

# THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



## Supplemental Information Packet

**Agenda Related Items - Meeting of May 12, 2020  
Supplemental Packet Date: May 11, 2020**

**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.



Community Development Department  
**MEMORANDUM**

2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard • Thousand Oaks, CA 91362  
Phone 805/449.2500 • Fax 805/449.2575 • www.toaks.org

**TO:** Andrew P. Powers, City Manager  
**FROM:** Mark A. Towne, Community Development Director  
**DATE:** May 12, 2020  
**SUBJECT:** **Agenda Item No. 7.C. – First Amendment to Agreement for Professional Services for Building Division**

Attachment #2 of the referenced agenda item is being replaced with the attached agreement amendment which has been revised to include Exhibit B1.

TO COUNCIL: 05/11/2020  
AGENDA ITEM NO.: 7.C.  
MEETING DATE: 05/12/2020

Project Name: Professional Services  
for Building Division

**FIRST AMENDMENT TO  
AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES  
BETWEEN THE CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS  
AND  
CSG CONSULTANTS, INC.**

**Contract No. 12267-2019**

THIS FIRST AMENDMENT to the Agreement for Professional Services entered into between the **CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS**, a municipal corporation, (hereafter "City") and **CSG Consultants, Inc.** ("Consultant"), entitled Professional Building Consulting Services and dated December 20, 2019 (herein "Contract") is made this 12th day of May 2020.

RECITALS

- A. On December 20, 2019, City and Consultant entered into a contract for professional services whereby Consultant provides consultant services to City staff from registered engineers, ICC or CALBO certified building officials, plan examiners, inspectors, and permit technicians.
- B. Section 3 of Contract currently, and as may have been previously amended, provides for a "not to exceed" total payment as consideration to Consultant of \$75,000 for professional consulting services.
- C. Section 5 of Contract, currently, and as may have been previously amended, provides for a termination date of December 31, 2020.
- D. City is in need of extending the date of the Contract so Consultant can continue to provide the necessary consultant services to City under the terms of the present Contract, and Consultant is desirous of extending the term of the contract as well as providing continued consultant services to City and receiving additional compensation for said services.

AGREEMENT TO AMEND

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned parties to Contract agree to amend Contract as described below:

Part 1. The Contract is extended for a period of 6 additional months and Section 5 is hereby amended to read as follows:

The term of this Agreement is from the date first written above to June 30, 2021 unless the term of this Agreement is extended or the Agreement is terminated as provided for herein.

Part 2. The sum of \$275,000, is added as compensation to Consultant under the present Contract for the above-described additional services, and Subsection 3 (a) of Contract is hereby amended to read in its entirety as follows:

(a) **Maximum and Rate.** The total compensation payable to Consultant by City for the services under this Agreement **SHALL NOT EXCEED** the sum of \$350,000 (herein “not to exceed” amount), and shall be earned as the work progresses on the following basis:

“Hourly at the hourly rates and with reimbursement to Consultant for those expenses set forth in Consultant's Schedule of Fees marked Exhibit "B1", attached and incorporated herein. The rates and expenses set forth in that exhibit shall be binding upon Consultant until June 30, 2021 after which any change in said rates and expenses must be approved in writing by City's Project Manager (City is to be given 60 days' notice of any rate increase request), provided the not to exceed amount is the total compensation due Consultant for all work described under this Agreement.”

Part 3. All terms used in Part 1 and 2 above shall have the meanings ascribed thereto in Contract. Except as amended in Part 1 and 2 above, all other sections, terms, obligations, duties, clauses, and provisions of Contract shall remain the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties execute this First Amendment to Contract as of the date set forth above.

CONSULTANT

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Cyrus Kianpour  
Title: President

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: Doug Rider  
Title: Secretary

CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Al Adam, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cynthia M. Rodriguez, City Clerk

**APPROVED AS TO ADMINISTRATION:**

---

Andrew P. Powers, City Manager

**APPROVED BY DEPARTMENT HEAD:**

---

Mark A. Towne  
Community Development Director

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

Office of the City Attorney

---

By: Felicia Liberman  
Assistant City Attorney

**EXHIBIT “B1”  
SCHEDULE OF FEES**

Plan review is based on a percentage of plan check fees and includes the initial plan review and two subsequent reviews. Additional reviews, deferred submittals, revisions, and RFIs will be charged at the appropriate hourly rate below or as otherwise determined by mutual agreement with the City. RFIs for larger developments will be performed at an hourly rate, and turnaround times will be agreed upon in advance with the City.

<b>PERSONNEL / REVIEW TYPE</b>	<b>ALL INCLUSIVE FEE / HOURLY RATE</b>
<b>BUILDING OFFICIAL SERVICES</b>	
Certified Building Official	\$170
Overtime	1.5 x Hourly Rate
<b>BUILDING PLAN REVIEW SERVICES</b>	
Building Plan Review	75% of City’s Plan Check Fee
Expedited Plan Review	95% of City’s Plan Check Fee
Building Plan Review – ICC Certified Plans Examiner	\$100
Building Plan Review – Professional Engineer	\$125
Building Plan Review – Professional Structural Engineer	\$140
CASp Review	\$125
Overtime	1.5 x Hourly Rate
<b>BUILDING INSPECTION SERVICES</b>	
Certified Building Inspector I	\$85
Certified Building Inspector II	\$95
CASp Inspector	\$125
Overtime	1.5 x Hourly Rate
<b>PERMIT TECHNICIAN SERVICES</b>	
Permit Technician	\$70
Overtime	1.5 x Hourly Rate

Overtime services will be billed at 1.5x the applicable hourly rate. All hourly rates include salaries, benefits, workers compensation insurance, local travel and miscellaneous office expenses. Should the scope of work change, or circumstances develop which necessitate special handling, Consultant will notify the City prior to proceeding.

