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 Community Development Department at (805) 449-2500. Assisted listening devices are available at this meeting. Ask Community Development 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.
To: Planning Commission

From: Kari Finley, Planning Division Manager for
      Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director

Date: April 26, 2021

Subject: Correspondence and Staff memorandum received for item 08A GPA 2019-70760

Attached is correspondence from the public and an update memorandum from staff received subsequent to the printing of the Agenda Packet.
Chamber Comment Letter - Preferred Alternative Land Use Map - For Planning Commission

Adam Haverstock <ahaverstock@conejochamber.org>
Fri 4/23/2021 11:13 AM

To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>
Cc: Michael Forbes <MForbes@toaks.org>; Haider Alawami <HAlawami@toaks.org>; Danielle Borja <dborja@conejochamber.org>; Cyndi Rodriguez <CRodriguez@toaks.org>

1 attachments (184 KB)
Preferred Land Use Map - Comments Provided v2.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.

Hello,

Please see the attached letter from the Executive Committee of the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce commenting on the Preferred Alternative Land Use Map up for consideration at the Planning Commission this Monday.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,
Adam

--

Adam Haverstock
Director of Government Affairs & Tourism
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
Helping Businesses Succeed and Conejo Valley Thrive!
805-370-0035 | ahaverstock@conejochamber.org

Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
April 23, 2021

Chair Nelson Buss  
Thousand Oaks Planning Commission  
2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Preferred Land Use Alternative Map – Comments Provided

Dear Chair Buss and Members of the Planning Commission,

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to provide feedback on the Preferred Land Use Alternative Map for your consideration and review.

As the voice of over 800 members of the Conejo Valley business community who employ tens of thousands of local residents, the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce is a major stakeholder in the City of Thousand Oaks general plan process and request your consideration of the three recommendations below.

1. **Allocate more “Mixed Use Medium” and add “Mixed Use High” back to the Map**

Our Chamber supported Alternative Map #1 in the first survey because it included targeted areas of “Mixed Use Medium” and “Mixed Use High” designations. We feel this strategy will provide a good balance of workforce housing and jobs for the future of Thousand Oaks.

Alternative Map #1 was the top choice of survey takers, showing community support for higher density.

- **70% of the respondents supported increasing density citywide to 45 units per acre** – the equivalent of a residential medium or mixed-use medium designation to allow for smaller and potentially more affordable units within the same building envelope.

- **74% of survey respondents said “agree” or “strongly agree” to allow 45 units per acre in the Rancho Conejo area.**

We would request that the planning commission reintroduce the “Mixed Use High” designation and designate additional parcels as either “Mixed Use Medium” or “Mixed Use High,” to support this data.
2. **Allow more flexibility at the Opportunity Sites by increasing density and designating them “Mixed Use Medium” or “Mixed Use High”**

In 2017, the Thousand Oaks City Council on a 5-0 vote approved an Economic Development Strategic Plan to encourage “public and private investment in the ‘Opportunity Sites’. “

These sites have already been designated as economic development opportunities by the city council and several of these sites are in the areas of change including:

- Borchard Road Site
- The Oaks Mall
- Nazarbekian Site
- Former K-mart Site

More information can be found on page 40 of the Thousand Oaks Economic Development Strategic Plan ([https://www.toaks.org/home/showdocument?id=16994](https://www.toaks.org/home/showdocument?id=16994)).

We request that these sites be given the maximum amount of flexibility for future development by designating their entire sites as either “Mixed Use Medium” or “Mixed Use High”.

3. **Move housing designations from established parcels to sites that have the most building potential**

As a practical matter, it makes sense for the city to allocate housing units to places where projects have real potential to be built in the near- or medium-term future. Parcels that have been recently developed have cost recovery plans that span upwards of 30 years, and expensive financing that must be paid off. Allocating housing to sites like these will not actually produce housing over the 25-year life of this general plan.

Some examples include:

- The Northgate Plaza (Bed Bath and Beyond) on southwest corner of the Thousand Oaks Blvd and Westlake Blvd intersection.
- The recent industrial development adjacent to Rancho Conejo Blvd north of the 101 Freeway.
- The industrial area across Hampshire Road from the former K-mart site (includes the Southern California Edison lot and new UCLA building currently under construction).

Housing allocated to these sites is wasted because it will never be built. The density on these sites is better utilized on parcels where the ownership has the intention to build.
Thank you for your service on the Thousand Oaks Planning Commission; our Chamber always appreciates our excellent partnership with the City of Thousand Oaks.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 805-370-0035 or dborja@conejochamber.org.

Sincerely,

Danielle Borja, MBA
President/CEO
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
April 23, 2021

Via Email to: kparker@toaks.org

Chair Nelson Buss and Commissioners
City of Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
Attn: Kelvin Parker,
Community Development Director
2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Preferred Land Use Alternative Map
Thousand Oaks General Plan 2045

Dear Chair Buss and Commissioners:

This letter is written regarding Item 8A on your April 26, 2021 meeting agenda wherein you will be considering the Preferred Land Use Map ("Map") that was forwarded to you by the City’s General Plan Advisory Committee ("GPAC"), including providing any recommended modifications thereto.

