacramento on the issues of homelessness, sustainability, and broadband access, especially for rural communities. She reviewed upcoming LCC events, such as the Councilmember Academy in Newport Beach, the June Policy Committee meeting in Sacramento, as well as board meetings and caucus meetings.

- c. **LCC Executive Director Carolyn Coleman:** Director Coleman shared her professional background leading to her appointment with the LCC. She was recruited as a private sector attorney to work for the Mayor of Indianapolis and served as the department head for land use and housing where she managed a staff of two hundred. She rose to the position of Deputy Mayor before leaving to serve as the Legislative Director of the National League of Cities (NLC) and served there for twelve years before coming to the LCC.

She reminded the division of important work that needs to be done on housing. The Governor and legislature have plans for how to increase housing. She believes cities can support and play a pivotal role in developing a more viable plan. She continuously reminds the Governor that cities are not home builders and that he needs to work closely with developers. She also cautioned that SB 50 may be done for the year, but there are other bills being considered that have nuances of SB 50. She encouraged the division to stay involved in fending off such bills.

- E. **Division Soapbox (dedicated time for division members to share any interests):** City of Goleta Councilmember James Karyico asked division members to contact LCC leadership in advocating for SB 234. This bill would require a large family daycare home to be treated as a residential use property. The LCC does not have an active position on this bill. Councilmember Karyico believes it is important to have more childcare facilities located in neighborhoods.

COUNCIL GOAL COMPLIANCE:

Meets City Council Goal A:

- A. Provide municipal government leadership which is open and responsive to residents, and is characterized by ethical behavior, stability, confidence in the future, and cooperative interaction among civic leaders, residents, business representatives, and City staff, while recognizing and respecting legitimate differences of opinion on critical issues facing the City.

PREPARED BY: Mina M. Layba, Legislative Affairs Manager