TO COUNCIL: 05/11/2020; MEETING DATE: 05/12/2020; AGENDA ITEM: SEE COLUMN LABELED AGENDA NUMBER

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Jacqueline Jimenez		8A - CDBG Action Plan	I am in favor of this item	My name is Jacqueline Jimenez and I am the Home Repair Specialist for Habitat for Humanity of Ventura County. This FY2019-20, Habitat Ventura, will be completing eleven total home repairs in the City of Thousand Oaks. We were funded through CDBG funds for ten homes for but we were able to fit an additional home to our budget. Currently, we have completed three of the eleven homes. Habitat for Humanity of Ventura County thanks the City Council for the continual support in being a builder of hope. Together we are building strength, stability, self-reliance and shelter in the City of Thousand Oaks for mobile home park low-income homeowners. Thank you!
Chaise Rasheed	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am in favor of this item	After reviewing the proposal and drawings for this project I have decided to respectfully ask the council to approve the process for the project to move forward. It is important for all cities to avoid urban decay as much as possible and the proposal for the Kmart site would revitalize what currently is a decaying parcel. It will also be one step forward towards meeting some of our housing needs. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.
Liz Hoskinson	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am in favor of this item	I am so happy to see this project is moving forward. The property has been vacant for so long. This new development will bring needed housing to our community. It is my hope that there will be affordable housing as part of the project as our community definitely needs that. Thank you.
Megan Crosby	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am in favor of this item	I think it's a great idea to move further with this proposal and vet it out. The site is an eyesore, and it is not good for our community to have a large lot vacant for such a long time. Thank you, Megan Crosby

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Donna Ryba	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I feel that the redevelopment of this property (as proposed) fails to address several things, the most important of which is the addition of hundreds of cars trying to squeeze through the already congested intersection of 101 and Hampshire twice a day. Beyond that, under the assumption that most residents will be families, the development provides no play area for children. Unspecified indoor "amenities" fail to address this. Lastly, give the state of the retail economy, do we really need more retail space? Maybe the plan could be revised to provide less retail space and/or residential units and more recreation space for kids? Finally, what is the definition of "affordable" housing, and how many of the proposed residential units would qualify as such?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>While we can understand the need for housing, a high-density project like this will severely increase traffic and is totally inappropriate for the area.</p> <p>People chose to live here because of the relative peace and quiet. Wealthy developers pushing ill-fitting projects like this, don't live here and will not have to deal with the negative impacts. It's all about the money. And a lot of that money influences city officials, it seems.</p> <p>Increasingly, it seems a goal of developers and government officials working in tandem, to shoe-horn stack and pack housing where it isn't warranted or welcomed.</p> <p>Contrary to the idealism behind this - that encouraging more concentrated residential living is somehow the 'progressive' destiny of our state - those who live in Westlake have the right to preserve the qualities that made this town desirable in the first place. I think I speak for the majority of residents who do not wish to see our town get any more crowded that it already is.</p> <p>It is not the place of city officials, in conjunction with influential developers, to usurp the will of the people by ruining the town's character, block by block., for profit. Thank you for welcoming my comments.</p>
Susan Widick	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I oppose the zoning change to accommodate the proposed residential project. I am a property owner of two homes on Willow Lane. The Hampshire Road intersection can not absorb the projected flow. Thousand Oaks has always had a two story limit on buildings in the past. Are we now giving up on our city and accepting high density four story apartment complexes? I will not support it. The neighborhood street parking is already overwhelmed by the dirt of on-site parking for Natren and the nursing home. There is not ample parking provided in these plans; neither for the units nor to support the retail space. The local streets cannot absorb anymore overflow parking. Please vote no on the zoning change.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Donna Bohana	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Needs to be on a smaller scale somewhat like the Palisades village that Caruso did. Parking underneath and all traffic to go towards Westlake Blvd to avoid traffic issues...lots of bike stales fro local residences. Another alternative is an outdoor move theatre drive in but higher end perfect for social distancing at this time. Homegoods as a staple maybe good...or a newly designed bowling alley to meet the new social distancing requirements. Nothing like what is proposed. its too large and modern design needs ot fit with The Westlake Vibe
Chris York	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I am concerned about the rezoning of the old kmart site to high density residential and the affect in which it will on the local RE zoned directly adjacent to it. I feel this rezoning will encroach into the RE neighborhood and not only affect the proposed property as high density but the surrounding areas as well. Obviously the traffic concerns in and around the proposed site are quite burdened with existing traffic and again the surrounding area is utilized as a short cut to avoid the congestion on Hampshire Road. Please decline the proposed special plan for this site and let's see if we cant get a project in there that will better fit the surrounding area. Thank you
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	Neutral	Is there a chance of perhaps absorbing the Shell gas station into the site plan rather than building around it? Two gas stations within a block of each other seems like overkill for that particular area, and perhaps the owner of the small Shell station would be amenable to a deal if asked (?).
Dr. Christopher Pianno	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	We should deny this project and also Not have a virtual meeting to decide this Until we can all be physically present! To decide such a project

