Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Items - Meeting of October 22, 2019
Supplemental Packet Date: October 17, 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

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.
From: Leanne Tapper <cypresspta41@gmail.com>
Date: September 19, 2019 at 10:53:56 PDT
To: rmccoy@toaks.org, aadam@toaks.org, claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, Bob Engler <bengler@toaks.org>, ejones@toaks.org
Subject: Re: Maurice/Reino Project

All,

I meant to attach these artist renderings of the new monstrosity.

Best,
Leanne

On Thu, Sep 19, 2019 at 10:52 AM Leanne Tapper <cypresspta41@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Mayor McCoy and City Council Members,

I recently viewed the "updated" plans by Mr. Albert Cohen for the proposed project at 3801 Maurice Drive (RCA 2018-70458; LU 2018-70457) by Applicant: Cohan Family Partnership. At the last City Council meeting I attended, you voted to not green light his project and suggested if he wanted to come back he would need to drastically reduce the scale of the project to low or medium density to fit with the neighborhood. I'm afraid he didn't heed your advice. He is now planning on submitting plans for another high-density monstrosity. He reduced it by a mere 10 apartments and it's only five feet less in height.

My neighbors and I are outraged. We could meet somewhere in the middle if he proposed low to medium density housing that matched Brighten Lane across the street and had parking and garages for all houses. But we do not want a large apartment building going in here.

My petition is now up to 512 signatures:


Please listen to your constituents. My husband and I worked very hard to buy our home, please don't over populate our lovely gem of a neighborhood. I implore you to not green light this new project.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Leanne Tapper
629 Gentle Creek Circle
Newbury Park, CA 91320

TO COUNCIL: 10/17/2019
AGENDA ITEM NO.: 9.A.
MEETING DATE: 10/22/2019
- DATE: Oct 22 6pm
- Changes:
  - 27 APTS NOT 37
  - NOT USING Access Rd
  - VISIBILITY ON CORNER
  - 1 IN-AND-OUT POINT
  - NO 3-STORY
  - REDUCED PROFILE

SAME
10 CONDOS
I’d like to thank the members of the City Council for the openness you have shown with regard to Albert Cohen’s proposed development in the vacant lot next to Albertsons in Newbury Park.

Albert Cohen’s consultant, Tim Gallagher, recently hosted a meeting with the homeowners of the three housing developments that abut his proposed development at the corner of Maurice and Reino. The purpose of the meeting was to comply with the City Council directive to review his plans with the neighbors in order to solicit their feedback and make adjustments as necessary before presenting his revised proposal to the Council.

Mr. Cohen has once again displayed his total disdain for the neighboring homeowners. His revised proposal includes only three modifications to the original.

1. The total number of housing units has been reduced from 47 to 37. I will get to this later.
2. He is no longer proposing access to the development via the Albertsons’ driveway but is still proposing several parking spots along that path.
3. He has reduced the size of the proposed apartment building from three floors to two floors but this is extremely misleading as he has also replaced fully underground parking with parking that is half underground and half above ground. The net result is that the overall height of the building would be reduced from 37 feet to 31 ½ feet. That is a reduction of only 5 ½ feet.

Regarding Item #1 above, the Council advised Mr. Cohen to come back with a scaled down proposal from high density to medium density. It is my understanding that medium density would be a max of 25-27 units on that small 1.7 acre parcel. Instead he came back with 37 units due to some rule or law that allows him to have a bonus of 10 additional units if he provides only 4 units of “affordable housing”. So basically he is sticking his nose up at the neighbors as his greed again surfaces.

TO COUNCIL: 10/17/2019
AGENDA ITEM NO.: 9.A.
MEETING DATE: 10/22/2019
This revised proposal is totally unacceptable to the neighboring homeowners.

Despite these minor changes made by Mr. Cohen, the problems highlighted at his last City Council presentation remain: Parking, Traffic, Safety, Density, and an apartment building that is total incompatible with the surrounding single family neighborhoods.

While the City Council has directed Albert Cohen to review his proposal with the neighbors before presenting it to the Council, it is blatantly obvious that he has no interest in compromising with the neighbors but is simply checking a box that says he did what the Council requested. This despite the fact that Mr. Cohen clearly stated at the May City Council meeting that ... “We’re willing to negotiate with the neighborhood”.

Several homeowners have presented workable alternatives to Mr. Cohen’s representative that would allow him to develop his small land-locked parcel of land but all of those have been ignored or summarily dismissed. I have proposed that Cohen consider housing for the elderly at that site. This is such an obvious solution. Elderly individuals are less likely to still drive and therefore the number of vehicles at that site will result in less impact on the major objections of the neighbors with respect to parking, traffic, and safety. In addition, this is an ideal site for that use because of the walking proximity to a supermarket, two drugstores, a hairdresser, a coffee shop, a bank, and several restaurants. Mr. Cohen simply ignored this proposal.

The City Council rejected Albert Cohen’s original proposal. The Council should now reject his revised proposal.

Regards,

Robert E. Filiault
527 Havenside Avenue
Newbury Park, CA 91320
Cell: 805-312-0709