

Administrative Hearing

SUPPLEMENTAL

Dated October 15, 2020

Meeting of

October 15, 2020

(Memo and Additional Correspondence)



Community Development Department
MEMORANDUM

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

To: Marjan Behzadi, Administrative Hearing Officer
From: Carlos Contreras
Date: October 15, 2020
Subject: Additional Correspondence Received for DPMN 2020-70030

Attached is correspondence received from members of the public after the packet was printed for the subject case.

Attachment: Correspondence

October 13, 2020

Re: Development of property at 1649 Hauser Circle, Thousand Oaks

Case # PPD 2020-70030

To Whom It May Concern,

The plans for 1649 Hauser Circle propose a type of property that is very much out of character with the neighborhood. The numerous buildings and activity areas draw concern that this property will be used for entertaining purposes, greatly increasing traffic, noise and light pollution on a quiet residential street.

A primary concern is parking. Hauser circle is a relatively narrow road. This has never been an issue because every property on the street has ample space set aside for parking both resident and guest vehicles on the property itself. No one is ever required to park on the street, no matter how large or small the property or home.

The plans for 1649 are allowing only five parking spaces (including garage space) for a very large property with a 5-bedroom home and many entertaining facilities. This lack of parking will lead to guests parking their vehicles on the street. As there is no parking whatsoever in front of the property itself, guests will be parking not only in front of adjoining homes, but also on the inside of the blind turn across from this property. This is a downhill decreasing radius, blind turn which is approached over a partially blind rise, facing directly into the evening sun. The applicant's driveway is located at the exit of this turn. Guests will be crossing the street at this spot, which is obviously a safety hazard.

Vehicles parking here also create a serious safety hazard for other vehicles, in addition to pedestrians and horses which use Hauser Circle as a popular recreation route as well as a link between horse trails to the West and East. This is why residents have always avoided parking along this curved stretch of Hauser. With no other easy options, the guests of 1649 will certainly park here, not realizing the danger they are creating. When a vehicle is parked on the inside of this turn, cars traveling North have their view further blocked, and it becomes difficult or impossible for two vehicles to pass side by side. The proposed plans and their lack of parking on the 1649 property creates a choke point by design. During construction the problem will likely be even worse, with large vehicles and equipment situated in this turn.

Unless more parking is required on the applicant's property, these plans will be encouraging neighbor conflicts, creating safety hazards for residents and lowering the overall quality of life in a neighborhood that currently prides itself on its quiet and friendly atmosphere.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Steve Simmons
1624 Hauser Circle

Jeremy Lux
1645 Hauser Circle
Thousand Oaks
CA 91362

REF: (PPD) 2020- 70030
Location 1649 Hauser Circle
APN 670-0-110-220

Mr Behzadi,

In light of the fact that we as the neighbors living on the adjacent property at 1645 Hauser circle have only been given two sub 1 hour zoom calls to review partial plans of the proposed development at 1649 Hauser Circle (PPD) 2020-70030 and were given only a few days to prepare for this meeting we object to having this hearing today and request a further 30 days to allow time to consult with subject matter experts in the various areas of concern. The applicant and the City have had as much time as they needed, the neighbors and residents of Hauser Circle deserve the same and at a minimum 30 days.

Along with the objection of insufficient time to review the following areas of concern and objection to the Staff Report herein referenced by page number and item number should be noted for the record.

Page 2 # 4

Object

The proposed residence and accessory buildings are not compatible with surrounding development

The floor area ratio including all accessory buildings is .18 which is 67% larger then the next biggest floor area ratio usage site on Hauser Cir 1655 Hauser Cir .11 Floor area ratio

Page 2 # 6

Object

The project will be detrimental to the public safety and well being of the current residents of Hauser Cir due to parking congestion and the associated traffic safety issues created by the narrow blind corner

Page 5 Conclusion

Object

The proposed development will adversely affect surrounding properties and over -intensify development of the subject lot due to the 2 Barns, pool house, recreation building, sport court and pool resulting in a .18 floor area ratio which limits the available onsite parking available to

Page 2
(PPD) 2020-70030

all the surrounding developments who have a average floor area ratio of .07 and as such have ample onsite parking. The proposed development floor to area ratio is almost 3 times larger than the surrounding development. The subject property has NO street parking frontage and due to the excessive floor area ratio parking will spill over in front of neighbors homes creating inconvenience and significant safety issues.