A subsidiary of Kennedy Wilson, One Baxter Way, LP, owns The Oaks, a 43-acre property located at the southwest corner of Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Lakeview Canyon Road. An office building has occupied a portion of the property for a number of years; however, on February 23, 2021, we received permission from the City Council to initiate the process for a General Plan Amendment and allocation of residential units to add the Gateway, a multifamily component, to The Oaks.

The Oaks has been designated as "Industrial Flex" on the GPAC’s Map, with an assigned Floor Area Ratio of 2.0. We respectfully request the Commission to consider applying a multifamily residential designation on a portion of The Oaks consistent with our plans that are have been in process for the past two years. Alternatively, creation of a designation that would allow for mixed uses, inclusive of residential uses, would provide the flexibility to create a village atmosphere at The Oaks. This request is predicated upon the following facts and rationale:

- Gateway will be screened from the view. The Oaks is surrounded with hundreds of fully grown oak and sycamore trees. The density of these trees screens views into The Oaks from Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Lakeview Canyon Road. The adjacent Promenade at Westlake is also screened from view due to the density of foliage along the common boundary. To the south, a berm screens views from the Freeway into The Oaks. In areas where the berm doesn’t block views into The Oaks, there is dense landscaping that screens views from the Freeway. The Oaks is screened from view from public rights-of-way.

- The inclusion of a residential component for The Oaks allows for commute-free housing opportunities and walking and bicycling opportunities to the Promenade and other retail and offices lining Thousand Oaks Boulevard west of Westlake Boulevard. An existing access easement, in favor of The Oaks, provides vehicular and pedestrian access across the Promenade from Thousand Oaks Boulevard to the shared bridge crossing, which connects The Oaks with the Promenade. Functioning together as a horizontal mixed-use superblock along with The Promenade, where commercial and entertainment opportunities exist in very close proximity, The Oaks can provide a genuine pedestrian-friendly “Village”. Additionally, the residential component at The Oaks will include a number of affordable dwelling units, which are virtually non-existent in this area of Thousand Oaks.
The Gateway can accommodate needed housing within established density limits within the City. Given that The Oaks will likely always be mixed use property that includes the office building, the prospects of accommodating many acres of multifamily units is self-limiting, as with each acre committed to residential, there occurs a great cost to replenish existing, required parking for the office uses which would be removed with further multifamily development.

The initial concept of adding a multifamily component to The Oaks has already been vetted at the City Council level and the proposal is proceeding in a manner consistent with that vetting. To not include the property would be inconsistent with the Council’s prior action.

The Map that has been transmitted to you from the GPAC designates certain nearby properties for inclusion of a residential component, which from an industry perspective are not feasible for housing. For instance, The Promenade, as well as the Bed, Bath & Beyond site, are earmarked for residential on the Map. However, residential uses could not be built without major demolition of existing, functional and financially successful commercial structures. The underutilized condition of The Oaks’ site means that land is available to integrate a residential component upon the property without removing established uses and structures.

Presently, the east end of the Thousand Oaks Boulevard corridor has no availability of viable sites for housing other than at The Oaks. To emphasize, the Oaks is an underutilized site that is well suited for the inclusion of a residential component in a manner that fits very well spatially within its surroundings.

Thank you for your consideration of designation allowing the inclusion of a housing component at The Oaks.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Eadie
Sr. Vice President – Entitlement & Development

cc via Email: GPAC c/o Michael Forbes
Steven Kearns
Andrew Powers
Haider Alawami
Fwd: Borchard & 101 Development

Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>
Fri 4/23/2021 2:13 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Steve McCollum <srmccollum@verizon.net>
Date: Fri, Apr 23, 2021 at 13:47
Subject: Borchard & 101 Development
To: claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>, bengler@toaks.org <bengler@toaks.org>, aadam@toaks.org <aadam@toaks.org>, ejones@toaks.org <ejones@toaks.org>, kmcnamee@toaks.org <kmcnamee@toaks.org>

I have lived in the Thousand Oaks portion of Casa Conejo since 1979. The Borchard Wetlands area has always been known and planned to be for single family homes. Even the General Plan designates that purpose. All of the Casa Conejo area (except facing Wendy and Borchard) is exclusively single family residential homes. Only single family residential homes are compatible with the community. Other types of construction would adversely impact the character of the neighborhood and its value.

Permitting "multi-residential/mixed use" of the Borchard Wetland area will add significantly more traffic to Alice Drive, Denise Street and Shirley Drive than single family residential development of the subject area. Traffic Engineers will confirm the delta is significant. If you have the opportunity to drive along Shirley Drive you will notice that it is very serpentine and narrow. Extra traffic (more than designed for) would certainly be hazardous. And Alice Drive is already a Drag Strip - I feel sorry for the people that live there. Then there is the "Bella Shortcut" to get to Wendy Drive, it will find major use by those getting to and from the freeway.

Also, connecting Borchard to Wendy Drive via the Domino's Pizza bridge would be a mistake. That was previously done with Michael Drive, and subsequently double terminated with cul-de-sacs at the midpoint to stop thru traffic. Connecting Borchard to Wendy through the Borchard Wetland area would cause the same problem that previously existed on Michael. Please don't make the same mistake again

Simply said, I oppose all development of this property other than single family residential homes.

