

THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

Cynthia M. Rodriguez

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

5:00 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.

Voicemail Transcription

From

Charles Garcia

5/21/2019

Hi, my name is Charles Garcia and I have been a resident here in the Conejo Valley since 1977 and I oppose the allowing of sleeping/camping in our public parks here in the Conejo Valley. Please call me at 805-432-0822. We need to seek other alternatives such as why not shelter them somewhere here...we have so many empty buildings. Hopefully you will vote correctly for this ban. Thank you.

2019 MAY 21 PM 4: 36
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

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

From: Karen Reddick <kgreddick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2019 2:44 PM
To: Alisa Lacy <ALacy@toaks.org>
Subject: Homeless situation

Hello, I strongly suggest that the voting members of our City Council find a way to watch the KOMO Seattle Is Dying news video. Ask yourself why the police want to quit. Why people are not sending their students to Washington University. Why the police in Boise are giving their homeless free one way bus passes to Seattle.

Seattle didn't have this problem 15 years ago. Now they rank second to San Francisco on the homeless/drug problems list.

Watch the video. It is shocking.

KAREN REDDICK.

2019 MAY 21 PM 4:36
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

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

From: Leane Ricardo <leanericardo@gmail.com>
Date: May 21, 2019 at 4:03:09 PM PDT
To: "kparker@toaks.org" <kparker@toaks.org>
Subject: Vacant lot on Maurice/Reino

2019 MAY 21 PM 4: 36

CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

Dear Planning commission,

I am writing you today with my concerns with the proposed change in zoning and plan for 47 units to be built in Newbury Park, as I am unable to attend tonight's meeting.

My name is Leane Ricardo and I live across the street from the vacant lot on Maurice /Reino in Newbury Park. My address is 559 Clearwater Creek drive. We are the closest home to the lot. We moved into the house when it was first built 12 years ago. We always knew that something would be built on that lot but were told by the builders Centex homes that it was zoned as light commercial.

A few years ago, I attended an HOA meeting where the owner of the vacant Maurice/Reino, property Albert Cohen, wanted to get our approval to build housing units there. He showed us beautiful plans which included subterranean parking and three story units. Our HOA management company at the time, Lordon management, warned us against subterranean parking because of the potential to damage homes across the street, with our home being the most at risk, but not the only home at risk.

I understand that the city is in need of housing and specifically affordable housing but 47 units on that property is too many. Units that are 3 stories high doesn't fit in with the surrounding community profile nor with Thousand Oaks and Newbury Park in general. The parking issues will supposedly be solved with subterranean parking but this could possibly shift and or ruin my home and the homes that back onto Maurice in the Brighten Lane community. In the unlikely event there is no additional risk to my property, how could I accept the disruption and impact to quality of life such a large project would entail? We are not opposed to housing being built there but we are highly opposed to it having subterranean parking, to the buildings being three stories tall, to the number of units, and to the community asked to bear only negative impacts of such a development.

The recent traffic study that was conducted with the conclusion that there is no change needed in the traffic signaling on Reino and Maurice ,even with the potential increase in traffic has me deeply concerned for numerous reasons. Street parking and increased traffic in the neighborhood is dangerous for all the children that ride their skateboards, bikes and walk to school, or who are just outside in general. Many mountain bikers, including those from NP High school mountain biking team, use Maurice road because of its proximity to the trail heads. With no change to the traffic signal on Maurice and Reino i.e. not even a four way stop, I foresee more accidents and higher risks to pedestrians and bikers. I also foresee much higher noise levels during the weekends and family hours in the community due to an increase in traffic and congestion.

The city needs to address how benefits and costs are realized by the stakeholders, the largest stakeholder being the local community. How does this development improve the local community? This is more obvious in a light commercial zoning framework. Densely populated units on that lot, especially when that lot, is at present, zoned as light commercial, and community members bought their homes in good faith that the lot would remain a commercial property doesn't lend itself to the benefit of all community members.

Thank you,
Leane Ricardo
leanericardo@gmail.com
805 405 1697

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

From: Vickie Zhao <vzhao100@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2019 4:24 PM

To: Andrew Powers <APowers@toaks.org>

Subject: Council Agenda 5/21/19, Oppose Item no. 9A, Cohen lot, zoning change

Hello,

I'm a resident in TO and oppose the zoning change for the 47 unit, high density low income project at Maurice and Reino Rd. Low income units are needed in every city/town, but not in already established neighborhoods where it does not fit the characteristic and current zoning of the existing site; the developer's goals are only profit and to meet goals w/r to low income bldg. within the City. The surrounding homeowners would not have purchased their homes knowing that Cohen had this planned for the proposed lot. Concerns by all the existing homeowners are: increased traffic issues, no room or ROW for a signal at the intersection of Maurice and Reino, increase in crime/gangs, multiple families occupying one and registered sexual offenders occupying low income units.

Please do not approve the zoning change.

Vickie Zhao
TO resident

2019 MAY 21 PM 4:36
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

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