Not reasonable by any standard

Page 5 Planning # 2

Object

The recreation room has been renamed from the original proposed plans where it was a ADU which is prohibited when placed in front of the property.

We have been assured by the city, this conveniently renamed but identical structure with plumbing and sewer, is not to be used as a dwelling in any way, now or in the future. The applicant has made oral representations to neighbors that a brother will be living in the recreation structure. If this structure stays in plan, our concerns are steadfast it remains in use only as a recreation/exercise structure and not converted to a dwelling with added closets, wall, kitchenette, washer/dry, or gas line. It is our understanding a change would immediately be cause for remediation by the City. We sincerely hope it will not come to that.

We welcome having new neighbors to enjoy our small community, we only ask that their home and property usage and parking impact be compatible with the surrounding development and ask both applicant and City to reconsider and remove the recreation building.

Page 7 # 8 Required Parking

Makes reference to a four bedroom dwelling.

Page 10 # 28

Makes reference to Westlake Ranch Homeowners Association.

Makes one wonder what else has been missed, or is incorrect, undermines staffs credibility with relation to accuracy in detail as well as supports the neighbors being given at least 30 more days to carefully review these proposed plans. It should be noted that the neighbors had to point out to the City Planners that ADU units in front of the main house were a violation of the code on the last set of plans, if we had not been paying attention it would have been approved and built.

Page 8 # 17 Lighting

The plans stay silent on lighting on rest of property?

Page 3
(PPD) 2020-70030

Page 9 # 23 Construction hours

Object

Request construction be limited to 5 days a week.

12 hours a day six days a week of noise, dust and our house shaking from grading is not reasonable and unfair to neighbors who work hard and have a right to two days a week of peace and quiet.

Page 17 # 52 Grading permit and soils certification

Significant concerns regarding drainage both during and after construction. Having lived on the adjacent property for years the amount of water runoff during heavy rain is significant. Also of concern is the potential of the undermining of retaining walls and damage to our home and structures on our adjacent property from vibrations from heavy machinery required for grading.

Page 19 # 58. Known easement conflicts

What are the existing easement conflicts identified by the City?

Based on the fact the subject property has no street parking I ask the following questions:

Where will all the construction workers park?

Where will the porter potties be located?

Where will the haul away waste bins be deposited?

There is no mention of the location of the pool equipment, we request it be located on the north side of the property to minimize noise

Having raised all these concerns and objections and engaging in what can be difficult discussions we feel it is better to address and resolve at the beginning of the journey then stay silent and precipitate a potential for contentious confrontation and conflict later.

We look forward to a reasonable dialogue and resolution and having another family join our wonderful small community of neighbors who are friends and look out for each others best interests.

Thank you

Amy Parbury
1645 Hauser Circle
Thousand Oaks
CA 91362

October 15th, 2020 Administration
REF: (PPD) 2020- 70030
Location 1649 Hauser Circle
APN 670-0-110-220

Good afternoon,

With only two weeks, amid a pandemic, time to review plans via two sub-one-hour zoom calls (October 5th and 9th) with the City has not provided enough time to study the provided plans thoroughly and consult subject matter experts. We, therefore, ask for an additional 30 business days minimum for our review, following which we can reconvene this hearing. We deserve as much time as the applicant and City.

My second big concern is in opposition to Page 5, Staff Report Conclusion, as we feel the plans, which include several accessory structures, does overdevelop on the subject lot. This is reflected in the city report comparing page 3, Table 1 surrounding development in the floor to areas ratio; however, this table does not include the four additional proposed structures on the property. The floor area ratio is actually .18, inclusive of all five proposed structures.