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
		9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Just a thought - for a project of this magnitude, why not wait until people can physically attend and more forcefully voice their opinion.</p> <p>We're distracted by the pandemic and restricted by COVID and I am certain many people are eager to be physically present to make their voices heard - a virtual meeting just doesn't seem to have the same impact.</p> <p>I can tell you that the overwhelming opinion will be to disallow this project.</p>
Lynn Krause	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>First, it is both negligent and arrogant to hold a virtual meeting regarding a project (K-Mart/Hampshire) that will have such an enormous impact on this community. This needs to be an in person meeting and so should be postponed until this is possible.</p> <p>There is a lot of community opposition to the proposed project and the community needs a viable method in which to be heard.</p> <p>Currently, traffic is a problem at the freeway and TO Blvd. It will become untenable with the addition of hundreds of vehicles in a small area. Most of us live out here because we do not want to live the San Fernando Valley experience. We do not want additional high density construction...or the crazy traffic that brings...or the attending increase in crime. Certainly there are better uses for that parcel that better serve the community.</p> <p>Lynn Krause</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Robert Luce	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Thousand Oaks City Council members, Good afternoon. I am a current Homeowner near the former-Kmart-Freddy's steak-burgers site and I am in opposition to a zoning change from Commercial to Commercial/Residential for a proposed for new multi-dwelling units project located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road. I am asking you Thousand Oaks City Council to Deny Without Prejudice the current proposal and that this project should not require a specific plan so the Developer must comply with existing City codes. The Developer should come back and propose something with less living units that's more reasonable given the available acreage per living unit used at nearby Apartment buildings on Hampshire.</p> <p>At the upcoming T.O. City Council meeting this Tuesday May 12 please deny the entire project at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road and have the Developer come back with a more reasonable plan for far fewer units than the proposed 353-units that I understand will also end-up including the State mandate 35% bonus-units for an additional 124-units. So this proposed project would be for 476-units and add over 1000-Residents living in this this space at the Hampshire / 101 freeway that I hear is already "D" rated for efficiency and safety. Adding another 750-1,000 Residents and their vehicles based on the current proposal is not safe for the area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Thousand Oaks City Council should not be holding this project prescreening process when there's financial and health stress residents are feeling during COVID-19.</p> <p>Again Please Deny Without Prejudice the current proposed multi-dwelling living units project located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road, do not require it to have a specific plan and make the Developer comply with existing City codes.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Len Polan	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>The renderings show multiple negative impacts on Hampshire road. The building are too tall right next to the road, the white is stark and harsh, and there seem to be no softening of the "edge adjacent to the road". Please "soften the impact" by better edge treatment including but not limited to more trees, lower buildings and better color schemes reflecting the palette of tans and browns making the buildings blend into the environment.</p> <p>If possible because of density and height restrictions , can the developer place on site amenities?</p>
Sydney Grolman	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>To the Thousand Oaks City Council:</p> <p>I have lived in this community for more than half of my life. I previously lived in Chatsworth (the Valley), and my family moved here specifically to get away from the congestion, crime and poor school districts associated with high-density residential areas. I am a young professional who currently lives in a house in the neighborhood directly adjacent to the development.</p> <p>Please Deny Without Prejudice the current proposal so that this community will continue to be an open, clean and healthy place for me to one day raise my children.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Sydney Grolman</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Miroslaw Grolman	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>To the Thousand Oaks City Council:</p> <p>I have owned and operated a business in this community for over 20 years, I live and own property in the community, and I have raised 2 grown children in the area and have 2 small children that will be growing up in the area.</p> <p>I am opposed to the zone change for the properties located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road.</p> <p>I am asking the Thousand Oaks City Council to Deny Without Prejudice the current proposal as I am against the specific plan required for this project. Please ask the Developer to present a project that follows the existing City codes.</p> <p>I am also upset that the Thousand Oaks City Council is holding this meeting during the COVID-19 government shut down. This alone makes me feel as though we as community members and real estate owners are not being treated fairly.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Miroslaw Grolman</p>
Narda Fargotstein	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am in favor of this item	<p>Finally a developer is willing to plan for affordable housing and retail to get that EYESORE of the EMPTY KMART as an entrance to our city. What a wonderful opportunity for residents to be able to live freeway close and close to transportation which will keep our air cleaner. And what an opportunity to have NEW BUILDINGS with all of the upgrade in codes which make our community safer and less prone to fires from bad electrical. I can't wait to shop and be proud of my community for stepping up to provide more affordable housing to our next generation teachers, fire fighters, custodial staffs, restaurant workers and police.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Karen	Newbury Park	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	DO NOT change the zoning. It needs to remain commercial zoning so we get a business and tax revenue. The majority of citizens do NOT want apartments which will overburden schools, attract more crime, and add significantly to traffic. Thousand Oaks needs to remain suburban, and NOT the urban valley like you keep pushing down our throats. Start listening to the taxpayers in the community instead of your paid consultants from northern CA.
Ryan S Rose	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	This spot should either be used for Section 8/low income housing or a park. We definitely do not need mixed use retail. This experiment of trying to be the Valley doesn't fit for the city of Thousand Oaks. We are not the San Fernando Valley, Hollywood, or Downtown Los Angeles where you can put mixed use in a short amount of space and charge a high amount of rent. The city should look at other alternatives besides charging an absorbent amount of rent for the upper class and nothing for the lower or poor. Please consider other alternatives than putting mixed use in an area known for its quietness and scenery. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Mark Tanchuck	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I hate to see my community of Thousand Oaks even further continue to look like Orange County. Please don't do this. It will continue to add to density of our community, and, by so doing continue in the destructive trend to destroy the peaceful nature of our community. Thank you.
Susan Meraz	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	Neutral	Please stick to your own established guidelines. Your maximum residential zoning is 353 units and your height limit is 35 feet. Why are we writing a 2045 guide if it's all going to be overwritten at your convenience?
John Floyd Esq	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Have'nt we learned our lesson? The streets cannot handle 200-400 more cars near this development. It should remain commercial and we should be looking for a new tenant to occupy Kmart...not bring more congestion to our community. The original city planners( our local founding fathers..and mothers) had it right. That's why we moved here. Keep this insane growth going and you'll find an exodus along with your base taxpayers. There's plenary of land for building down the grade or to the left in Agoura. Don't you dare change the zoning.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Brandon Renfrow	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	This is even more ridiculous than the Home Depot idea. Rules? What rules? We'll just build whatever we want all over the city because the council will never do anything to stop it.
Ken and Sally Hibbitts	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>We are in favor of changing the zoning to either residential or mixed use.</p> <p>However, as currently presented, we oppose this project as submitted for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.. It's far too dense and needs to be reduced to the recommended max of approx 350 units.</li> <li>2. There are not enough lower income units and this number needs increasing.</li> <li>3. The architecture is horrific and looks like a factory...nothing appealing nor is it cohesive with the rest of Thousand Oaks. It needs a total redo...the street boxy lines are most unpleasant.</li> <li>4. The overall height is far too high and will be very unsightly from the freeway as well as from Hampshire Rd.</li> <li>5. There is no children's play area which is definitely needed, especially if families are to residents here. Indoor apts need to have outdoor spaces for kids.</li> <li>6. The landscaping is very minimal and I see no oversized trees, etc. It looks nearly barren.</li> <li>7. The traffic considerations Have not been fully analyzed and the impact upon the local area in terms of parking, etc needs more study.</li> <li>8. The cost of the real improvements needs to be born by the developer.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you. VOTE NO on this project.</p>
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Please postpone This meeting until We The people of Thousand Oaks can be in attendance.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Tim Toton	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>This is urban sprawl of Warner Center envy ilk. It will provide city government more tax base and more voters under the guise, as councilman Ed Jones put it, "For the children." I run from all legislation with that heartstring argument.</p> <p>I have a different opinion about affordable housing, not every town needs to have it. Find a starter place in a relatively outlier area, commute to work, save up and then "move on up." Isn't that the way it works, merit and personal good fortune, not legislation and mandates? That is an insulting dilution of the American Dream - that one cannot achieve without a government handout.</p> <p>We specifically moved here to get away from the urban sprawl of the SFV. But the shine of those growing Towers through the Warner Center 2035 plan is catching the eye of developers and councilmembers alike. Add to that a governor and government who is firm in giving away what should be earned and you have a way of life in real jeopardy. Stand up for our small town by keeping it small on purpose. We dont have to be a starter home destination. We should be where starter families aspire to move - the prize community.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Suzanne Luce	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>The families and property owners in this neighborhood are extremely concerned about the effects of the proposed project by IMT.</p> <p>We are in favor of the site being developed and are well aware of the need for housing locally and across the state, but this project does not fit in with the longtime single family zoning just behind the site, as well as the much lower density of the multi-dwelling units located along Hampshire Road.</p> <p>The project is in direct contrast (nearly double the units per acre) to the other multi-unit projects from Foothill to Triunfo Roads. We need an assurance that the new development will not exceed the units per acre of the existing properties in order for the project to be considered suitable. This would require the council to take the 35% state bonus amount into consideration and keep the numbers low enough upon approval to buffer this increase and the lack of local control over density at that point. Beyond the number of units, the height and scale of this project also require variances that are not appropriate or suitable for the existing neighborhood</p> <p>Again, I share the opinion of many of the residents in this area that a residential project is welcomed for this site. The quality and value of the project to the city is apparent in the proposal, but there appears to be a lack of suitability for the area and consideration of the effects of its density.</p> <p>For example, there is the already congested intersection of Hampshire/T.O. Blvd and the 101 and the rampant use of Foothill and Willow as an alternative route or "cut through." It is difficult to imagine that this project would be feasible for the coming and going of up to 2,000 new residents or even half that many.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Kathrin Nolan	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I request that the City of Thousand Oaks DENY the initiation of the General Plan Amendment and allocation of residential units for the proposed project. I feel that it is in the best interest of residents and our children that this property remain commercial and not be converted to mixed use.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed building heights are not compatible with the neighborhood and not appropriate for this project type and location.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Nicole Carnation	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>To the Thousand Oaks City Council:</p> <p>I am a business owner/ investor, landlord, local philanthropist, and a mother with young children. I have lived in this community for nearly 20 years, and I have often stated that this is one of the best places in the US to live.</p> <p>The proposed zone changes for the properties located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road to accommodate such an excessively large project will be detrimental to the quality of life that this community offers its residents. I understand the pressure put on the City by the state, but I think it is highly unfair for so much of this burden to be placed on the same surrounding area - there is plenty of open space for additional developments to be more spread out. The apartment developments already built in the area have ruined the school we are zoned for, and the School Choice program is so impacted that we were wait listed for all 3 schools we applied for. So now I am left with no option but to (1) put my child in a very poor school; or (2) pay for an expensive private school.</p> <p>I am asking the Thousand Oaks City Council to Deny Without Prejudice the current proposal. I am against the need for specific plan required for this project and feel that the developer should be able to present a project that is reasonable.</p> <p>Please also note that I am also disappointed with the decision by the Thousand Oaks City Council to push this meeting through during the COVID-19 government shut down. We are in the middle of a Global Pandemic and State of National Emergency, when people are scared for their health and financially stressed. I know many older people in the area without the knowledge/ability to participate in a computerized meeting or submit online comments. The Council's attempt to push this through without providing the community an opportunity to present our concerns in person feels wrong.</p>
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I am opposed

