

# THOUSAND OAKS CITY COUNCIL



## Supplemental Information Packet

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

**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

### **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.

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

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>Edited-please disregard other comment I sent a few moments ago, this one is edited:</p> <p>I am completely opposed To this project and know it will completely change the dynamic of this community forever. Even if additional law enforcement is added, there are no assurances that Crime will not rise</p> <p>In addition, This project is not consistent with the community of Westlake Village or Thousand Oaks.</p> <p>San Francisco has suffered tremendously from these types of developments. This development should not be allowed.</p> <p>I do not understand why the 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 this project opposes it. In addition, in light of the pandemic, a virtual meeting is not acceptable.</p> <p>You should wait until we can all meet in a larger forum- maybe football field so we can space out with proper social distancing, to get everyone's opinion heard.</p> <p><u>This is not the American way. this is not consistent with this community and this is just not right.</u></p>
Susan Epperson	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Please postpone the meeting regarding this issue until a public forum can be held in person. Submitted uses for this property have been unsuccessful for more than a decade due to the community concern for exponential growth in traffic and population. It is of great import to the residents of this community that those issues are addressed and that all interested parties have a say in the approval/execution of this new plan.
MU	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	No more housing!! Repave the lot and but some businesses/shopping there
Jeff Bredehorn	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	That intersection, and Hampshire Rd/101 interchange cannot handle the extra traffic 24/7.
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	This will overcrowd Hampshire Blvd which is already an overcrowded area to begin with. This will also take away from the charm that Thousand Oaks has to offer.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
K Young	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020- 70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p data-bbox="789 214 2032 344">As a brand new member of the impacted neighborhood, I would like to officially OPPOSE this item due to its potentially harmful addition to this community. It's clear that this property should be utilized to avoid it becoming a blight on the city, HOWEVER I strongly oppose a HIGH DENSITY APARTMENT COMPLEX as the solution. The proposed changes would mean a building of at least 4 STORIES which drastically changes the surroundings.</p> <p data-bbox="789 393 2032 483">We, the homeowners who live here, would be looking at a COMPLEX of windows, instead of the panoramic views of the mountains. One of the reasons I left the Hollywood area and ventured out to beautiful Thousand Oaks is because of the terrain and the LACK OF OVERSIZED APARTMENT BUILDINGS.</p> <p data-bbox="789 532 1453 555">Having that many apartments would mean OVERCROWDING.</p> <p data-bbox="789 604 1789 626">Having that many people would mean a disastrous CLOGGING of Hampshire Blvd at all times.</p> <p data-bbox="789 675 2032 734">Yes, housing is necessary. But not here and not at the expense of the individuals who already live here. Please, do not allow these changes. Please do not allow this to be the solution of 'what-to-do with this property'. Thank you.</p> <p data-bbox="789 782 1159 799">K Young Thousand Oaks CA 91361</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>This proposal will bring too much traffic to the intersection of Hampshire and the 101 freeway. It is currently difficult to exit the 101 at Hampshire when traffic backs up. Have any of the city council members even tried to exit the 101 at Hampshire from 5:00 p.m to 6:30 pm on weekdays? I commute daily to Ventura from Westlake Village and drive home every day in bumper to bumper traffic as high density housing is added along our freeway exits. I challenge the City Council members to try exiting the 101 between 5:00 and 6:30 p.m on weekdays and then envision this proposed project with the increased number of vehicles that will result.</p> <p>Additionally, the traffic noise added by 388 apartments, 71 townhomes, and 15,000 square feet of retail space will adversely affect the enjoyment of the homes in the immediate surrounding areas. Westlake Boulevard is a feeder street to the freeway, and Hampshire is already highly traveled between the 101 and Westlake Boulevard. My family lives in the Foxmoor homes near Hampshire and Westlake Boulevard. You hear the traffic noise from 4:00 a.m. until midnight. You cannot even open the windows without hearing the traffic noise, motorcycles, loud mufflers, and trucks. We cannot handle the additional traffic noise that will result from this proposed development. There already are apartment buildings at this proposed building site. We do not need additional density at this location.</p> <p>I can envision construction traffic and large trucks carrying construction supplies coming up Potrero Road from the Home Depot in Newbury Park to service this proposed project because it will be easier to get to the project than traveling on the busy 101 and exiting at Hampshire Road off the 101. This Construction traffic will increase the traffic on Westlake Boulevard by Westlake Elementary School where children are walking to school, and where we now ride bicycles, jog, and walk our pets. This will also increase the noise pollution in our residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>This proposal is out of character for our neighborhoods. It is going to make the area feel like Van Nuys or Northridge — congested and high density. This is NOT the character of Westlake Village. Why are you ruining the character of our lovely city? I urge you to read the general plan for the City of Thousand Oaks and the policy set forth therein regarding maintaining the beauty and character of the community. Ask yourself if this proposal is consistent with the character of our city. Please consider a lower density use of this property that will not impact traffic or cause noise pollution, such as duplexes or an assisted living facility for seniors who do not drive. Scale down this proposal please. There are currently no assisted living facilities for low income seniors in Westlake Village. How about a senior center for Westlake Village or a community center? We do not need 450 residences at this intersection. What are you thinking?</p>
E. Murphy	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Nearly 500 units of low income housing is not a good use of 12 acres in this is area.
	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big.
Jill Savege	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too high density project for this space
Evelyn Schultz	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am in favor of this item	I am in favor of the project being built. It provides the needed housing and the plans proposed will only enhance an old vacant lot that has been an eyesore for many years.

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	Too loud
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
David	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	This area is already dense with apartments along Agoura road and Triunfo Canyon. This kind of development does not suit the areas needs. Foothill road is no longer a safe place to park as residents at the apartment complex line the street with cars, persons in their cars consuming alcohol, and after hours loitering. There has also been an increase in transient vehicles and campers lining the area. Litter concerns in this area as well due to the heavy footprint the current apartment complex's have on the area. COVID 19 should be an eye opener for our future. Promote distance, create space, and allow people to live in a more open environment. Ventura county saw the lowest amount of COVID cases VS bordering counties. This was directly driven by density. Our grocery markets remained healthy due to the cities population count. City council should be proud of this and voice concern of future pandemics.
I oppose the Kmart item !	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Not a good idea at all !

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Catherine Townsend	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	NO! Please do not let this happen!!! My husband and I intentionally bought our house here 25 years ago to get away from the San Fernando valley/Woodland Hills/Warner Center area. We have raised 3 kids here and they attended CVUSD. In just the last 5 - 10 years this area is becoming more crowded, with more traffic and more crime. As it is now, it takes me three times as long to get on the 101north at Hampshire during rush hours as it used to. I moved here because Ventura County was not over crowded and because of the beautiful open spaces. The population and traffic impact from this kind of project will turn our beautiful area into Warner Center. Too drastic increase in population density. I'm sure my family is not alone in vehemently objecting to this size project. Westlake Village will never be the same. We have enough residential property here. Put up something retail with non disruptive hours and respect for the surrounding residents. THIS IS TOO BIG AND IM AFRAID FOR THE FUTURE OF WESTLAKE VILLAGE! MANY GOOD RESIDENTS WILL LIKELY SELL THEIR HOMES AND MOVE.
Julia	Newbury Park	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am in favor of this item	City needs to move forward with old Kmart property . It's been an eye sore for years . I have lived in the Conejo Valley for 51 years and it's time to fix some of these old vacant lots . Future needs this to happen !!
JC	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Reason for opposition is This proposed project is to densely designed for the amount of space to many units, development is a positive thing but this proposal is to densely populated. Thank you
Karina Shkadova	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Hi! I'm a young mom. We recently moved to Westlake and we love the way of life here! We do not want any more development, the city is calm and beautiful enough as it is! We are opposed to opening k mart here!
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Very concerned about traffic