- House 5,268 sf
- Barn 1, 600 sf (oppose anything over the max high of 15 feet as stated in the ord. N. 1678-NS)
- Barn 2, 600 sf (oppose anything over the max high of 15 feet as stated in the ord. N. 1678-NS)
- Pool House 453 sf, (oppose anything over the max high of 15 feet as stated in the ord. N. 1678-NS)
- Rec/Exercise house 600 sf (the Ordinance report states accessory units and ADU but nothing about Rec/Exercise) (oppose anything over the max high of 15 feet as stated in the ord. N. 1678-NS)
- *Sport Court not included in .18 ratio floor area ratio calc*
 - .18 usage ratio represents a 63% increase over the next biggest ratio lot in the surrounding development (1655 Hauser Cir .11 floor area ratio) ref. Page 3, Table 1
 - And if you remove the garage square footage, the main house footprint is 4453 square feet, making the accessory buildings cumulatively 2253 square feet, 50.59% of the house footprint.

I object to aka ADU, renamed Recreation/Exercise Structure and request increased parking on the lot for the following reasons:

1. Full parking capacity on the subject's lot is not consistent with the current neighborhood standard. Even neighborhood homes with less square feet can accommodate more parking.
2. The number of spots on the subject's lot does not take into consideration extra occupancy (sf), visitation, or several outbuildings. (note discrepancy questions if 5th bedroom is the main house or additional Rec/Exercise structure: pg. 7, #8 4 bedrooms main house or per Second Floor plans A3 & pg. 4, Parking, 5 bedrooms main house)?
 1. Pg. 23, #72 The Turnabout cannot be used as parking.
 2. This lot has no front street parking.
 3. Pg. 2, #6 This parking limitation on the property seems self-imposed and should not deem a one-lane circle street as a solution, creating safety and congestion concerns that do not currently exist. Having experienced a fire evacuation, I can see this being a hazard not only day-to-day but in emergency situations.
 4. Pg. 3 Evaluation: Will both barns be a habitat for animals only, or will any barn space be utilized for recreational or exercise purposes as well?

Of utmost concern is any property damage, especially due to grading or excavation on site.

- Pg. 7, #12 & Pg. 11, #35- Will grading impact the privacy of adjacent neighbors? If so, how will the applicant address?
- Pg. 11, #38 – We have not had time to see the Public Works Drainage Plan/Design. Who is liable for any drainage issue or damages inflicted on neighbors?
- Pg. 12, #40. & Pg. 17, #52, 53- Have soil samples been done? Or will samples be done prior to construction to confirm topography? Are possible impacts to existing neighboring structures known?
- Pg. 18, #54 – When is the pre-grading meeting? Will there be blasting? Do we know the quantity of earth to be moved? And the route to export or import if needed? If we have cracking or damage to adjacent property who do we call? Will we have prior notification of excavation or demolition times?

Other Notes:

Pg. 4, Parking – Will privacy be protected with no light evasion or spillage on adjacent properties, especially for Parking as suggested by staff, condition # 16.

Pg. 7, #7 - We have had no time to review Public Works. Need more time.

Pg. 7, #10 – How many feet for setbacks? Especially top or toe to barns?

Pg. 9, #23 – Will there be a staged area on the property for construction vehicles, equipment, porta-potties, bins, etc. which would also adhere to the construction hours.

Pg. 10, #28 – How and what involvement does the Westlake Ranch Property Owners Association have on Hauser Circle?

Pg. 11, # 33 – What lighting restrictions will be enforced, especially for the sports court, barns, and Rec/Exercise and Pool House?

Pg. 11, #36 – What Oak Tree(s) will be protected or lost due to construction?

Pg. 18 #56 – Encroachment questions unknown?

Pg. 19, #58 – What are the Easement conflicts?

Pg. 21, #62 As mentioned in the Staff report, the applicant needs time to discuss with adjacent neighbors the driveway design.

Where will trash bins go after construction with only drive way at the front of property?

Would like to learn more about the landscaping plans to see vulnerable areas and how it may help with privacy?

Can we get the contractor's and building inspector's phone numbers?

We found Hauser Circle to be a very welcoming community. As we welcome the Gudvi family I ask if code is really the only determination in our community development? I pray the neighbor's concerns and objections carry significant weight as we continue to live together peacefully in this lovely, close knit circle of friends.

From: Elissa Frankowski

Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 9:52 AM

To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>

Subject: Comment for Hearing PPD-2020-70030

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.

I would like to add the following as a comment to the record in regards to agenda item PPD-2020-70030 for the hearing this afternoon.