Steve McCollum.
2895 Shirley Drive
Newbury Park, CA  91320

805.657.9933

--
Claudia Bill-de la Peña
Mayor, City of Thousand Oaks

805.449.2103

Biography
Website
Twitter
Facebook
Instagram

#inthistogether #tostrong
Form Submission - Comment Form

Squarespace <form-submission@squarespace.info>
Fri 4/23/2021 3:05 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

Sent via form submission from Toaks2045

Name: Judy Seeger

Email: seegerteam@gmail.com

Message: I request a outdoor meeting on Sunday night around 4 Pm so all people who are interested in this community can come.
**Fwd: ISSUE: Planning for Thousand Oaks**

Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>
Fri 4/23/2021 3:54 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

------------- Forwarded message -------------
From: shahriar ghodsian <drlungs1@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Apr 23, 2021 at 15:11
Subject: ISSUE: Planning for Thousand Oaks
To: <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>

PLEASE – Take time and slow down the “General Plan”. As a resident and business owner it is IMPERATIVE to take time and NOT Rush on making changes to Thousand Oaks’ zoning and future development.

Concerned,

S. Ghodsian

--

Shahriar Ghodsian, MD | Pulmonary & Critical Care

250 Lombard St., Suite 1, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

p: (805) 370-5840 | f: (888) 823-3506

https://www.thehospitaldoctor.com/

--

Claudia Bill-de la Peña
Mayor, City of Thousand Oaks
805.449.2103

Biography
Website
Twitter
Facebook
Instagram

#inthistogether #ststrong
Re: Form Submission - Comment Form

Judy Seeger <seegerteam@gmail.com>
Fri 4/23/2021 3:07 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

Broken record rather than trying to accommodate. That’s what this sounds like to me. I don’t understand. Whatever business you are in, you want to do the best for the people you are trying to help. If it is the people, have a live meeting on Sunday afternoon 4 pm outside and invite the public. If you are working for special interests, I guess you would have zoom meetings on scheduled times to fit those people. Who are you trying to help? Please let me know. I would like an explanation of why you choose not to accommodate the people.

Judy

On Fri, Apr 23, 2021 at 2:57 PM General Plan <GP@toaks.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Judy,

Thank you for your email. We appreciate our community members wanting to stay involved in this important process. If you are interested in participating in our next General Plan Update meeting, please see the link below to review the upcoming Planning Commission agenda for this Monday evening starting at 6pm. This agenda includes instructions on how to participate from home. The Department Report is recommending that the Planning Commission provide a recommendation to City Council (on 5/18/21 and 5/25/21) regarding the preferred land use map for the Thousand Oaks 2045 General Plan. There will be an opportunity for public comment or written comment at these public hearings.

https://www.toaks.org/departments/city-clerk/boards-commissions/planning-commission/planning-commission-agenda

Also, a second online survey to comment on the preferred land use map is now available until May 12th. Please visit our website at www.toaks2045.org/landusealts to take the survey. Please make sure to subscribe to our email list below so you never miss a future meeting or opportunity to participate!

Thank you for your interest in the General Plan Update.

Sincerely,

General Plan Project Team

Community Development Department
www.toaks2045.org

Subscribe to our updates here!

---

From: Squarespace <form-submission@squarespace.info>
Reply-To: "seegerteam@gmail.com" <seegerteam@gmail.com>
Date: Thursday, April 15, 2021 at 12:38 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>
Subject: Form Submission - Comment Form

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.

Name: Judy Seeger
Email: seegerteam@gmail.com
Message: I suggest you put your new plan at the old Kmart in Westlake and not in Newbury park. We are already too crowded. I would love to give my opinion and be part of discussions.

Judy Seeger
Fwd: ISSUE: Planning for Thousand Oaks

Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>
Fri 4/23/2021 3:54 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: shahriar ghodsian <drlungs1@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Apr 23, 2021 at 15:11
Subject: ISSUE: Planning for Thousand Oaks
To: <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>

PLEASE – Take time and slow down the “General Plan”. As a resident and business owner it is IMPERATIVE to take time and NOT Rush on making changes to Thousand Oaks’ zoning and future development.

Concerned,

S. Ghodsian

Shahriar Ghodsian, MD | Pulmonary & Critical Care
250 Lombard St., Suite 1, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
p: (805) 370-5840 | f: (888) 823-3506
https://www.thehospitaldoctor.com/

--

Claudia Bill-de la Peña
Mayor, City of Thousand Oaks
thank you

Bob Brown <oneoutofmany@live.com>
Fri 4/23/2021 5:57 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

Dear Neighbors,

Thank you for all you are and all you do for living well.

As we plan, may we include mercy, forgiveness, and compassion.

May we uphold abundance and generosity for all, and oppose greed and acquisitiveness for those with sharp elbows and self-centeredness.

Robert Brown
799 Calle Naranjo
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
805 300 2666
FW: KMart

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Sat 4/24/2021 11:38 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Cyndi Rodriguez
Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2021 6:26 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Fwd: KMart

As requested, please forward to PC and appropriate staff

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Joan Edwards <jdithers17@gmail.com>
Date: April 24, 2021 at 12:01:44 AM PDT
To: Cyndi Rodriguez <CRodriguez@toaks.org>
Subject: KMart

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

Hi Ms. Rodriguez,
Will you kindly make copies of my comments for each of the Planning Commissioners.