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Cathie Post	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Please do not approve of this measure! Too Much!!!!
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Deny without prejudice!!!!!!!!
Monica Henriksen	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Would have to be re-zoned. would increase traffic off Hampshire, that intersection is busy enough. Would be an eyesore as your driving on the freeway, this isn't Hollywood we don't large/tall buildings off the freeway.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Audrey Freeman	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>This project is not consistent with the community of Westlake Village or Thousand Oaks. There are no insurance is that the increase in population along with the actual two and three story development will not contribute to Crime due to population density along with the 50 low income units.</p> <p>San Francisco has suffered tremendously from these types of plans.</p> <p>I completely opposed this and think it will completely change the dynamic of this community for ever. Even if additional lawn Forssman is added on a permanent basis, This project is not consistent with the community of Westlake Village or Thousand Oaks. There are no insurances that the increase in population along with the actual two and three story development will not contribute to crime due to population density along with the 50 low income units.</p> <p>San Francisco has suffered tremendously from these types of plans.</p> <p>I completely opposed this and think it will completely change the dynamic of this community forever.</p> <p>This development should not be allowed.</p> <p>I do not understand why this city council members are even considering this, it is inconsistent with everything this community is about.</p> <p>Every single resident in Westlake Village that is aware of that opposes it, I have not met one resident and I've spoken to over 100 about this, who support this project.</p>

**ALL FOLLOWING ITEMS ARE  
RELATED TO ITEM 9.A.**



City Council  
**MEMORANDUM**

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

**TO:** City Council

**FROM:** Al Adam, Mayor

**DATE:** May 12, 2020

**SUBJECT:** **Ex Parte Communication, Agenda Item 9A – Residential Capacity Allocation and Initiation of General Plan Amendment for a Project Located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road (RCA 2020-70105/LU 2020-70104); Applicant: IMT Capital V Hampshire, LLC)**

In compliance with Thousand Oaks Municipal Code Section 1-10.08, the purpose of this memo is to convey that I met as shown below regarding the subject agenda item:

I met with various members of the applicant team related to 325 and 391 Hampshire Road to discuss the details of their project.



City Council  
**MEMORANDUM**

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

**TO:** Mayor & City Council

**FROM:** Claudia Bill-de la Peña, Mayor Pro Tem

**DATE:** May 12, 2020

**SUBJECT:** **Ex Parte Communication, Agenda Item 9A – Residential Capacity Allocation and Initiation of General Plan Amendment for a Project Located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road (RCA 2020-70105/LU 2020-70104); Applicant: IMT Capital V Hampshire, LLC)**

In compliance with Thousand Oaks Municipal Code Section 1-10.08, the purpose of this memo is to convey that I met as shown below regarding the subject agenda item:

I met with various members of the applicant team related to 325 and 391 Hampshire Road to discuss the details of their project.