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Mary Neifert	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Mr. Mayor and councilmembers,</p> <p>I live in Foxmoor Hills, close to the site for the proposed project. I moved there in 2011 after living on the very dense and crowded westside of Los Angeles for close to 20 years. With the overcrowding of most of Los Angeles and its surrounding areas, it is not surprising people are now discovering Westlake and Thousand Oaks. People appreciate open space, low density city planning, good public schools and the friendly, home-town feel. The proposed project will block the view of the surrounding hills and remove virtually all open space. While the huge increase in traffic, noise and pollution would undoubtedly affect all who live nearby, in my opinion the more pressing issue is that this development doesn't fit in our city. You don't see these developments in cities like Santa Barbara and Montecito, where the city council takes great care to limit development and ensure any approved projects fit in with the neighborhoods. In those communities, developers still come and build, they just do it within the parameters set by the city.</p> <p>I urge the council to take a stand here. This is just one of the first of these types of proposals that will be coming now that our city has been discovered. We have already seen one go in at the formerly beautiful site of Lupe's restaurant. We are at a fork in the road. Will our city turn out like Encino and other overcrowded communities full of excessive noise and other pollution and traffic, creating a chaotic instead of peaceful surrounding for its residents? Or will the city take us the way of Santa Barbara? Preserving the flavor or what makes us special by protecting quiet neighborhoods, keeping a low density to avoid overcrowding, and protecting the livelihood of its residents?</p> <p>Our city's character was built on prior city officials' emphasis on protecting that hometown feel and low-density character. I do understand it is much harder to protect the character of Thousand Oaks now. Developers are salivating at the old strip malls on TO boulevard, as well as other sites like the one at Hampshire that is the subject of the applicant's proposal. They can't wait to buy the old buildings to tear down and put in three and four-story centers that do not take into account the aesthetic feel of the surrounding structures or what is good for the neighborhood. And it will not be easy for the City Council to resist being bowled over by these folks. These developers are persistent, have deep pockets and aggressive lawyers. They will make hundreds of millions of dollars destroying the character of our city – and they don't care about any of it except getting the project approved so they can pocket those millions.</p>
Linda Parks	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I have slides I want to show at the meeting. Please let me know how I can submit.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Richard Mula	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I feel the city is going downhill, going overboard and becoming out of control with these types of projects. As residents for over 22 years we moved here to get away from the valley sprawl, to better schools and open spaces. Notably my prediction for this project, is that it is going to be a disaster just as the eyesore project at Erbes Rd. to T-Oaks Blvd. has become. Reviewing the Kmart project the proposed new mall and shops will not only be an eyesore, blocking views of the mountains, but create impossible traffic jams. The 101 interchange even now with fewer people on the road due to Covid often has a queue of cars as far back as the Shell station at Foothill Blvd. And don't get me started on other intersection in our neighborhood, coincidentally have any of you tried to exit the shopping center at Agoura and TO Blvd, from the Agoura road in late afternoon, often the left turn traffic is lined up to the point cars can't even exit the parking lot. And let's not kid ourselves, now with no school what do you think is going to happen when the local schools open again, the traffic in all the adjacent streets will be impossible to navigate to the 101 fwy. With the addition of 460 apartments and how ever number of families and cars that will bring is just an insult to what I can imagine the founding fathers of the Conejo Valley area ever thought about this unique valley we call home. The local air quality will be smog city.</p> <p>Frankly I think the city council has gone nuts to allow these projects, you might as will change the name of Thousand Oaks to Western San Fernando Valley. The day this becomes reality is the day we pack up and move someplace else. This project is just too big, too many stories, too crowded, too many cars, and what for? The only people to benefit are investors that could care less about our neighborhood and our quality of life. After all they are only after profit \$\$\$\$ , not good will and to become friendly neighbors. The Acorn article indicated comments made by Ms. McKay that she "feels good about this going forward", why should we put our trust in this woman who is probably getting a comfortable salary pushing this agenda. I don't see it at all and NOT AT ALL HAPPY with the way our community leaders are spending our tax money on countless studies and high cost consultants, there just seems to be no common sense anymore in our leadership, and in the way of life many of us have made this our home, converting our wonderful city into just another sprawl like the valley east of us.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Janet Miller Wall	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>For the following reasons, City Council should choose Staff Report Recommendation #2, denying the initiation of the General Plan Amendment and allocation of 353 Measure E residential units:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Density:</b> Jam packed at 459 units. A reasonable increase in density for the Kmart site might allow 25 units per acre, or 275 units. Similar to nearby apartment complexes.</li> <li>2. <b>Height and Magnitude:</b> Mansionization; a concrete jungle. 4-story, 55 ft. tall buildings set back only 37 feet from Hampshire Road is shocking. Opposite the effect of neighboring apartment and business complexes.</li> <li>3. <b>Building Design:</b> Inner-city tenement look. Ruins character of surrounding community.</li> <li>4. <b>Measure E units:</b> Public needs to know why 106 units in this proposal do not count toward Measure E "housing bank."</li> <li>5. <b>Open Space:</b> Calculation appears flawed. Not nearly enough green public open space. Mostly small private balconies and concrete patios.</li> <li>6. <b>Mixed Use:</b> No need for additional commercial. Nix mixed-use and build 100% homes.</li> <li>7. <b>Traffic:</b> Thousands of additional daily trips. Already hazardous at 101S offramp and Willow Lane junction.</li> <li>8. <b>Resident parking:</b> Embrace that we are a car culture in Thousand Oaks and not likely to crave public transportation. Autos will likely become more energy efficient so demand more parking on site to lessen street congestion.</li> <li>9. <b>Specific Plan:</b> Unnecessary if project adheres to time tested standards and codes.</li> <li>10. <b>Affordable Housing:</b> Acorn reported 50 "low income apartments" in February. Staff report says 32. As proposed, 427 rentals will not be "affordable" at all.</li> <li>11. <b>Emergency evacuation:</b> Be personally invested in whether residents can evacuate safely instead of responding that police and fire will be responsible for evacuation safety. Lives are in your hands when you approve reckless, overly dense housing projects.</li> <li>12. <b>Other Housing Sites:</b> Oaks and Janss Malls are mostly empty of retailers and customers and are ripe for mixed use. Other empty commercial space might also relieve the burden of RHNA requirements without creating a mountain of density intensity on Hampshire.</li> <li>13. <b>"Prescreening Process":</b> Details of every project should be closely examined before the nod occurs. Preapproval gives Applicant an unearned advantage. It also gives the public perception of bias.</li> <li>14. <b>Public participation:</b> Prescreening is untimely. Most residents are staying home avoiding disease and worrying about finances and/or unemployment. Most seniors do not ZOOM on computers.</li> </ol> <p>Please deny the proposed IMT project and send it back for redesign and community compatibility. Please hold major decisions such as this one for a time when ALL interested residents can fully participate.</p>
David Hasson	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I am opposed to the zone changes for the properties located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road as the added population would cause further hardships to the current residents. The traffic and noise factor are already issues. Adding to the congestion would be a detriment to the city . The schools would be burdened with providing space and services to additional school age children when they have not adequately served our current school population. Our property values would also be negatively impacted by the dense housing that is being proposed on the site. All in all it is a terrible idea and we are definitely opposed to rezoning.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Alev	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Too big
Lana Decker	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	This would impact road conditions on our rural community with use and parking which is limited at this time any way. The traffic on Willow and Hampshire is already heavy. We are limited three locations to exit. Willow to Conejo Rd, Thousand Oaks Blvd. Willow Lane to Hampshire, Right turn only. Willow Lane to Fairview, to Hampshire.
Nora Aidukas	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers, Please consider postponing this action until such time as it is possible to have members of the community meaningfully participate in this public process. I'd like to draw your attention to the May 8, 2020 letter from the Thousand Oaks Boulevard Association that states, unironically, "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." The City Council should take care to appear fair to both its residents and the applicant. Thank you for your consideration.
Allen Decker	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	By rezoning and building a high rise community it will set a allowance for more high rise to be built it this area. Our community is rural and our homes and roads are set up for limited traffic and parking. Which has already exceeded its limits. This is a time not to make an official decision on this, with the Coronavirus, social Distancing. Our small community is not aware totally of your meeting and agenda.. Please postpone.
Jacob C. Decker	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I am not apposed to the project, but I am apposed to this location. The impact would be to heavy on everything around us, traffic, parking, schools, freeway exit and enterance . Ours is a rural community. Leave us that way that is why we purchased this property 45 years ago.
Greg Korn	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	The cover sheet of the Prescreen Packet consists of an illegible rendered view from Hampshire. It is heavily faded. Perhaps this is a pdf printing error. It would be helpful for the public to see a legible rendered view on the cover sheet, not a camouflaged view. That said, the position and massing of buildings a and b block the sightline view of the conejo ridge from the sidewalk and bike lane on Hampshire road. I am not sure if this is something that needs to be addressed, but the prior K mart development did not block this view.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Richard Mula	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>This is an addendum to my previous response directed to the city officials', that I probably should have put in the first place.</p> <p>I feel that the city council is no longer acting in this person's interest, and probably others like myself, as such I'm looking for positive change in the near future. Besides considering leaving the area I would also vote for changes, to folks that are more along the mindset I have for our community, which is to resist temptation for big business developments such as this Kmart site, that in my opinion will negatively impact our community.</p> <p>Thank you Richard Mula</p>
Silvana Zucca	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Please DENY this request.</p> <p>It is unfair to burden one neighborhood with resolving all the housing needs of Thousand Oaks. You should spread it out throughout all of Thousand Oaks. This proposal goes against MANY city codes. Trying to get around the city codes with a General Plan amendment is sneaky since most residents don't understand what this is!!!</p> <p>On top of which, this is unfair to have this meeting while your residents are suffering due to a PANDEMIC!!!! Unbelievable!!!</p>
Tina Frugoli	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Vote NO. I realize the council tries to comfort residents by stating that it's just a "pre-approval and not the final design." What we've seen in the recent past (with 299 TO Blvd) is the design became worse, more dense, more tree destruction and more violations of city standards as time passed. So if this 4 story, high density monstrosity is just the beginning, I don't have a sick enough imagination to think of what the final design might look like. Don't do this to our community. Vote NO on this proposal.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Wendy Harrison	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020- 70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	It is an overbuild and we really don't know the impact that it will have on the environment.... Mixed use really isn't necessary for this space. TO Blvd has already been rezoned so why move into rural areas? There are already so many vacancies for both retail and restaurants in our community why would we want more? The traffic congestion that this project will bring will add to the already problemed intersections and fwy on/off ramps. Too many residents packed into small space brings concerns for safety during the next wildfire evacuation! Project needs to be smaller more reasonable for space.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Amanda Rosenbeck	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>Thousand Oaks City Council,</p> <p>First and foremost, it is important to note that for a project of this magnitude it is highly inappropriate to hold a “virtual” meeting during the current pandemic. This meeting should have been postponed to a date when we the tax paying residents can physically attend and voice our opinions in person. There are many residents who are unable to use the virtual tools necessary to attend, and they, just as all other residents are the glue that keeps this City together.</p> <p>I, along with my Husband and two daughters under the age of 2, are homeowners directly behind the Kmart site (Foothill Dr). We moved here 3 years ago from Los Angeles as young professionals with the intent to start a family and live the Thousand Oaks dream. That dream that we were sold on consisted of beautiful open space, a strong family-oriented vibe, increased safety, less population density and WAY less traffic. Fast forward 3 years, and we have been blessed with the family we longed for, however that Thousand Oaks Dream now looks like our past Los Angeles Reality.</p> <p>Please Vote to Deny the Zone Change from Commercial to Residential due to the future detrimental effects it will have on our City as a whole. Currently, this exact neighborhood has a mix of residential and industrial, there are two preschools, a probiotic plant, a Senior Citizen Home and two apartment complexes (which has a combined 157 units). Because of this mix use, parking is already scarce. This neighborhood is more rural than other Thousand Oaks neighborhoods, there are blind spots and pockets with no sidewalks. Because of this, safety in the streets is already a concern. The project that is being proposed will consist of 459 Whopping Units. SAY WHAT!??? Those residents will absolutely have guests and where will those guests park? There are only 42 guest parking spots, and there will obviously be more than 42 guests. Hence those guests will go on the hunt for parking, they can’t park on Hampshire as it’s a No Parking Zone, so they will inevitably try to park in OUR neighborhood and all of the surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>We are very pro-growth in a steady fashion. My husband is in Commercial Construction and 95% of his Projects, like this one, are solely in the Los Angeles area. While Los Angeles is great for these type of projects, the negative impacts are some of the worst congestion that many people here are lucky to not have encountered. IMT is in the business to make money, lots of money and finding every loophole possible to fulfill their agenda. There is nothing wrong with a money grab, however this is the wrong City to fulfill that agenda. It is important to note that only a small portion of these units will be affordable. But again “affordable” is all relative. In Santa Monica, for example, a low income unit can range anywhere from \$2500 and up. It is concerning that the Developers are not disclosing the exact amount of the rental prices. The reason why they are not showing their hand is because the units will be EXPENSIVE. It is very likely that the Developer will use the City of “Westlake Village” for marketing, which would then drive up their rental prices. Any Individual who cannot afford to buy a home most likely will not be able to rent a unit at this proposed site.</p> <p>Emergency response ? I hope you are considering the response if we were to have another Woolsey. This area is meant for Commercial (which would allow people to come in and go OUT). However if the Zone Change is passed we are now taking the distributed traffic and concentrating it in residential form, which would mean adding up to 1,000 cars permanently. If there is a fire, how are we all going to get out??? One thing that we should have learned in the past few years from Borderline, Woolsey to Covid is that life is unexpected and that people are what make a community great, not profits.</p> <p>Please vote to Deny the project. Thank you, Amanda Rosenbeck</p>
Deven Decker	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I am a student that lives in this area. I have attended local Elementary school, and Middle School. The roads in this area are not safe to ride my bicycle or walk the roads are narrow two way streets with no sidewalks, no bike lanes. I do not think adding a high rise apartment would fit in and for sure not allow for the extra traffic and the problems it will cause in the future. We live in a rural community, not a big city.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Nathan Decker	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I oppose this development, due to the impact of our rural community. The streets around your proposed project could handle the increased traffic, our schools will be impacted. We are not opposed to low cost housing as much as the location of this project and its impact.
		9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I own 4 plex that has 6 parking spaces. Each of my units has two adults. Each adult has a car. Two of those vehicles need on street parking. It is often unavailable which necessitates finding it blocks away. Please realize that each adult in a rental or condo works today and seldom is able to walk or bike to that job. Also building up against the sidewalk as at Lupe's site was a terrible decision. Do NOT do it again please.
Kaylee Decker	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	Bad timing to conduct a vote on proposal to develop during this time of social distancing. More people need to be involved. This development will effect zoning, schools, traffic, parking and home values which are all a minus. Our local area street are not safe now, with no sidewalks, bike lanes, parking. But we have and will continue to enjoy our area without them, IF the area stays rural NOT heavy density. Please do not consider this project in this area. Residences will be effected on every aspect of it.
	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I oppose adding more residents to the area around Foothill Blvd. Having cars trying to turn both left and right onto foothill and wait for the light will be a traffic nightmare. Also having more cars turning right into Hampshire along with all the cars exiting the 101 will cause a backlog. It was already too busy to make a right from foothill or the other 2 apartment complexes unless the light is green.
Chris Berman	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	I am very against the affordable housing in the Kmart parking lot. The city & school district has already been negatively impacted and strained by the housing on Conejo School Road. We don't need more.