To: Thousand Oaks Planning commission
Fr: Joan Edwards
Re: the 4/26 meeting of the commission

Please deny the app for the KMart property.
Existing residents should not have to pay for
Improvements of the 101/Hampshire intersection.
A traffic study must be completed to address
Evacuation plans. Thousand Oaks will experience future wildfires.
Please insure that 3 stories remains the height limit for ALL future buildings.
30 permits for new housing per acre is already
too dense for our town. Do not allow for more density.
ALL new housing in T.O. should be AFFORDABLE.
The setback should be 35’.
Mountain Ridgeline Rule

glraymond <glraymond@earthlink.net>
Sat 4/24/2021 4:34 AM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

Please use my guideline in whatever plan you decide on.
Gary Raymond

Sent via my Samsung Galaxy, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Fwd: The new developments in NP

Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>

Sat 4/24/2021 1:05 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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: Martina Snow <matasnow@gmail.com>
Subject: The new developments in NP
Date: April 23, 2021 at 9:34:41 AM PDT
To: claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com

To whom this may concern,

I'm writing to express my thoughts regarding the new proposed developments in Newbury Park. I've lived here for 8 years now and I'm already feeling like our home is becoming busier each year. We moved here because of the safety and the amazing school system so we can give our children beautiful future. This new proposal is going to bring lower income population into out city and will not only overcrowd our small quiet city but also take away the charm and safety we all feel we have here. Please don't let this go through. Our homes will loose their value and our city will also become unattractive.
Thank you.
Martina Snow
Newbury Park resident
Form Submission - Comment Form

Squarespace <form-submission@squarespace.info>
Sat 4/24/2021 5:38 PM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

Sent via form submission from Toaks2045

Name: Nancy Dean

Email: ndeanto@gmail.com

Message: More police should be hired. Already there are homeless people in Thousand Oaks. They should be cleared out and not allowed to land in Thousand Oaks and the surrounding areas.
FW: Memo re concerns on proposed GP changes

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Sun 4/25/2021 9:07 PM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

4 attachments (2 MB)

From: Mic Farris <micfarris1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>; Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>; Al Adam <AAdam@toaks.org>; Ed Jones <EJones@toaks.org>; Kevin McNamee <KMcNamee@toaks.org>
Cc: Andrew Powers <APowers@toaks.org>; Tracy Noonan <TNoonan@toaks.org>; Kelvin Parker <KParker@toaks.org>; Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Memo re concerns on proposed GP changes

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.

Mayor Bill-de la Peña, Members of the City Council, and Planning Commissioners:

Please find attached information expressing my concerns regarding the range of options available for the upcoming consideration of the General Plan update.

Please consider making these materials available regarding Item 8A of the April 26, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Thanks,
Mic Farris
FW: Memo re concerns on proposed GP changes

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Sun 4/25/2021 9:07 PM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

4 attachments (2 MB)

From: Mic Farris <micfarris1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>; Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>; Al Adam <AAdam@toaks.org>; Ed Jones <EJones@toaks.org>; Kevin McNamee <KMcNamee@toaks.org>
Cc: Andrew Powers <APowers@toaks.org>; Tracy Noonan <TNoonan@toaks.org>; Kelvin Parker <KParker@toaks.org>; Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Memo re concerns on proposed GP changes

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.

Mayor Bill-de la Peña, Members of the City Council, and Planning Commissioners:

Please find attached information expressing my concerns regarding the range of options available for the upcoming consideration of the General Plan update.

Please consider making these materials available regarding Item 8A of the April 26, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Thanks,
Mic Farris
City Councilmembers and Planning Commissioners:

I write to you in hopes that you request additional information and a greater set of options to support your decision making regarding the proposed General Plan update.

In being part of the activities relating to the General Plan update, including being a member of the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), I have concerns that the alternatives being pursued do not reflect a full range of available options.

**What Constitutes an “Inconsistency” with the General Plan?**

My primary concern stems from interpretation of recent legislation, best posed as a relevant hypothetical:

Assume a parcel is in the High Density Residential GP category allowing up to 30 du/ac and is zoned for 20 du/ac (e.g., RPD-20U) within the allowable GP range (e.g., 15-30 du/ac), so the zoning is consistent with the GP designation.

If a project meets all objective criteria for the zoning except that it proposes 30 du/ac instead of the 20 du/ac allowed by the zoning, can the City deny the project, based on the objective criteria that it exceeds the allowable density under the zoning?

The answer to this question seems critical to the path forward for the City in its General Plan update.

Previous city zoning decisions setting a maximum density within the range of the General Plan densities are consistent with the General Plan, as these are compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the plan.

However, my understanding is that a recent city interpretation has been pursued that, for the zoning to be consistent, the allowable density of the zoning cannot merely lie within the General Plan range but must match the maximum GP density. Under this interpretation, such a misalignment would be interpreted as “inconsistent” with the General Plan.

An example of a true inconsistency relating to density is where the property is designated High Density Residential (15-30 du/ac) and the zoning is RPD-10U. The zoning maximum is outside the defined range of the General Plan, so this is clearly inconsistent. Under recent changes to the Housing Accountability Act, the penalty to
the local jurisdiction is that the project could be allowed density up to 30 du/ac, per the General Plan.