**TO:** Mayor & City Council

**FROM:** Bob Engler, Councilmember

**DATE:** May 12, 2020

**SUBJECT:** **Ex Parte Communication, Agenda Item 9A – Residential Capacity Allocation and Initiation of General Plan Amendment for a Project Located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road (RCA 2020-70105/LU 2020-70104); Applicant: IMT Capital V Hampshire, LLC)**

In compliance with Thousand Oaks Municipal Code Section 1-10.08, the purpose of this memo is to convey that I met as shown below regarding the subject agenda item:

I met with various members of the applicant team related to 325 and 391 Hampshire Road to discuss the details of their project.



City Council  
**MEMORANDUM**

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

**TO:** Mayor & City Council

**FROM:** Ed Jones, Councilmember

**DATE:** May 12, 2020

**SUBJECT:** **Ex Parte Communication, Agenda Item 9A – Residential Capacity Allocation and Initiation of General Plan Amendment for a Project Located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road (RCA 2020-70105/LU 2020-70104); Applicant: IMT Capital V Hampshire, LLC)**

In compliance with Thousand Oaks Municipal Code Section 1-10.08, the purpose of this memo is to convey that I met as shown below regarding the subject agenda item:

I met with various members of the applicant team related to 325 and 391 Hampshire Road to discuss the details of their project.

From: Mark Sellers <MSellers@jacksontidus.law>  
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2020 5:07 PM  
To: Mark Towne; City Clerk's Office  
Cc: Shawn Moradian (toba.bid@gmail.com); heatenterprises; Doug Menges;  
Dave Gulbranson; steve Kasten; Deborah Kernahan; Keith Sinclair  
Subject: TOBA Support Letter for Council Prescreening Tuesday Night Meeting  
Attachments: City Council TOBA support Letter.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Attached is TOBA's project support letter for Council Prescreening at Tuesday night meeting

Mark Sellers  
Senior Counsel

msellers@jacksontidus.law  
D: 805.418.1914

2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 200  
Westlake, CA 91361  
O: 805.230.0023  
F: 805.230.0087  
www.jacksontidus.law

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Jackson Tidus is a recognized Partner in ABA-EPA's Law Office Climate Challenge

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*



## THOUSAND OAKS BOULEVARD ASSOCIATION

2815 Townsgate Road, #200, Westlake Village, CA 91361

*"DEDICATED TO THE BEAUTIFICATION AND REVITALIZATION OF THE BOULEVARD"*

---

May 8, 2020

VIA E-MAIL (MTowne@Toaks.org and City Clerk)

The City Council of the City of Thousand Oaks  
2100 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

**Re: May 12, 2020, City Council Meeting; Agenda Item 9A; TOBA Board Member's Support of IMT Capital V Hampshire, LLC's Council Prescreening Approval of a Mixed Use Project at 325 Hampshire Road.**

Dear Honorable Council Members:

As you know, Thousand Oaks Boulevard Association ("TOBA") has spent a considerable effort in evaluating the reality of market factors impacting the City's central commercial corridor, and in creating a new vision for that area that will encourage customers to visit this central area. TOBA Board Member's whole-heartedly support IMT Capital V Hampshire, LLC's General Plan Amendment from "Commercial" to "Commercial/ Residential" and the allocation of 353 dwelling units of the citywide Measure E residential capacity, and to authorize concurrent processing of legislative Council actions and project entitlements for a proposed mixed use project located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road. The large site is 11.79 acres in size, with a number of dilapidated unattractive vacant commercial buildings on the property. This site is an underutilized property with structures seriously in need of removal. As an entryway to the Boulevard from the 101 Freeway, any upgrade and visual enhancement of this key property will benefit the Boulevard.

In addition, the Boulevard businesses do not have the commercial benefit of freeway exposure with its high traffic or vehicle counts of potential customers, therefore, having a sufficient nearby residential population to the Thousand Oaks Boulevard stores, banks, services and restaurants is vital to producing a viable commercial corridor for the City. We feel these centralized infill "mixed use" projects are a form of "Smart Growth" or a Sustainable Community Strategy for the sensible integration or mixing of residential and commercial uses into a central infill area near key transportation corridors (bus lines), thus putting these uses in close proximity to create alternatives to driving, by walking, taking a bus, or biking to shop, eat or work.

There is now a critical importance for this project and development effort due to the adverse fiscal impacts on local commercial properties and on Boulevard businesses caused by the imposition of, and now ongoing, Covid-19 national and State of California emergency and reduced shopping and business activities from governmentally and privately imposed lock downs or social distancing.

The applicant as part of its community outreach program had asked to present their project and Council prescreen proposal to our Board at its March 24, 2020, meeting for our support, however, we were forced to cancel that meeting due to Covid-19. With the benefits of this project being easily recognized, we can recommend you approve this initial step. Thank for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Mark G. Sellers". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Mark" being the most prominent.

Mark G. Sellers  
Secretary TOBA

MGS:sh

1485969.1

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020 6:12 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Hampshire Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Item 9.A

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jodi Gardiner <gardinersix@gmail.com>  
Subject: Hampshire Project  
Date: May 9, 2020 at 4:38:56 PM PDT  
To: aadam@toaks.org, claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, rmc coy@toaks.org, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@toaks.org

We live behind the proposed TO Ranch development and are opposed to any zone change. With Corona Virus going around this is not the time to make drastic changes.

Families are stressed right now and slipping this in while people can't attend to the issue is unethical.

We know the lot needs to be developed but due to traffic, crime, population density and

various other conditions we would ask that the project does NOT require a Specific Plan

and that the city will Deny Without Prejudice. The proposed development is not in the

best interest of the city or the neighborhood.