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Nicole Hanson	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020- 70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>There is something special about Thousand Oaks. With over 100,000 people, it still has some of that small town charm. It doesn't feel like a typical city. Our City Council, representing the will of it's constituents has, until recently, been very conscientious and dedicated to preserving our open space and limiting the height of buildings and signage to keep our skyline free from obstructing the beautiful views around us. The current project on Thousand Oaks Boulevard is already extremely concerning and doesn't adhere to previous development practices. That really caught my attention- regrettably, after the fact. Unfortunately, it's too late to stop that now.</p> <p>I moved to Thousand Oaks in 1978. I grew up here and graduated from Thousand Oaks High School. My daughter is graduating from Thousand Oaks High School this year. I love living here. I am a single, low income parent and personally understand the need for housing- especially affordable housing. However, the construction of a four story building crammed into the old K-Mart property isn't in keeping with who we are as a community. Thousand Oaks is spread out by design. That is one reason we are the city that we are. People come here to get out of the valley. If people want to live in a densely populated urban city, there are already plenty of those around and they can move there. The Thousand Oaks City Council should reject this plan on behalf of the voters who have entrusted them to keep our unique city intact. We are not the valley and don't want to become a valley. There is still time to stop that from happening. Please deny this project.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Emily and Micah Harris	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>My husband and I are strongly opposed to the proposed zone changes. We will be most impacted as we live directly behind the old K-Mart building and we're expecting our first child. Based on your criteria for prescreen approval, section a.) Suitability of Site- this location is not suitable for affordable housing apartments. Traffic on Hampshire Rd can be congested and already is extremely congested nearest the freeway. We assume parking will also be an issue and the appropriate number of arrangements will not be made, forcing people to park on the surrounding streets. This is currently a problem on Foothill with not enough parking provided by the Windsor Terrace Rehab Facility for their employees and visitors. Section d.) Community Benefits- more affordable housing units in this area will provide more detriments to the community than benefits. Our property values will decrease, and our school systems (and the children most importantly) will suffer (as they already have with the addition of the affordable housing units on Los Feliz). Our highest concern, with the thought of raising our child in mind, is of safety. Population-dense, low-income areas increase crime, more specifically theft and drug use. We want to keep our community safe, especially for our little ones. We would love for a business to settle in this space as the abandoned K-Mart and parking lot is an eye sore, but it is our sincerest request that you deny this measure for our belief that more affordable housing units is not what this community needs. Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.</p>
Liz Christensen	Westlake Village	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>I am concerned that the artists renderings completely go against the spirit of the community. I have lived in the Conejo Valley since 1993, and part of what drew me to the area was the height restrictions of buildings and the specific residential and business areas. Having lived in Glendale and San Francisco, I am not interested in turning this area into mixed use, high density housing with a "big city" feel. The additional traffic this project would generate is not acceptable. Living in a neighborhood down the street from this location, you would be impacting my home value as additional cars "cut through" the neighborhood, which would ultimately decrease my property value. Finally, the 101/Hampshire freeway situation is not able to handle the additional traffic this high-density project would generate. I'm not interested in hearing how the developer would fix that either - the last time work was done on that intersection it dragged out for months, created additional problems, and ultimately changed very little about the road. Personally, I think the city council has missed out on 15 yrs of tax revenue that they could have had if they had approved the Target or Home Depot years ago. This project should not be used to try to rectify that - 4 stories and 459+ residential housing units is not the answer.</p>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
Josh Rosenbeck	Thousand Oaks	9A - Hampshire Rd Kmart RCA 2020-70105 IMT Capital	I am opposed to this item	<p>DENY THE INITIATION OF THE GPA AND ALLOCATION OF 353 MEASURE E RESIDENTIAL UNITS FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Councilmember Jones continues mentioning that we need housing for our kids. As of this date, 5/12/2020 there are at least 165 rental units with vacancy in Thousand Oaks</li> <li>2.The three developments next door to this site on Foothill &amp; Hampshire rent 1bd/1ba units for \$2,000+/month. DO NOT believe the fantasy that young professionals will be able to afford these brand new units if they can't afford one of the units open in these 40-50 year old complexes.</li> <li>3.Councilmember Jones has said on social media that it is too dense for his taste. It would not make sense to approve something that is too dense, then try to backtrack later.</li> <li>4.Councilmember Jones has said on social media that he is concerned about parking. The current calculations account for 750 parking spaces but neglect to account for any several parking situations that are also possible. This will put the required parking at 900, which leaves you short 150 spaces. Additionally, the guest parking is undercounted and puts the LACK OF PARKING AT 200 SPACES.</li> <li>5.The street parking is already fully utilized on Willow, Foothill &amp; Fairview due to Natren, Windsor Terrace, The Verona&amp; Westlake Villas (which only has 157 units). No further parking can be accommodated, which is why this needs to remain a commercial site.</li> <li>6.Councilmember Bill-de la Pena acknowledged that the City cannot deny a "density bonus", so why would councilmembers approve the 359 unit plus bonus zone change, then think they will be able to scale back this 459 unit monstrosity later.</li> <li>7.As a Commercial Contractor I see this type of construction all over L.A. They market this as "affordable", but the only thing "affordable" is a few studios tucked in odd corners, next to noisy elevators/ mechanical equipment/ loud entrances, etc. The rest of the units are \$3,000+ for a 1bd/1ba unit. This is a tool for developers to capitalize on tax breaks and grants for MORE PROFIT.</li> <li>8.This site is zoned commercial for a distributed traffic flow between 7 a.m &amp; 7 p.m, this zone change would create concentrated traffic loads between 6 a.m &amp; 9 a.m &amp; 3 p.m &amp; 6 p.m, which this area was not created for and hence not zoned for. This would add 900+ cars at peak hours.</li> <li>9.There is no reasonable way to determine the traffic impact during the current pandemic, so moving forward with anything would be a COMPLETE LACK OF DUE DILIGENCE.</li> <li>10.The Land Owner is trying to hold the City hostage by demanding "High Density" zoning so they can sell the land for max profits or they will hold Home Depot for the remaining 5 years of the lease. Land Owners' only looking for profit is not who our elected officials are here to represent. You are elected to represent your constituents who overwhelmingly oppose this zone change.</li> </ol>