In these situations (possibly those properties in the 2017 Measure E study identified with such mismatches representing GP capacity of about 5,400 units), it may be prudent to take appropriate actions to bring those in line.

To date, however, I have not heard of an instance (such as the example above) where an inconsistency resulted from differences between the maximum density of the GP land use designation and the applied zoning that is within the GP range.

To be consistent, the zoning needs to be compatible with, not identical to, the General Plan.

I am concerned that the interpretation of what constitutes an “inconsistency” with the General Plan undergirds the entire GP update discussion, as this, combined with changes to the Housing Accountability Act (AB 3194) and the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (SB 330), lead to cascade of consequences, resulting in the perceived need for redistributing tens of thousands of residential units in our General Plan update, affecting nearly every (non-open space) parcel in the city.

**Requesting A More Comprehensive Range of Options**

Rather than having only one view of what must be done, city decision makers should request their legally defensible range of options.

Given state requirements, meeting RHNA requirements (just over 2,600 units to be identified within the Housing Element) and bringing General Plan designations in line with preferred zoning (approximately 5,400 units identified by the 2017 Measure E analysis) could serve as the minimum bound for what is truly required.

In evaluating the impacts of development decisions, including those of a General Plan update, California law requires that various alternatives must be evaluated, including the “no project” alternative. No such discussion has been presented regarding the size and scope of the proposed changes – only that the redistribution of residential units must occur on the order of tens of thousands with varying alternatives in those distributions.

To ensure the Planning Commission and the City Council can make the best possible decisions and leverage the greatest degree of local control, these bodies need to be broadest range of legally defendable approaches, and the alternatives being evaluated should include a range of impacts, not merely different variations of the maximum impact.
Effects of Proposed General Plan Changes on Existing Single-Family Residential Neighborhoods

Attached are maps from the GIS tool used in comparing the current GP designations with those contemplated by the new map.

In the last slide, it overlays those neighborhoods where the current GP designation of Low Density Residential (2-4.5 dwelling units/acre) and the new GP designation is Neighborhood Low (2-6 du/ac).

If the designations overlap, these are being changed under the proposal from Low Density Residential to Neighborhood Low, which means that these neighborhoods are having their maximum densities increased by as much as 33%.

The reason why this is important: if the more recent view of zoning and GP consistency is pursued, new development in these neighborhoods must be allowed at the top of the new, higher GP density range.

There are references to the use of subdesignations within Neighborhood Low (2-4.5 and 4.5-6), but this only became known to the public last week, these are not in the GIS tool, and there will apparently be a sizable portion of the new designation at the higher subdesignation. If the average max density is 5.4 du/ac for Neighborhood Low (from the attached table in the PDF), this means 60% of the acres designated as Neighborhood Low are at 6 du/ac with 40% at 4.5 du/ac.

Unfortunately, we do not know as of today which 60% of these neighborhoods will have these higher subdesignations.

This seems to run counter to the claim that single-family neighborhoods are being protected by reducing densities "that could allow townhomes and multifamily housing to be constructed in single-family neighborhoods" (Briefing Book, pg 4).

In my view, residents should know whether the City is planning to increase the densities of their neighborhoods before the PC and Council approve these plans.

Evaluation of the Commercial Acreage Restrictions of Measure E

While much of the attention regarding the General Plan update and its adherence to relevant law (both city and state) is with respect to the residential baseline calculations, there is another Measure E constraint that must be evaluated and has not been presented to date - the limitation on increases of commercial acreage.

Before the late 1990s, the General Plan never had designations with mixed use - the designations were strictly residential or commercial designations. The "Commercial/Residential" designation, the first truly mixed use GP designation, was
added after the 1996 passage of Measure E, but I believe the designation was only applied to properties that were already commercial.

This meant that no mixed use designation added commercial acreage through its application. In fact, the approval of the Thousand Oaks Boulevard Specific Plan took pains to restrict use of some lands in the SP area to ensure no commercial uses were allowed to stay away from the Measure E commercial acreage limitation; otherwise, this would have triggered a public vote per the ordinance.

However, in the proposed General Plan update, if properties that are currently designated with non-commercial uses, such as residential or industrial or institutional, are redesignated to commercial use (whether strictly commercial or mixed use), this adds commercial acreage under Measure E and should be evaluated relative to that baseline.

**Conclusion**

There are many worthwhile ideas from the GPAC to be considered in your recommendations for the General Plan update. The future of our city will benefit from entertaining these alternatives and taking a measured approach to their implementation if that is the desired path forward.

However, to date, there has been no considered discussion about the true alternatives to the size and scope of the update itself.

I urge the Commission and the Council to seek its broadest range of options before recommending General Plan changes of such size and scope.