Thank you,  
Jodi Gardiner

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020 6:45 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: 325 Hampshire Road Project  
Attachments: 325 Hampshire Rd Mixed Use Project - Support.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Item 9A

Begin forwarded message:

From: Danielle Borja <dborja@conejochamber.org>  
Subject: 325 Hampshire Road Project  
Date: May 9, 2020 at 1:21:54 PM PDT  
To: "AAdam@toaks.org" <AAdam@toaks.org>, "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, "bengler@toaks.org" <bengler@toaks.org>, "ejones@toaks.org" <ejones@toaks.org>  
Cc: Andrew Powers <apowers@toaks.org>

Dear Mayor Adam and Councilmembers,

Please find attached a letter of support from the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce for the proposed development at 325 Hampshire Road.

We urge you to approve item 9A on your upcoming council meeting agenda, which would “pre-approve” this project and allocate units from the city’s Measure E Housing Bank.

Sincerely,

Danielle Borja

Danielle Borja  
President / CEO  
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce  
P: 805.370.0035 | D: 805.267.7507

2020 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tom Cohen

Chair

Cohen Begun & Deck

Natalie Yanez

Chair Elect

eXp Realty

Don Philipson

Chair Emeritus

WSI ePro Marketing

Rick Lemmo

Chair Emeritus / Director-at-Large

Caruso

Jill Haney

Treasurer

Montecito Bank & Trust

Matt Midura

Chair Emeritus / Secretary

Pepperdine University

Lisa Safaenili

Director-at-Large

Westminster Free Clinic

Elaine Salewske

Director-at-Large

Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Ltd.

Danielle Borja

President / CEO

Greater Conejo Valley

Chamber of Commerce

DIRECTORS

Adam Antoniskis

The Oaks Shopping Center

David Barnett

Hyatt Regency Westlake

Steve Bertram

Atara Biotherapeutics

Redonna Carpenter-Woods

Bank of America Merrill Lynch

Captain Jeff Chism

Naval Base Ventura County

Monique Corridori

Corwin

Stacy Diaz

PennyMac

Michael Dutra

Candu Graphics

Darla Everett

Amgen

Kinsie Flame

Moms of Conejo Valley,

Jacob Flame's Tang Soo Do University

Johnathan Franklin

Los Angeles Rams

Eva Gomez

California State University

Channel Islands

Jason Herbison

HUB International

Aaron Kitzman

Villa Esperanza Services

William Koehler

Law Offices of William D. Koehler

Javier LaFianza

Hugh O'Brian Youth Leadership

Mark LaValle

Hatch Café & Market

Andrea McClellan

Boy Scouts of America

Dianne McKay

Mustang Marketing

Michelle Menzel

GreatWay Roofing

Douglas Messner

Ameriprise Financial

Eddie Moore

Oaks Christian School

Marja Price

Janss Marketplace

Ed Sahakian

Ventura County Credit Union

Milla Shaposhnik

Union Bank

Candice Shehorn

Key Pointe Asset Management

Kimberly Tharpe

Community West Bank

Ryan Van Ommeren

California Lutheran University

Felix Wang

Best Western Plus

Thousand Oaks Inn

Joe Weber

Chatsworth Products

Sepideh Yeoh

Un1teee



May 9, 2020

Mayor Al Adam

City of Thousand Oaks

2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd

Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

CC: Thousand Oaks City Council, City Manager Andrew Powers

RE: 325 Hampshire Road Mixed-Use Project – SUPPORT

Dear Mayor Adam and Councilmembers,

As the President/CEO of the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce I would like to express our organization's support of the proposed development at 325 Hampshire Rd (the former Kmart site). The Executive Committee of the Chamber has reviewed this item and it is our assertion that this vibrant mixed-use project will help bring prosperity to our community while alleviating the urgent need for new housing required by the State of California.

The purpose of the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce is to enhance the profitability of businesses through leadership, political action and dynamic programs to promote economic vitality for our members and community. Our membership includes over 900 business leaders who work hard every day to help grow our local economy.

Please approve item 9A on your upcoming council meeting agenda, which would "pre-approve" this project and allocate units from the city's Measure E Housing Bank.

With the amount of disruption occurring in the local and world economy it is incumbent upon local leaders to keep projects like the 325 Hampshire Project moving forward.

As always, we appreciate the excellent partnership between the City and our Chamber of Commerce.

Sincerely,

Danielle Borja, MBA

President/CEO

Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce



From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Saturday, May 9, 2020 9:21 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Regarding Building on the Site of the old Kmart

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Giovanni Long <brozus1@gmail.com>  
Date: May 9, 2020 at 20:42:45 PDT  
To: Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com  
Subject: Regarding Building on the Site of the old Kmart

By building on the site of the abandoned Kmart of Hampshire, there will be many consequences that will make the build not worth it. One of the largest problems with building there is that an already quite busy part of Thousand Oaks will now have many, many more people, making the area a lot more like a crowded city. I live relatively close to the abandoned Kmart, and there is already a quire high number of cars driving around every day. The added traffic would take a way from the pleasantness of Thousand Oaks not being an overcrowded city. That's one of my favorite things about Thousand Oaks, that it is not too big, but also not too small. By packing in people right next to each other with so many at a time, it takes away the thing that I like most about my home. An area crowded with people takes away from what makes Thousand Oaks great. I ask that you do not let apartments be built on the site of the old Kmart. Thank you for listening to the people of Thousand Oaks!

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 10:14 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Kmart proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Silvana Zucca <longzucca@yahoo.com>  
Date: May 10, 2020 at 10:03:59 PDT  
To: "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, "bengler@toaks.org" <bengler@toaks.org>, "ejones@toaks.org" <ejones@toaks.org>, Al Adam <AAdam@toaks.org>  
Subject: Kmart proposal

Dear City Counsel,

I am concerned that the Kmart proposal will change the character of our city to be more like the San Fernando Valley. It is too dense and does not have enough parking.

Please postpone this vote.

Please Deny Without Prejudice so it can be scaled down.

Let them build and make money, but don't let them change the character of our city.

Thank you for your time,  
Matthew Long  
48 year resident of Thousand Oaks

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Sunday, May 10, 2020 6:33 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Kmart lot redevelopment

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mitch Gardiner <mitch@baconvfx.tv>  
Date: May 10, 2020 at 15:45:23 PDT  
To: aadam@toaks.org, Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@toaks.org  
Subject: Kmart lot redevelopment

I wanted to voice my concern over the proposed development on the old K-Mart lot. I

have lived between the lot and the hills for 20 years now and I desperately want the area improved, but I strongly oppose the proposed approach because of its excessively high density and the congestion and precedent the development as proposed would cause.