Name (optional)	Community (optional)	Agenda Number	In favor/ Opposed	Written Comment
				<p>Con't:</p> <p>11.IMT is using the small portion of “affordable housing” to fool the community into thinking this entire project will be affordable. IMT Simi Valley rents a 594 sq.ft. unit 1 bd/1ba for \$1,800/month. They will charge MUCH more for a prime location. These units will not be affordable for young people.</p> <p>12.IMT is a billion-dollar, national Owner/Developer who looks only at profits. They are trying to put the max number of units for the max profits with no regards to the impact to the community. This does not align with the Thousand Oaks principles.</p> <p>13.The Planning Commission has neglected Measure E, and now they are trying to make up a lot of ground in one project. Your constituents should not have to suffer so that a few people can make sure their jobs are secure at the City level.</p> <p>14.The Planning Commission is trying to proceed with concurrent processing of project entitlements to fast track this project, and push it through with no real understanding of consequences or how the zone change would affect the community. They should prove the zoning change will not have negative impacts BEFORE they present a zone change.</p>

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 3:36 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: KMART -- Too much traffic makes it a liability for city in evacuation events

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: yvonne <mythyvonne@yahoo.com>  
Subject: KMART -- Too much traffic makes it a liability for city in evacuation events  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 3:08:15 PM PDT  
To: Claudia Bill-de la Pena <claudiabill@roadrunner.com>, Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>

Dear Councilwoman Bill de la Pena,  
The KMART proposal is unacceptable. It is too dense. Please reduce the density and remove commercial/retail element. Mixed use is not a panacea for all development. This location is not correct for a project of this scope. Maybe put it in Newbury Park where there is better freeway access, or over by CLU. CLU has a Specific Plan correct?  
Too much traffic and congestion at this particular juncture makes this KMART plan a liability for the city in evacuation events.  
It is already nearly impossible to get to Thousand Oaks Blvd. for dinner between the hours of 4:00-6:30 from Westlake Village.  
It can take upwards of 20 minutes to get from Westlake Blvd./Agoura Rd. to Thousand Oaks Blvd (1/4 mile).  
Our family and friends like to frequent multiple restaurants on the Blvd. : Mouthful, Crown and Anchor, Exotic Thai, Mastro's, Moqueca, Darband, Los Dos Amigos. There are a lot of excellent small businesses and restaurants on Thousand Oaks Blvd. that we enjoy. It takes planning if we want to patronize the Blvd. There is almost always traffic back-ups at the light at Westlake Blvd and T.O.Blvd. One can wait through 2-3 signal cycles. We typically use Hampshire in an effort to get directly to the "heart" of the Boulevard rather than overshoot at Westlake Blvd.  
Hampshire at the 101 is already congested most of the day and worse during "rush hour." If it takes even longer to get to the Boulevard for dinner, or shopping forget about it. Business owners on Thousand Oaks Boulevard will likely have to say goodbye to our patronage. We'll just get on the freeway and head to somewhere else.  
It is strange that you are considering commercial/retail when we have so much vacant square footage already. It also seems like you are

cannibalizing the business district on T.O. Blvd.  
As for evacuations, there is a stacked fuel load behind KMART and behind the small neighborhood along Willow Lane. This fuel load extends through open space to Hidden Valley, Lake Sherwood and to Sycamore Canyon. A small portion of this burned in Woolsey and other, smaller incidents, but the majority has not burned for decades. The Woolsey Fire Event was a wake up call. Egress from the south side of the lake was impeded. Hundreds of us spent the night in the parking lots at Vons and Westlake Hyatt. This was because of the uncontrollable element of wildfire. This proposal is controllable.

Please don't trap us in Westlake.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Brockwell

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 4:52 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: T.O. City Council K-Mart Site Development

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: Kevin Young <ktyoung30@gmail.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 16:40:19 PDT  
To: Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com  
Subject: T.O. City Council K-Mart Site Development

re: K-Mart Site Development at 325 & 391 Hampshire Rd.