Sincerely,

Mic Farris
Thousand Oaks General Plan

Current Land Use Map

All Land Use Designations

- Reserve Residential (0-2 du/ac)
- Very Low Density Residential (0-2 du/ac)
- Low Density Residential (2.4-5 du/ac)
- Medium Density Residential (4.6-15 du/ac)
- High Density Residential (15-30 du/ac)

[Residential Designations Only]

https://raimi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=926fa752c4d3482abf888e166f8fd577
Reserve Residential (0-2 du/ac)
Very Low Density Residential (0-2 du/ac)
Low Density Residential (2.4-5 du/ac)
Medium Density Residential (4.6-15 du/ac)
High Density Residential (15-30 du/ac)

https://raimi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=926fa752c4d3482abf888e166f8fd577
Thousand Oaks General Plan

Current Land Use Map

Low Density Residential
Land Use Designations Only

https://raimi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=926fa752c4d3482abf888e166f8fd577
Under the proposal, approximately 80% of Low Density Residential neighborhoods appear to have the maximum density increased by up to 33% as a result of the new Neighborhood Low designation.

https://raimi.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=926fa752c4d3482abf888e166f8fd577
# TO2045 Maximum Residential Capacity

## Existing General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Maximum Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Maximum Units Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Developable Land</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Density</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park*</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Residential</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure E Pool incl. Mobile Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,836</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>81,124</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Thousand Oaks, 2017 Measure E Capacity Analysis*

* Included in the Measure E Pool

## Preferred Land Use Alternative (Citywide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Density (du/ac)</th>
<th>Maximum Units Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Rural</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>up to 1</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Very Low</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>&gt;1 - 2</td>
<td>3,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Low*</td>
<td>6,538</td>
<td>&gt;2 - 6</td>
<td>35,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Low Medium</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>7,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Medium**</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>&gt;10 - 20</td>
<td>6,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Medium High</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>&gt;20 - 30</td>
<td>7,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>up to 10</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Low</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>&gt;20 - 30</td>
<td>12,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Medium</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>&gt;30 - 45</td>
<td>3,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,033</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80,936</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Thousand Oaks, Raimi + Associates, 2021*

*Average maximum density across Neighborhood Low 5.4 du/net acre*

**Average maximum density across Neighborhood Medium 16.6 du/net acre*

## Notes:

1. The Preferred Land Use Alternative total residential acreage is lower due to a redesignation of religious institutions and schools as institutional. These were previously categorized as residential.
2. The Preferred Land Use Alternative residential numbers are draft and are subject to change as the Preferred Land Use Alternative is refined from public input and City Council direction. The final Land Use Map will total 81,124 residential units to be consistent with Measure E and SB 330.
**Housing Accountability Act Decision Matrix**

This decision tree generally describes the components of the HAA. Both affordable and market-rate developments are protected by components of the HAA. The statute contains detailed requirements that affect the applicability of the HAA to a specific housing project based on its characteristics.

---

**A) Does the project meet the definition of a housing development?**

- **YES**
- **NO: HAA does not apply**

**B) Are 20% of the total units affordable to very low- or low-income households, 100% affordable to moderate or middle income households, or an emergency shelter?**

- **YES, Subdivision (d) applies**
- **NO, Subdivision (j) applies**

**Does one of the following findings apply?**

1. Housing element is in compliance, RHNA has been met (permitted) or exceeded for all income categories proposed for project.
2. Project has a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, and there is no feasible method to mitigate or avoid impact.
3. Denial is required to comply with specific state or federal law, and there is no feasible method to comply.
4. The project is proposed on land zoned for agriculture or inadequate water or sewer.
5. The project is inconsistent with both zoning and general plan land use designation, and the project is not proposed on a site identified in the housing element, and there are sufficient sites to accommodate the RHNA or zoning for emergency shelters.

- **Yes**
  - Make finding and move to C).
- **NO**
  - Project cannot be denied w/o potential HAA violation.

**C) Is the project consistent with objective general plan, zoning, subdivision, and design standards and criteria?**

- **YES**
- **NO**

**Does the project meet general plan standards but zoning is inconsistent with general plan?**

- **YES**
  - The project is consistent with zoning
- **NO**
  - Provide written documentation of inconsistency.

**Is there a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety? and Is there no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact?**

- **YES**
  - Can make written findings to deny project or condition approval at lower-density.
- **NO**
  - The project cannot be denied w/o potential HAA violation.

---
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From: karen wilburn <karenwilburn32@outlook.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 3:38 PM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Letter for tomorrow's meeting

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 submit the attached information to the commission.

KAREN
Karenwilburn32@outlook.com
213-216-1937
4/26/2021

My name is Karen Wilburn & I have lived in Newbury Park for 22 years. I am also a member of Conejo Valley Advocates for Sensible Planning. [https://cvasp.org/](https://cvasp.org/)

During the Feb 11th & Feb 17th Zoom Office hours meetings, I asked Mr. Raimi what the ultimate build out of new dwelling units would be in the areas of change. He wasn’t able to answer my question. I would not expect any Planning Commissioner or City Council Member would be willing to make such an important decision without this information. It turns out I was right. Commissioner Newman wisely asked him the same question at the March 29th meeting. Mr. Raimi’s response (as reported by the Acorn) was it’s somewhere between 2,600-32,000 units. Commissioner Newman suggested that maybe there could be some narrowing of this range. Based on the staff report that was just released the ultimate buildout in the areas of change would be 22,460 dwelling units. 15,836 of these would be mixed use. Since we don’t currently have much mixed use in the city, I can make the assumption that these would be additional units. Let me state that another way. This new map could potentially result in 15,000 additional housing units in an area the size of 484 acres or 3% of our city. This is not what the vision of Thousand Oaks & Measure E was founded on.