I am specifically concerned that the state density bonus will allow 35% more units than what the City's guidelines currently allow. The reality of that density will likely cause considerable congestion in an area already considered one of the worst intersections

(rated D) in the city. With up to 2,000 new residents and insufficient infrastructure to handle traffic we would see 1.5-2% of the entire city navigating a couple of blocks for access to surface streets and the freeway. The egress from the development will require a U turn at an intersection prone to congestion. The fact that the young families living in these units will attend Conejo Elementary means the traffic will flow behind the

units

along foothill and willow in an attempt to avoid the U turns and morning gridlock at the intersections, a practicality that likely won't be reflected in a traditional traffic study.

I am further concerned that this development will allow for additional construction at density levels beyond the city's current limits as other developers build with the 35% state bonus, majorly impacting the surrounding communities along Triunfo Canyon.

Again I would readily and enthusiastically support a residential development here, but it should be of a scale that will not overburden these intersections, frontage roads, and local freeway access. Further, it should not threaten the character of the adjacent communities along Triunfo and even as far as First Neighborhood with four story developments that exceed city guidelines by 35%.

Redeveloping this area is very important but should not require a Specific Plan and as the proposed development stands please deny without prejudice and ask the developer to resubmit a proposal that is in character with - and of a similar density to - what has already been built.

Thank you for your attention and help.

Regards

Mitchell Gardiner

**From:** "Luce, Robert W" <[Robert.Luce@charter.com](mailto:Robert.Luce@charter.com)>  
**Subject:** **Opposition to a zoning change from Commercial to Commercial/Residential for a proposed project for new multi-dwelling units located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road**  
**Date:** May 11, 2020 at 11:55:48 AM PDT  
**To:** "[aadam@toaks.org](mailto:aadam@toaks.org)" <[aadam@toaks.org](mailto:aadam@toaks.org)>, "[claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com](mailto:claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com)" <[claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com](mailto:claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com)>, "[bengler@toaks.org](mailto:bengler@toaks.org)" <[bengler@toaks.org](mailto:bengler@toaks.org)>, "[ejones@toaks.org](mailto:ejones@toaks.org)" <[ejones@toaks.org](mailto:ejones@toaks.org)>

Thousand Oaks City Council members, Good morning. I am a current Homeowner near the former-Kmart-Freddy's steak-burgers site and I am in opposition to a zoning change from Commercial to Commercial/Residential for a proposed for new multi-dwelling units project located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road. I am asking you Thousand Oaks City Council to Deny Without Prejudice the current proposal and that this project should not require a specific plan so the Developer must comply with existing City codes. The Developer should come back and propose something with less living units that's more reasonable given the available acreage per living unit used at nearby Apartment buildings on Hampshire.

At the upcoming T.O. City Council meeting this Tuesday May 12 please deny the entire project at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road and have the Developer come back with a more reasonable plan for far fewer units than the proposed 353-units that I understand will also end-up including the State mandate 35% bonus-units for an additional 124-units. So this proposed project would be for 476-units and add over 1000-Residents living in this this space at the Hampshire / 101 freeway that I hear is already "D" rated for efficiency and safety. Adding another 750-1,000 Residents and their vehicles based on the current proposal is not safe for the area.

Furthermore, the Thousand Oaks City Council should not be holding this project prescreening process when there's financial and health stress residents are feeling during COVID-19.

Again Please Deny Without Prejudice the current proposed multi-dwelling living units project located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road, do not require it to have a specific plan and make the Developer comply with existing City codes.

If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you.

Robert Luce

E-MAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply e-mail and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, copying, or storage of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited.

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 1:21 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Development of Kmart Property

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laurence Stern <ljsconsult27@gmail.com>  
Subject: Development of Kmart Property  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 12:45:13 PM PDT  
To: aadam@toaks.org, claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@taoks.org

I have reviewed the plan for the proposed development of the Kmart property as posted on the City of Thousand Oaks website and want to express my opposition to the plan as currently presented. My opposition is based on 2 factors: The density of the plan will substantially increase the traffic burden on the 101 Hampshire on and off ramps, the intersection of Hampshire and Thousand Oaks Blvd and the dangerous intersection at Hampshire and Willow Road. Because there is very little space to reconfigure the freeway ramps or these intersections it does not appear that the additional traffic volume can be accommodated in a meaningful way.

My other objection is the appearance and height of the development; the cube like style of the buildings is not in keeping with the general architectural style of other large buildings in our community such as The Oaks Mall and City Hall.

I am not opposed to the development of this property and I am not opposed to a mixed use concept; however, the current plan is an overreach. It should be scaled back to lessen the traffic impact and its appearance should be revised. I urge the City Council to dismiss the application without prejudice. Thank you for consideration of my views.

Yours truly,  
Laurence Stern  
922 Ranch House Road  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91361

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:47 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: In Support of Mixed Use on Hampshire

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Angie Simpson <angiesimpson805@gmail.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 14:15:54 PDT  
To: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <cbilldelapena@gmail.com>, Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudiabill@roadrunner.com>, aadam@toaks.org, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@toaks.org  
Cc: kurt simpson <kurtsimpson@hotmail.com>  
Subject: In Support of Mixed Use on Hampshire

May 11, 2020

Dear Ed, Claudia, Al, and Bob,

In case there is an issue with the zoom platform and call in process for this week's Thousand Oaks City Council meeting my husband, Kurt Simpson, and I wanted to make sure to voice our support for the Council to approve changing the zoning at the Kmart site from "commercial" to "residential/commercial."

We moved to Westlake/Thousand Oaks in Village Homes in 2001. As a family, we enjoyed the Kmart shopping center and the local Italian restaurant that was once located in the dilapidated center. We look forward to having some sort of retail restored on Hampshire, and we are happy that there is also potential to include much needed housing units, and usable park/green space.

Due to COVID-19, we believe there has to be a sense of urgency and collaboration across our diverse community to solve our local housing crisis and stimulate the economy. We believe thoughtful, attractive, environmentally conscious mixed use projects are a great solution in 2020.