To the Thousand Oaks City Council,

As a brand new member of the impacted neighborhood, I would like to officially OPPOSE this item due to its potentially harmful addition to this community. It's clear that this property should be utilized to avoid it becoming a blight on the city,

HOWEVER I strongly oppose a HIGH DENSITY APARTMENT COMPLEX as the solution. The proposed changes would mean a building of at least 4 STORIES which drastically changes the surroundings.

We, the homeowners who live here, would be looking at a COMPLEX of windows, instead of the panoramic views of the mountains. One of the reasons I left the Hollywood area and ventured out to beautiful Thousand Oaks is because of the terrain and the LACK OF OVERSIZED APARTMENT BUILDINGS.

Having that many apartments would mean OVERCROWDING.

Having that many people would mean a disastrous CLOGGING of Hampshire Blvd at all times.

Yes, housing is necessary. But not here and not at the expense of the individuals

who already live here. Please, do not allow these changes. Please do not allow this to be the solution of 'what-to-do with this property'.

Thank you.

K Young

Thousand Oaks CA 91361

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 4:53 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: 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.

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: Mike Ceurvorst <mikec@rpagc.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 16:43:47 PDT  
To: "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Subject: Kmart Property

Hi Claudia,

I just wanted to express my disappointment on the proposed construction project at the old Kmart site.

Several years ago, the community voted out Home Depot due to the potential added traffic and congregating day workers. It was a hard fought battle and somewhat dirty battle. I remember the controversy on how the proposition was worded. It was confusing to say the least. It was also made to look as if the owners of the Do-It Center were running the show.

So now we have mixed use coming in. Several years ago the community voted down an expansion and mixed use proposition on Thousand Oaks Blvd. The city had a developer in from San Luis Obispo who preceded to tell us that they wanted to bring a little of downtown LA into Thousand Oaks. !?!?!? We don't want that! We worked our tails off to save and move here to get away from that LA feeling. I remember reading the developers remarks in the Acorn when asked about the added traffic. He said, "What's a few more cars on an already busy street." That's horrible! We are already adding traffic where the Lupe's Restaurant was. That was a shady deal!

We used to have a height moratorium here in Thousand Oaks. The City

Council made Rick Caruso's group redesign the clock tower at the Promenade. BMW had to revise their design due to the height. How are the new developers getting away with building 4-stories? We can currently see the Kmart property while driving west on Hillcrest. What the heck will be visible when you add 2 more stories? It's going to stick out like a sore thumb. And then every developer will come into town and say that that property got away with it, why can't I? Can't wait to see those law-suits!

I completely understand that something needs to be done with the property. Regardless, we need to stay within the cities and community focus. It shouldn't always be about income and profit making. I know our wonderful governor is enforcing low income housing rules. I'll guarantee it isn't happening in his neighborhood. We elected the city council to fight for us, your constituents. Thousand Oaks had a pride in the safest city in the state to live in. We LOVE our Sheriff's Department. we love our parks. We love our sense of community. This goes away once we open ourselves up to large developments that don't match our community.

I always say, don't complain without offering a solution. I'm sure when Kmart was thriving, there was a lot more traffic. I would say, build underground parking for all vehicles. Build a large enough underground tunnel and loading dock in the back that would allow for deliveries and movers. This would not disturb the local neighborhood. Put mixed use on the street side and a row of condos/apartments above. It would need to remain within the cities current height moratorium.

Thank you for listening,

Mike Ceurvorst  
Resident

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Monday, May 11, 2020 6:26 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Please Deny without prejudice

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: Anyez Klevecz <anyezk@gmail.com>  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 18:21:20 PDT  
To: "aadam@toaks.org" <aadam@toaks.org>, "bengler@toaks.org" <bengler@toaks.org>, "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, "ejones@toaks.org" <ejones@toaks.org>  
Subject: Please Deny without prejudice

Dear council members,

Your constituents are at home and stressed over finances, kids being out of school, and health issues. Please postpone this vote.  
And this Kmart project is too big!  
Please Deny Without Prejudice so it can be scaled down.

Cordially,

Anyez Klevecz

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 8:34 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: No Change in Zoning 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: mary@neifertlaw.com  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 08:05:54 PDT  
To: Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@toaks.org, aadam@toaks.org  
Subject: No Change in Zoning on Hampshire

Mr. Mayor and councilmembers,

I want to begin by thanking councilmember De La Pena for posting the proposed plan for the Hampshire project on the Nextdoor blog. If she had not posted it, there are many residents who would not have known this project was being proposed.

I live in Foxmoor Hills, close to the site for the proposed project. I moved there in 2011

after living on the very dense and crowded westside of Los Angeles for close to 20 years. Thousand Oak's charming character attracted my husband and me. The main attraction was that open spaces had been preserved and it was so much less crowded than the westside. My husband, who grew up in the San Fernando Valley, first complained that he thought he would be bored here. Within a week of our moving in,

he said he felt like he was on vacation every day and that it was the best decision we could have made.

The city has changed quite a lot since then. The first change happened when the shopping center on Westlake Boulevard south of the 101 freeway was renovated. While

I was sorry so many old and beautiful trees were cut down in that renovation, I understood the center needed updating. It's nice having some new restaurants and

stores there, but it has brought a lot more traffic to a once quiet area. I have since learned that the master plan was originally meant to mirror the shape of a barbell, with built up areas at Moorpark Road and Westlake Boulevard, while leaving Thousand Oaks boulevard less dense with a more local feel. This made sense to me.

Just a couple of years ago I saw another influx in the crowd here. It happened after the terrible fires, when many Malibu residents discovered how wonderful our city is after fleeing the devastation there. In addition, the San Fernando valley is terribly overcrowded and, in most areas, consists of a jumble of aesthetically unappealing apartment and commercial buildings that have sprung up over the years without regard for keeping such development in line with the neighborhood character. Valley residents are also looking to move west where it is less crowded. Even Calabasas suffers from the cookie cutter feel of tract home developments centered around a typical Caruso built shopping center. While the homes and shopping center are beautiful, Calabasas does not have the character that makes TO special.

With the overcrowding of most of Los Angeles and its surrounding areas, it is not surprising people are now discovering Westlake and Thousand Oaks. People appreciate open space, low density city planning, good public schools and the friendly, home-town feel. The proposed project will include 398 apartments and 71 townhomes, along with some commercial space. It includes at least 4 buildings, that are both 3 and 4 stories high and that will abut Hampshire, blocking the view of the surrounding hills and removing virtually all open space.

While the huge increase in traffic, noise and pollution would undoubtedly affect all who live nearby, in my opinion the more pressing issue is that this development doesn't fit in our city. You don't see these developments in cities like Santa Barbara and Montecito, where the city council takes great care to limit development and ensure any approved projects fit in with the neighborhoods. In those communities, developers still come and build, they just do it within the parameters set by the city. I urge the council to take a stand here. This is just one of the first of these types of

proposals that will be coming now that our city has been discovered. We have already seen one go in at the formerly beautiful site of Lupe's restaurant.

We are at a fork in the road. Will our city turn out like Encino and other overcrowded communities full of excessive noise and other pollution and traffic, creating a chaotic instead of peaceful surrounding for its residents? Or will the city take us the way of Santa Barbara? Preserving the flavor or what makes us special by protecting quiet neighborhoods, keeping a low density to avoid overcrowding, and protecting the livelihood of its residents?

Our city's character was built on prior city officials' emphasis on protecting that hometown feel and low-density character. I do understand it is much harder to protect the character of Thousand Oaks now. Developers are salivating at the old strip malls on TO boulevard, as well as other sites like the one at Hampshire that is the subject of the applicant's proposal. They can't wait to buy the old buildings to tear down and put in three and four-story centers that do not take into account the aesthetic feel of the surrounding structures or what is good for the neighborhood. And it will not be easy for the City Council to resist being bowled over by these folks. These developers are persistent, have deep pockets and aggressive lawyers. They will make hundreds of millions of dollars destroying the character of our city - and they don't care about any of it except getting the project approved so they can pocket those millions.