I live across the street from 1649 Hauser Cir and I, like others on our street, have several concerns about the proposed construction project including the number of proposed buildings and the probability of the proposed recreation building turning into an ADU after passing inspection. However, the main concern I would like to bring up is the parking situation for the construction crews during the building project.

The lot in discussion has no street parking and I am concerned about the number of cars that would be parked around the curve in our road and in front of my yard for an extended period of time on such a large project that would affect the safety and privacy of us who currently live on Hauser Circle. Many people walk or ride their bikes on our street throughout the day and having multiple vehicles parked on the street has been a problem in regards to safety in the past, especially on the curve. When other construction crews have been working on our street they will eat lunch or take breaks in their vehicles or even sometimes in my yard and leave fast food trash, construction trash and cigarette butts. Many of us moved to Hauser Cir because of the lack of traffic on the road and the privacy it affords us and our quality of life has been impeded every time a large project has been done and this one seems to be even bigger.

I would like to propose that the parking for this house be built first and that the construction crew be required to park inside the lot during construction to protect the safety and privacy for those of us who live on the street.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Frankowski

Hauser Circle Resident

From: Barry Stern

Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 9:08 AM

To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>

Subject: Admin Hearing--Video Conference

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.

Good Morning,

CASE PPD 2020-70030-, ADUD 2020-70031

I live at 1623 Hauser Circle and have just one concern/request.

I have a lot of curb area in which cars/trucks like to park. I have noticed this as I have been home and there has been construction going on for quite a while.

Not sure who is doing the construction.

Sometimes the vehicles park too high up the curb slope.

This has resulted in twice that someone has run over a rainbird sprinkler and broken it off completely.

I even put a large rock on the curb in front of each of the sprinklers to try and prevent someone from parking in the exact spot where one could be broken.

Since this hearing involves what looks like a large and lengthy construction process I just ask that the homeowners tell and **periodically remind** the workmen to simply be aware and more careful when they park in front of my house.

That's all.

Thank you,
Barry Stern

From: Steven Leo

Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2020 2:32 PM

To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>

Subject: RE: Case #PPD2020-70030, ADUD 2020-70031

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.

After reviewing the plans submitted to the City for the above Case we have some major concerns regarding the planned residences shown on the plans we reviewed in May at the City of Thousand Oaks offices.

As an initial overview my first impression was that the owner is planning on building a very large number of structures on the lot. According to the plans there are the following independent structure planned. As it has been a while since my review we am not sure of the square footage of each building but I think these a close.

- 5,200+ sq ft residence – 4 or 5 bedrooms
- 600 sq ft apartments – 1 bedroom
- 2 – 600 sq ft barns
- 1 – 400+ sq ft pool house

After close inspection of the property these are the specific concerns we have:

- It is a FLAG LOT – the street frontage is only the width of a driveway therefore there is ZERO street frontage.
 - No place to put trash and recycle containers for pick-up except in front of a neighbor's property
 - No place for guests to park if insufficient parking available within the property boundaries
 - Each of the 6 neighbors who will be impacted by this parking situation have at least room for a minimum of 10 vehicles within their property lines.
 - There are no curbs on this section of Hauser Circle so therefore if they have guests that park on the street they will be parking on the neighbor's property in front of their houses.
 - The property is on a tight blind curve which makes parking on the street across from their lot on the inside of the curve very dangerous
- Placement of an apartment unit in front of the primary residence
 - I believe there is a City or County Ordinances that does not allow for the placement of a "living unit" in front of a primary residence
- On property parking
 - If I remember the plans correctly there are only 2 single car garages – one on each front corner of the residence
 - I believe there was room for 1 vehicle to park next to the apartment
 - That is 3 parking spaces for the 2 residences that have 5 or 6 bedrooms.
- Grading questions
 - The plans showed the primary residence will be placed in such a manner that the property level will be raised from the existing level via retaining walls therefore raising the roof line of a 2 story house negatively impacting the visual line of site of 3 neighbors
 - Most residences on a slope cut into the slope to keep the height of the residence at a reasonable height

We have been notified the meeting to discuss this building plan has been cancelled and not yet rescheduled. Please make sure we are notified when the next meeting will be held so we may attend to voice our concerns,

Jan & Leo
1655 Hause Circle
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362