We understand the need for more housing, including affordable units & state requirements. What we don’t understand is why we are taking drastic measures that could move 15,000 unbuilt units into 4 small areas. Once we’ve made these changes the state may pass more laws in the future that prevent us from undoing it. It’s like someone is asking to borrow $10,000 & we’re saying, here take $50,000. These changes to the general plan should be done gradually over time. Also the city must absolutely hold developers feet to the fire regarding low income units. If they don’t provide them projects should not be approved!

Our group believes in sensible planning for all areas of the city but I’d like to comment on Newbury Park in particular. I’ve provided the commission with a google earth picture of Newbury Park demonstrating how much development has taken place in this part of the city since 1994. We simply can’t take this added housing density South of the Freeway.

Sincerely,

Karen Wilburn
2837 Denise St
Newbury Park, Ca 91320

A member of Conejo Valley Advocates for Sensible Planning
[https://cvasp.org/](https://cvasp.org/)
Rancho Conejo South of 101. The #’s below correspond to the chart & show the impact of mixed use housing in the
This is based on the alternative mapped released on April 16th. Acreage was obtained for the TO Zoning Map site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Range of # of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36 acres vacant land Low Density 2-4.5 du/acre max buildout 162 units</td>
<td>50/50 Combo Neighborhood Low-Medium (6-10 du height 35 2 story’) Mixed Low (20-30 du height 50’ 4 story)</td>
<td>468-720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commi-10 acres Baskin Robbins &amp; Library area</td>
<td>Mixed Low 20-30 du .25 FAR Max height 50’ (4 story)</td>
<td>200-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commi-Center across from park &amp; Center with Smart n Final</td>
<td>Commercial Neighborhood Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kohl’s (11 acres) Old school site (10 acres) 21 total</td>
<td>Mixed Low 20-30 du .25 FAR Max height 50’ (4 story)</td>
<td>420-630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commi-Areas. Marriot (3 story) &amp; down to Motel 6</td>
<td>Commi Regional 2.00 FAR Max height 75’ (6 story)</td>
<td>1218-1910 (current zoning is 162 units for this entire area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total “theoretical” range of dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the new map for the area from the Oaks Mall to the 23 freeway showing new mixed use designations. The acreage is based on TO zoning maps. Theoretical buildout could be 4570-6855 in this area.
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Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Sun 4/25/2021 9:07 PM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

-----Original Message-----
From: William Koehler <wdklaw1@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Cc: resp-mmn87-oylzg-z6vgj@conejochamber.chambermaster.com; ahaverstock@conejochamber.org
Subject: Item 8A on Monday’s PC meeting

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.

Honorable Chair & Commissioners:

My name is Bill Koehler. While not a resident of Thousand Oaks, I am a long time resident of the Conejo Valley, own property in this community, am a current Board member of the Greater Conejo Chamber of Commerce, and a former Planning Commissioner/Chairman, as well as a former City Councilperson and former Mayor for the City of Agoura Hills.

Unfortunately, prior plans prevent my virtual appearance at Monday evenings meeting, but felt the need to share my thoughts with you as you review and make your recommendations to the City Council regarding the Preferred Land Use Map before you tonight.

While I support the Chambers recommendations as outlined in Mrs Borja’s April 23 letter to the Commission, I would also like to point out that the reduction of mixed use medium density, and the total elimination of high density/ high density mixed use from the map would be a severe blow to providing much needed current as well as future workforce as well as entry level housing to the community. As the affordability of housing in the Conejo Valley is rapidly becoming unattainable, the failure to plan for a way that our workforce, as well as our children and grandchildren can afford to live and work in this community will all but disappear.

It has been my experience that the word “high density” carries with it only negative connotations; as well as something to avoid for fear the Conejo Valley will end up resembling the valley immediately to our east. I believe if situated correctly, which the Alternative Land Map #1 seemed to do, you provide the City Council with more “tools in their toolbox” to meet the various housing needs and price points necessary for a community to thrive.

While I have focused my attention on the reintroduction of high density/ high density mixed use, the arguments I have presented also hold true for mixed use medium, and I urge the Commission to reintroduce and support both to the City Council.

I thank you for your consideration of my comments.
Bill koehler
Agoura Hills

Sent from my iPad
April 25, 2021
City of Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
Item 8A: General Plan Update - Consideration of the Preferred Land Use Map.

The Conejo Climate Coalition has a vision for a more people-centric, walkable, connected Thousand Oaks. This vision for Neighborhood Town Squares will facilitate reductions in Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while simultaneously increasing housing that is actually affordable.

- **IDENTIFY** an existing, conveniently-located commercial "center" in each neighborhood.
- **REVITALIZE** existing vacant spaces around a central, outdoor, public-gathering space (Town Square) in each neighborhood "center".
- **BEAUTIFY** and green each Town Square with trees, plants, gardens, and parkland, as well as outdoor furniture that encourages people to gather in small groups
- **BUILD** housing that's "affordable by design" within walking/cycling distance of each Town Square. (Allowing higher density while maintaining the current allowable heights for residential, and incorporating shared common indoor and outdoor spaces, will result in apartments that are necessarily smaller, more affordable (by virtue of their size), and more numerous - meeting our city's state-mandated RHNA requirements faster in fewer developments.)
- **POWER** each Town Square with clean, inexhaustible, solar-generated, electric energy. Require all new, remodeled, or renovated development to be all-electric (no natural/fossil gas lines or appliances). This further reduces construction costs by eliminating the expense of installing dual energy system connections, and operating costs as electric appliances are far more energy-efficient
than natural gas-powered appliances, providing significant savings on energy utility bills.