Luckily, at least as to the project at issue tonight, the city has legal grounds to deny the change of zone for the proposed site. They can lawfully refuse to allow residential units at that site because it is zoned only for commercial use. And they should do so. It is a slippery slope. I agree the site needs a renovation. The developers can still make money putting in a few nice restaurants and spaces for boutiques, just not as much as they would make cramming in hundreds of residential units. Please take our side. We entrusted you to make these decisions for us - and we hope you protect our interests over those of the developers. It is your duty.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mary E. Neifert, Esq.  
Neifert Khorshid, A PLC  
2625 Townsgate Road, Suite 330  
Westlake Village, CA 91361  
Office: (805) 267-1112  
Facsimile: (805) 267-9776  
Email: [mary@neifertlaw.com](mailto:mary@neifertlaw.com)

Attorney-Client and Attorney Work Product Protection

The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential and may be protected attorney work product or subject to the attorney client privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, kindly notify Mary Neifert immediately by telephone at (805) 267-1112 or by e-mail at [mary@neifertlaw.com](mailto:mary@neifertlaw.com). Please also destroy all copies of this message and any attachments hereto.

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 8:51 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Kmart site for future high density 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.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Betsy Ceurvorst <betsyasl@hotmail.com>  
Subject: Kmart site for future high density project.  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 8:50:06 PM PDT  
To: "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com"  
<claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>

Hello

I've been a resident of Conejo Valley for 16 years. Before that I lived near LAX and North County San Diego. Both of my past homes I gladly left for one reason or another, but the changes being made to accommodate more people were taking away the charm of my old neighborhoods. That ultimately led to more crime, more smog & more traffic. I've learned about the possibility of an urban living project going in at the old Kmart site. The charm of this Valley has made me so happy to be a resident here. My friends & family enjoy visiting this beautiful spot because of the landscape, quaint feel, clean air and low traffic. They love the people up here that give off that vibe of a small town that only comes from being a small town. If we become a big congested city, we are just like the SF Valley, L.A. and all the rest. Let's preserve what's left of what makes this place so special...great views & quiet streets. California needs peaceful places. I'm proud to live in one of those places & I hope we can remain that way.

Thank you  
Betsy C.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 8:53 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Please Deny without prejudice

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: Anyez Klevecz <anyezk@gmail.com>  
Subject: Please Deny without prejudice  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 6:21:07 PM PDT  
To: "aadam@toaks.org" <aadam@toaks.org>, "bengler@toaks.org" <bengler@toaks.org>, "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, "ejones@toaks.org" <ejones@toaks.org>

Dear council members,

Your constituents are at home and stressed over finances, kids being out of school, and health issues. Please postpone this vote. And this Kmart project is too big! Please Deny Without Prejudice so it can be scaled down.

Cordially,

Anyez Klevecz

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 8:54 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: KMart site development

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: Sue Widick <hollidaytravel@gmail.com>  
Subject: KMart site development  
Date: May 11, 2020 at 4:57:12 PM PDT  
To: "aadam@toaks.org" <aadam@toaks.org>, "bengler@toaks.org" <bengler@toaks.org>, "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com" <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, "ejones@toaks.org" <ejones@toaks.org>

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments concerning the KMart site development. I have submitted an online comment card. I would like to address the issues with each of you.  
I am firmly against the rezoning of the KMart properties from commercial to residential or residential/commercial. I own two houses on Willow Lane. We are intimately involved with the Hampshire Road intersection and the traffic issues in our neighborhood. Both Fairview and Willow Lane are filled daily with parking overflow from Natren and the Windsor Terrace nursing home employees. Our neighborhood has tried to assail the city's assistance with our traffic issues to no avail. The Hampshire Road intersection, as you know, is one of the worst in the area. I believe it is rated a D. Adding any large residential development to this area is asking for an unmitigated disaster. Willow Lane is already too congested, too high a speed and has bad sight line issues. Requiring Willow Lane to absorb more traffic from a possible build of 459 units is madness. Our neighborhood, as small as we are, deserves to be represented. I am against the zone change being considered.  
Thank you for you time,  
Susan Holliday Widick  
3034 Willow Ln, Thousand Oaks, CA 91361  
3058 Willow Ln, Thousand Oaks, CA 91361  
--  
Holliday Travel Susan Holliday Widick 3034 Willow Lane Thousand Oaks, CA 91361  
805.496.2360 Hollidaytravel@gmail.com

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 12:09 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: KMART site development

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: Elena's Email <elena.lukas1@gmail.com>  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 12:05:25 PDT  
To: Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com  
Subject: KMART site development  
Ms Bill-de la Pena,

Although a mixed use project may be a good option for the Hampshire site, I believe

that the development that has been recently proposed is too dense and architecturally unappealing for that location.

We have been Thousand Oaks residents for more than 20 years, and urge the council members to look for a project more in keeping with the unique nature of our beautiful suburban community.

Thank you for your attention.  
Paul and Elena Lukasiewicz

Sent from my iPad

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 11:57 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Request to Deny Hampshire Rd/Kmart Housing 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.

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: Amanda Rosenbeck <amandarosenbeck@gmail.com>  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 11:42:24 PDT  
To: aadam@toaks.org, Claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, bengler@toaks.org, ejones@toaks.org  
Subject: Request to Deny Hampshire Rd/Kmart Housing Project

Thousand Oaks City Council,  
First and foremost, it is important to note that for a project of this magnitude it is highly inappropriate to hold a "virtual" meeting during the current pandemic. This meeting should have been postponed to a date when we the tax paying residents can physically attend and voice our opinions in person. There are many residents who are unable to use the virtual tools necessary to attend, and they, just as all other residents are the glue that keeps this City together.  
I, along with my Husband and two daughters under the age of 2, are homeowners directly behind the Kmart site (Foothill Dr). We moved here 3 years ago from Los Angeles as young professionals with the intent to start a family and live the Thousand Oaks dream. That dream that we were sold on consisted of beautiful open space, a strong family-oriented vibe, increased safety, less population density and WAY less traffic. Fast forward 3 years, and we have been blessed with the family we longed for, however that Thousand Oaks Dream now looks like our past Los Angeles Reality. Please Vote to Deny the Zone Change from Commercial to Residential due to the

future

detrimental effects it will have on our City as a whole. Currently, this exact neighborhood has a mix of residential and industrial, there are two preschools, a probiotic plant, a Senior Citizen Home and two apartment complexes (which has a combined 157 units). Because of this mix use, parking is already scarce. This neighborhood is more rural than other Thousand Oaks neighborhoods, there are blind spots and pockets with no sidewalks. Because of this, safety in the streets is already a

concern. The project that is being proposed will consist of 459 Whopping Units. SAY

WHAT!??? Those residents will absolutely have guests and where will those guests park? There are only 42 guest parking spots, and clearly there will be more than 10

percent of those units that have guests. Hence those guests will go on the hunt for

parking, they can't park on Hampshire as it's a No Parking Zone, so they will inevitably

park in OUR neighborhood. We will have cars piled on the street and slammed against

one another. Cars will fly around the blind spots while children are trying to ride their

bikes. Just thinking about this makes me shudder. One of those preschools (Little

Dreamers Early Childhood) is backed up right against the proposed site. Have the Developers taken that into consideration, have you, Council? We keep hearing "Oh we

need to get rid of the eyesore of the Old Kmart" but have you, council thought about

the homeowners, residents and children that are directly going to be affected in the area?

We are very pro-growth in a steady fashion. My husband is in Commercial Construction

and 95% of his Projects, like this one, are solely in the Los Angeles area. While Los

Angeles is great for these type of projects, the negative impacts are some of the worst

congestion that many people here are lucky to not have encountered. IMT is in the business to make money, lots of money and finding every loophole possible to fulfill

their agenda. There is nothing wrong with a money grab, however this is the wrong City

to fulfill that agenda. It is important to note that only a small portion of these units will

be affordable. But again "affordable" is all relative. In Santa Monica, for example, a low

income unit can range anywhere from \$2500 and up. It is concerning that the Developers are not disclosing the exact amount of the rental prices. The reason why

they are not showing their hand is because the units will be EXPENSIVE. It is very

likely  
that the Developer will use the City of "Westlake Village" for marketing, which  
would  
then drive up their rental prices. Any young person, or individual who cannot  
afford to  
buy a home most likely will not be able to rent a unit at this proposed site.  
Emergency response anyone? I hope you are considering what the response will be in  
  
an unfortunate scenario like Woolsey. This area is meant for Commercial (which  
would  
allow people to come in and go OUT). However if the Zone Change is passed we are  
now taking the distributed traffic and concentrating it in residential form, which  
would  
mean adding up to 1,000 cars permanently. If there is a fire, how are we all going  
to get  
out??? Please think about these long term effects. One thing that we should have  
learned in the past few years from Borderline, to Woolsey to Covid is that life is  
unexpected and we should try to prepare ourselves for the worst, but that people  
are  
what makes a community great, not profits.  
Please do the right thing and Vote to Deny this project in its entirety.  
Thank you,  
Amanda Rosenbeck

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 11:00 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Rezoning of 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.