Times have changed since 2009, and we have seen mixed use projects across many local communities be attractive, stimulate the local economy, and provide Californians much needed housing options. We support the Council considering the Kmart property for mixed use.

The original drawing and concept proposed by IMT published in the Acorn and recirculated today, Monday May 11th, we believe is very attractive for a first draft. We are confident the drawings will only further include details important to our unique community should the project move forward. We understand that a project of this magnitude will require many design renditions, and community input on the final proposals. Hopefully, the Council will continue to reiterate that

the vote on Tuesday May 12th, 2020, is simply regarding the zoning of the Kmart site, not to ink IMT's first draft drawings as they are merely a concept.

It is important that the public understand Tuesday's agenda topic and have the opportunity to learn about the pros and cons of mixed use housing verses a retail only space, and that the community understand the long term implications to the city and local neighborhoods should the Kmart site on Hampshire remain vacant.

Thank you for your service.

Sincerely,

Angie & Kurt Simpson

Angie Simpson  
m: 805.490.1403  
e: angiesimpson805@gmail.com  
@ASIMP805

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:48 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: 325 & 391 Hampshire Road

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nicole Carnation Grolman <ncarnation@gmail.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 14:36:07 PDT  
To: aadam@toaks.org, Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@toaks.org  
Cc: Nicole Carnation <ncarnation@gmail.com>  
Subject: 325 & 391 Hampshire Road

To the Thousand Oaks City Council:

I am a business owner/ investor, landlord, local philanthropist, and a mother with young children. I have lived in this community for nearly 20 years, and I have often stated that this is one of the best places in the US to live.

The proposed zone changes for the properties located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road to accommodate such an excessively large project will be detrimental to the quality of life that this community offers its residents. I understand the pressure put on the City by the state, but I think it is highly unfair for so much of this burden to be placed on the same surrounding area - there is plenty of open space for additional developments to be more spread out. The apartment developments already built in the area have ruined the school we are zoned for, and the School Choice program is so impacted that we were wait listed for all 3 schools we applied for. So now I am left with no options but to (1)

put my child in a very poor school; or (2) pay for an expensive private school.

I am asking the Thousand Oaks City Council to Deny Without Prejudice the current proposal. I am against the need for specific plan required for this project and feel that the developer should be able to present a project that is reasonable.

Please also note that I am also disappointed with the decision by the Thousand Oaks City Council to push this meeting through during the COVID-19 government shut down.

We are in the middle of a Global Pandemic and State of National Emergency, when people are scared for their health and financially stressed. I know many older people in the area without the knowledge/ability to participate in a computerized meeting or submit online comments. The Council's attempt to push this through without providing the community an opportunity to present our concerns in person feels wrong.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Nicole Carnation

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 2:49 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: PLEASE READ: Neighborhood concerns regarding Kmart prescreen

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Suzanne Luce <rsluce@yahoo.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 14:40:21 PDT  
To: ejones@toaks.org, bengler@toaks.org, Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, aadam@toaks.org  
Subject: PLEASE READ: Neighborhood concerns regarding Kmart prescreen Council members,

As IMT addresses your council tomorrow evening, please consider that the families and property owners in this neighborhood are extremely concerned about the effects of the proposed project.

We are in favor of the site being developed and are well aware of the need for housing locally and across the state, but this project does not fit in with the longtime single family zoning just behind the site, as well as the much lower density of the multi-dwelling units located along Hampshire Road.

The project is in direct contrast (nearly double the units per acre) to the other multi-unit projects from Foothill to Triunfo Roads. We need an assurance that the new development will not exceed the units per acre of the existing properties in order for the project to be considered suitable. This would require your council to take the 35% state bonus amount into consideration and keep the numbers low enough upon approval to buffer this increase and the lack of local control over density at that

point.

Beyond the number of units, the height and scale of this project also require variances that are not appropriate or suitable for the existing neighborhood

Again, I share the opinion of many of the residents in this area that a residential project is welcomed for this site. The quality and value of the project to the city is apparent in the proposal, but there appears to be a lack of suitability for the area and consideration of the effects of its density.

For example, there is the already congested intersection of Hampshire/T.O. Blvd and the 101 and the rampant use of Foothill and Willow as an alternative route or "cut through." It is difficult to imagine that this project would be feasible for the coming and going of up to 2,000 new residents or even half that many.

And, even with the scale and density being drastically adjusted, the traffic and congestion caused by the project will likely lead to the need for huge changes to this D-rated intersection already in need of drastic improvements. I realize a traffic study will follow as the project is further reviewed and revised, but the traffic concerns alone could be enough to make the project unsuccessful for the city and the developer.

In addition to traffic, because of the unprecedented nature of this project in the city, a new specific plan may be required beyond the specific plan already approved for the T0 Blvd improvements. Do we really want these type of changes to extend into the well established single family zoning in this neighborhood, which includes properties under low density, rural classifications?

Do we change the entire neighborhood for this project as a quick fix to accommodate the need for housing or can we challenge this project and the developers to instead create a project that satisfies a portion of that need while still being suitable for the area?

With these concerns at hand, we need your support tomorrow for a decision to deny the project without prejudice. We know that the developer, when prompted, can and will submit a concept that is more reasonable and suited to the area. Particularly

with  
the current lockdown, this proposal needs an immediate call for revision—through  
your  
deny without prejudice vote—and the residents of Thousand Oaks need to be allowed a  
fair opportunity to review it, which is only possible after the county orders are  
lifted.

Thank you for your service to our community and your attention to these concerns.

Suzanne Luce  
Homeowner at 332 Fairview Rd  
805-558-1962

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 3:27 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: KMart plans

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sincerely,

Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Councilmember, City of Thousand Oaks  
805.449.2103  
www.claudiabilldelapena.com  
Facebook: @claudiabilldelapenaTO  
Twitter: @Claudia\_Bill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marian <mlf1065@roadrunner.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 15:23:00 PDT  
To: Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com  
Subject: KMart plans

Sorry, I recently moved two blocks outside of TO.

So not for me to say, but the recent proposal looks like Playa Vista. Yikes. There might be some three story up against the hill, but most of it should be one and two stories to fit the Conejo.

Marian Fleming  
WLV