Begin forwarded message:

From: rdjdh@aol.com  
Subject: Rezoning of 325 & 391 Hampshire Road  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 9:33:54 AM 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>  
Reply-To: rdjdh@aol.com

I am opposed to the zone changes for the properties located at 325 and 391 Hampshire Road as the added population would cause further hardships to the current residents. The traffic and noise factor are already issues. Adding to the congestion would be a detriment to the city . The schools would be burdened with providing space and services to additional school age children when they have not adequately served our current school population. Our property values would also be negatively impacted by the dense housing that is being proposed on the site. All in all it is a terrible idea and we are definitely opposed to rezoning.

David Hasson  
271 Manzanita Lane  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91361

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 10:59 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: K-Mart Site Development

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: <lanaleadecker@gmail.com>  
Subject: K-Mart Site Development  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 9:58:00 AM PDT  
To: "claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com"  
<claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>

We have been residences of Thousand Oaks since 1964, At our present location since 1977.. We live in an area that is small, rural and the homes are not on flat, track home developments. Our streets and parking are limited, roads are narrow. And your development would cause traffic with walking (no sidewalks) bikes, and vehicles. One improvement does not improve the neighborhood, but cause more discontent. We do not support this development.

Allen O. Decker landowner  
Lana Decker Spouse  
Jacob Decker Resident and Son.  
Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 9:42 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Kmart proposal - Deny

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 <v-SZucca@Yamana.com>  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 08:56:02 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>  
Subject: Kmart proposal - Deny

Hi City Council members,

I believe that most of the residents in Thousand Oaks would like to see a change at the Kmart site. And I understand that you all would like your children to live here. This is achievable, but you must consider the type of dwelling you would like your child to live in.

I lived in Santa Monica for a few years because I was working there. I found a small apartment near work so I could walk to work. This was great. However, what was not great was when I had to use my car to get groceries, I would come back to my apartment and have to park a block or 2 away and haul my groceries to my apartment. I also had my bicycle stolen from my porch. This type of thing happens when people are crammed together.

My saving grace was that my boyfriend at the time (now my husband) lived in a small house he rented here in TO. Every weekend, I would drive out here and it felt like a vacation! Getting away from the crowded area I lived in was all I wanted to do.

My question is, do you want your kids to live in a place that will have not enough parking, will have traffic like the valley, will be trapped in an evacuation and

will  
have more crime? I don't!

This project is NOT the answer to the housing problems in T0. Trying to solve all the housing needs in one place is a bad idea. Spreading out the higher density throughout all of T0 is a more reasonable approach. If you allow this project to proceed, you will be affecting my neighborhood (behind Kmart) as well as Village homes etc. as well as the approximately 1500 people that would move into this small space.

Please deny this project for the sake of your children as well as mine!!

Thanks,  
Silvana Zucca (resident since 1972 with a small break in my 20's)

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <Claudia4Slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 9:40 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Written Comments to IMT/Kmart Prescreening  
Attachments: 05.12.2020 LTR re IMT Kmart CC Prescreening.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.

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: "Janet M. Wall" <walljanetm@gmail.com>  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 09:01:54 PDT  
To: aadam@toaks.org, Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>, Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>, ejones@toaks.org, Andrew Powers <APowers@toaks.org>  
Subject: Written Comments to IMT/Kmart Prescreening

Dear Drew and Councilmembers,

My comments are copied below and attached as a PDF to include in the public record. Thank you for considering my concerns.

~Janet  
Janet Miller Wall  
1901 Tamarack Street  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91361  
walljanetm@gmail.com  
May 12, 2020  
City Council, City of Thousand Oaks  
Community Development Department  
2100 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Density Intensity Application by IMT: Kmart Site

Dear Councilmembers:

For the following reasons, City Council should choose Staff Report Recommendation #2, denying the initiation of the General Plan Amendment and allocation of 353 Measure E residential units:

1. Density: Jam packed at 459 units. A reasonable increase in density

for the Kmart site might allow 25 units per acre, or 275 units. Similar to nearby apartment complexes.

2. Height and Magnitude: Mansionization; a concrete jungle. 4-story, 55 ft. tall buildings set back only 37 feet from Hampshire Road is shocking. Opposite the effect of neighboring apartment and business complexes.
3. Building Design: Inner-city tenement look. Ruins character of surrounding community.
4. Measure E units: Public needs to know why 106 units in this proposal do not count toward Measure E "housing bank."
5. Open Space: Calculation appears flawed. Not nearly enough green public open space. Mostly small private balconies and concrete patios.
6. Mixed Use: No need for additional commercial. Nix mixed-use and build 100% homes.
7. Traffic: Thousands of additional daily trips. Already hazardous at 101S offramp and Willow Lane junction.
8. Resident parking: Embrace that we are a car culture in Thousand Oaks and not likely to crave public transportation. Autos will likely become more energy efficient so demand more parking on site to lessen street congestion.
9. Specific Plan: Unnecessary if project adheres to time tested standards and codes.
10. Affordable Housing: Acorn reported 50 "low income apartments" in February. Staff report says 32. As proposed, 427 rentals will not be "affordable" at all.
11. Emergency evacuation: Be personally invested in whether residents can evacuate safely instead of responding that police and fire will be responsible for evacuation safety. Lives are in your hands when you approve reckless, overly dense housing projects.
12. Other Housing Sites: Oaks and Janss Malls are mostly empty of retailers and customers and are ripe for mixed use. Other empty commercial space might also relieve the burden of RHNA requirements without creating a mountain of density intensity on Hampshire.
13. "Prescreening Process": Details of every project should be closely examined before the nod occurs. Preapproval gives Applicant an unearned advantage. It also gives the public perception of bias.
14. Public participation: Prescreening is untimely. Most residents are staying home avoiding disease and worrying about finances and/or unemployment. Most seniors do not ZOOM on computers.

Please deny the proposed IMT project and send it back for redesign and community compatibility. Please hold major decisions such as this one for a time when ALL interested residents can fully participate.

Sincerely,

Janet Miller Wall

Janet Miller Wall  
1901 Tamarack Street  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91361  
[walljanetm@gmail.com](mailto:walljanetm@gmail.com)

May 12, 2020

City Council, City of Thousand Oaks  
Community Development Department  
2100 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: **Density Intensity Application by IMT: Kmart Site**

Dear Councilmembers:

For the following reasons, City Council should choose Staff Report Recommendation #2, denying the initiation of the General Plan Amendment and allocation of 353 Measure E residential units:

1. Density: Jam packed at 459 units. A reasonable increase in density for the Kmart site might allow 25 units per acre, or 275 units. Similar to nearby apartment complexes.
2. Height and Magnitude: Mansionization; a concrete jungle. 4-story, 55 ft. tall buildings set back only 37 feet from Hampshire Road is shocking. Opposite the effect of neighboring apartment and business complexes.
3. Building Design: Inner-city tenement look. Ruins character of surrounding community.
4. Measure E units: Public needs to know why 106 units in this proposal do not count toward Measure E "housing bank."
5. Open Space: Calculation appears flawed. Not nearly enough green public open space. Mostly small private balconies and concrete patios.
6. Mixed Use: No need for additional commercial. Nix mixed-use and build 100% homes.
7. Traffic: Thousands of additional daily trips. Already hazardous at 101S offramp and Willow Lane junction.
8. Resident parking: Embrace that we are a car culture in Thousand Oaks and not likely to crave public transportation. Autos will likely become more energy efficient so demand more parking on site to lessen street congestion.
9. Specific Plan: Unnecessary if project adheres to time tested standards and codes.
10. Affordable Housing: Acorn reported 50 "low income apartments" in February. Staff report says 32. As proposed, 427 rentals will not be "affordable" at all.

11. Emergency evacuation: Be personally invested in whether residents can evacuate safely instead of responding that police and fire will be responsible for evacuation safety. Lives are in your hands when you approve reckless, overly dense housing projects.
12. Other Housing Sites: Oaks and Janss Malls are mostly empty of retailers and customers and are ripe for mixed use. Other empty commercial space might also relieve the burden of RHNA requirements without creating a mountain of density intensity on Hampshire.
13. "Prescreening Process": Details of every project should be closely examined before the nod occurs. Preapproval gives Applicant an unearned advantage. It also gives the public perception of bias.
14. Public participation: Prescreening is untimely. Most residents are staying home avoiding disease and worrying about finances and/or unemployment. Most seniors do not ZOOM on computers.

Please deny the proposed IMT project and send it back for redesign and community compatibility. Please hold major decisions such as this one for a time when ALL interested residents can fully participate.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janet Miller Wall". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Janet Miller Wall

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 1:37 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: REQUEST TO DENY HAMPSHIRE RD. KMART DEVELOPMENT HOUSING & BUSINESS 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.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joshua Rosenbeck <joshrosenbeck@gmail.com>  
Subject: REQUEST TO DENY HAMPSHIRE RD. KMART DEVELOPMENT HOUSING & BUSINESS PROJECT  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 1:22:39 PM PDT  
To: claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com

Dear Councilmembers:

As a homeowner and commercial contractor living behind the existing K-Mart site with a young family, this project will negatively impact our family neighborhood and put our young daughters safety at risk with hundreds of additional cars trying to weave down our narrow/ windy streets. For this reason, I am requesting that the City Council should choose Staff Report Recommendation #2, DENYING THE INITIATION OF THE GPA AND ALLOCATION OF 353 MEASURE E RESIDENTIAL UNITS FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. Councilmember Jones continues mentioning that we need housing for our kids. As of this date, 5/12/2020 there are at least 165 rental units with vacancy in Thousand Oaks with another 54 having vacancy within this month. Please fill those before you consider building more.
2. The three developments next door to this site on Foothill & Hampshire (The Verona, Westlake Villas & Oakview Apartments) rents 1bed/1bath units for \$2,000-\$2,700/ month. DO NOT believe the fantasy that young professionals will be able to afford these brand new units if they can't afford one of the 47 units open in these 40-50 year old complex right next door.
3. Councilmember Jones has told several individuals on social media that it is too dense for his taste. It would not make sense to approve something that is too dense, then try to backtrack later. Set the record straight right away and DENY.
4. Councilmember Jones has told several individuals on social media that he is concerned about parking. The current calculations account for 750 parking spaces but neglect to account for any 2 car situations for a 1-bedroom for couples, any 3 car situations for a 2-bedroom for a couple renting with another individual, any 3 car situations for a 3-bedroom where a group of 3 friends rents a unit, or any 4 car situations for a 4-bedroom where a group of 4 friends rents a unit. This will put the required parking at 900, which leaves you short 150 spaces. Additionally, there are only 43

guest parking spaces, which is highly undercounted, as more than 10% of the units will have guest, which puts the LACK OF PARKING AT 200 SPACES. THIS FAMILY NEIGHBORHOOD CANNOT ACCOMMODATE 200 MORE CARS.

5. The street parking is already fully utilized on Willow, Foothill & Fairview

due to Natren, Windsor Terrace, The Verona & Westlake Villas (which only has 1/3 the units at 157 combined). No further parking can be accommodated, which is why this needs to remain a commercial site.

6. Other retail centers that are zoned commercial have ample parking throughout the City, which is why this site should stay commercial.

7. Councilmember Jones mentioned that some people want this "lifestyle", which would acknowledge that this zoning and project does not currently fit in with the Thousand Oaks family lifestyle. If someone wants a fast pace, jam packed lifestyle they should move to L.A., then when they want a slower, family lifestyle they should move to Thousand Oaks.

8. Councilmember Bill-de la Pena acknowledged that the City cannot deny a "density bonus", so why would councilmembers approve the 359 unit plus bonus zone change, then think they will be able to scale back this 459 unit monstrosity later.

9. As a Commercial Contractor I see this type of construction all over L.A. They market this as "affordable", but the only thing "affordable" is a few studios tucked in odd corners, next to noisy elevators, next to noisy mechanical equipment, next to loud entrances, etc. The rest of the units are \$3,000+ for a 1-bedroom unit. This is a tool for developers to capitalize on tax breaks and grants for MORE PROFIT.

10. This site is zoned commercial which would allow a distributed traffic flow between 7 a.m & 7 p.m, this zone change would created concentrated traffic loads between 6 a.m & 9 a.m & 3 p.m & 6 p.m, which this area was never created for and hence never zoned for.

11. There is no reasonable way to determine the traffic impact during the current pandemic, so moving forward with anything would be a COMPLETE LACK OF DUE DILIGENCE.

12. This development would add approximately 900+ more cars during peak hours at the worst intersection in Thousand Oaks.

13. This project does not account for any upgrades of the City infrastructure or terrible congestion at the intersections.

14. The Land Owner is trying to hold the City hostage by demanding "High Density" zoning so they can sell the land for max profits or they will hold Home Depot for the remaining 5 years of the lease. Land Owners' trying to only look for profits are not who our elected officials are elected to represent. You are elected to represent your constituents who overwhelmingly oppose this zone change.

15. The Land Owner will come to the City with a plan for the current zoning when they feel the pressure of \$0 income after the current lease is up.

16. IMT is using the small portion of "affordable housing" to fool the community into thinking this entire project will be affordable. IMT Simi Valley rents a 594 sq.ft. unit 1 bed/ 1 bath for \$1,800/ month. They will surely charge MUCH more than this for a prime location. These units will not be affordable for young professionals.

17. IMT is a billion-dollar, national Owner/Developer who looks only at profits. They are trying to put the maximum number of units for the maximum profits with no regards to the impact to the community. This does not align with the Thousand Oaks principles.

18. The Planning Commission has neglected Measure E, and now they are trying to make up a lot of ground in one project. Your constituents should not have to suffer so that a few people can make sure their jobs are secured at the City level.

19. The Planning Commission is trying to proceed with concurrent processing of project entitlements to fast track this project, and push it through with no real understanding of consequences or how the zone change would affect the community. They should prove the zoning change will not have negative impacts BEFORE they present a zone change.

With concern,  
Josh Rosenbeck

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 1:10 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Vote NO on Kmart 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.

Begin forwarded message:

From: gerry zucca <g\_zucca@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Vote NO on Kmart Project  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 1:02:27 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>

Vote NO on Kmart Project

There are many reasons to not rush into approving the beginning of the Kmart site project:

1. Too high density
2. Negative impact on traffic on our major road arteries, Hampshire Rd and TO Blvd
3. Four story proposals should be denied as out of character for our city
4. Negative impact on view of E Los Robles open space
5. The citizens are not paying attention, this is not a true public hearing of the proposal

The development of this location should probably be apartments, however this is not the right fit for the location and not the right time to approve.

Please deny, vote NO  
Gerry Zucca  
720 Rancho Rd  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362  
805-906-0039

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 1:10 PM  
To: City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Fwd: Agenda Item 9A

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: Nicole Hanson <nicolejhanson@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Agenda Item 9A  
Date: May 12, 2020 at 12:24:35 PM PDT  
To: claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com

Dear Ms. Bill-de la Peña,

There is something special about Thousand Oaks. With over 100,000 people, it still has some of that small town charm. It doesn't feel like a typical city. Our City Council, representing the will of it's constituents has, until recently, been very conscientious and dedicated to preserving our open space and limiting the height of buildings and signage to keep our skyline free from obstructing the beautiful views around us. The current project on Thousand Oaks Boulevard is already extremely concerning and doesn't adhere to previous development practices. That really caught my attention- regrettably, after the fact. Unfortunately, it's too late to stop that now.

I moved to Thousand Oaks in 1978. I grew up here and graduated from Thousand Oaks High School. My daughter is Graduating from Thousand Oaks High School this year. I love living here. I am a single, low income parent and personally understand the need for housing- especially affordable housing. However, the construction of a four story building crammed into the old K-Mart property isn't in keeping with who we are as a community. Thousand Oaks is spread out by design. That is one reason we are the city that we are. People come here to get out of the valley. If people want to live in a densely populated urban city, there are already plenty of those around and they can

move there. The Thousand Oaks City Council should reject this plan on behalf of the voters who have entrusted them to keep our unique city intact. We are not the valley and don't want to become a valley. There is still time to stop that from happening.

Please deny this project.

Thanks for your time & consideration,  
Nicole Hanson