- **JOIN** each Town Square to its neighborhood via a network of dedicated walking and cycling paths.
- **CONNECT** every Town Square and major attraction citywide through an all-electric public-transit system.
- **LINK** Thousand Oaks to nearby regional cities through strategically located intercity transit hubs.

For a more complete description of CCC’s vision for Neighborhood Town Squares, please visit: [https://www.conejoclimate.org/vision](https://www.conejoclimate.org/vision)

Realizing this vision in the land-use update requires we take advantage of housing opportunities in places like the Janss Marketplace, the Oaks Mall, and the village centers. A land-use survey conducted by the city suggested that 16% of respondents preferred adding mixed-use (with multifamily housing) on the portion of Moorpark Rd., which includes the Janss Marketplace, and 10% preferred allowing the entire area to be developed with mixed-use, for a total of 26%. An even percentage of respondents preferred allowing some (26%) or all (10%) of the village centers to be converted to mixed-use with residential uses, for a total of 36%. The preferred land-use alternative, however, sited some mixed use in the Janss Marketplace and in the Oaks Mall, but not in the village centers, despite favorability in the survey results being greater for the latter. Additionally, during the General Plan Advisory Committee workshop on 4/21/21 many community and GPAC members expressed support for including housing in both the village centers and in the Janss and Oaks malls on the preferred land use map.

The benefits of a more broadly distributed and diverse housing stock include: 1) more housing that is affordable by design and will always remain so, 2) a reduced concentration of development along the main artery of Thousand Oaks Boulevard, resulting in less traffic congestion, less potential spillover of parking into adjacent neighborhoods, and faster, safer egress during disaster evacuation situations, 3) the creation of walkable areas where more residents can accomplish their routine errands without driving, resulting in reduced vehicle miles travelled, fewer greenhouse gas emissions, less air pollution, and improved health outcomes, and 4) using existing, vacant commercial retail space to best advantage.
In addition to the Janss Marketplace and Oaks Mall, the Conejo Climate Coalition recommends that the Planning Commission also consider zoning the village centers for mixed use that allows for residential and commercial use.

Thank you.

Gordon Clint, Clint Fultz, Faith Grant, Kat Selm, Rose Ann Witt, and Silvana Zucca
Co-Founders
Conejo Climate Coalition
FW: Letter from Former Planning Commissioners re GP Update

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
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From: Mic Farris <micfarris1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 9:48 PM
To: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>; Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>; Al Adam <AAdam@toaks.org>; Ed Jones <EJones@toaks.org>; Kevin McNamee <KMcNamee@toaks.org>
Cc: Andrew Powers <APowers@toaks.org>; Tracy Noonan <TNoonan@toaks.org>; Kelvin Parker <KParker@toaks.org>; Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Letter from Former Planning Commissioners re GP Update

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.

Mayor Bill-de la Peña, Members of the City Council, and Planning Commissioners:

Please find attached a letter from former Thousand Oaks Planning Commissioners, offering recommendations for your upcoming consideration of the General Plan update.

Please consider making this letter available regarding Item 8A of the April 26, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Thanks,
Mic Farris

Additionally:
Nora Aidukas
Marilyn Carpenter
Janet Wall
Amy Walker-Davis
Laura Lee Custodio
To our fellow Thousand Oaks residents,

As former Planning Commissioners, we feel a strong connection to our amazing city and are concerned with the wholesale changes being contemplated for our General Plan today.

While we advocate for a slow growth approach, we also recognize we need to do our part to address the state’s housing crisis.

However, the proposal to increase the development plan for our city from our current 48,000 residential units to support over 81,000 units represents the most significant proposed expansion of development in the city’s six-decade-long history.

There is nothing that requires the City Council to do what would be a complete overhaul of our General Plan that has served our great city well for the last 50 years. Instead of 33,000 units, the city should limit the increase to 5,400 new residential units, the amount the City finds it must add to make its zoning consistent with the General Plan and double the amount the State requires.

We ask that these changes be in line with what the people of Thousand Oaks value for their city. Among those key values:

- Open space should be protected.
- Existing neighborhoods should be preserved.
- Building heights should be low in profile.
- The pace of growth should be measured.
- Our fiscal approach should remain sound, especially when supporting needed infrastructure.

We believe these values are still important today.

The development policies of our city and the decisions made by our Council and the voters to uphold them have served as the north star for the city’s maturity.

We ask that your Council defend these policies as other Councils have in the face of intense development pressures.
The very first goal of the Thousand Oaks General Plan approved in 1970 was: "To enhance and preserve the spaciousness and attractiveness of the Conejo Valley in accommodating future growth." Furthering that goal, the voters approved and re-approved measures requiring public votes when parks and open space are proposed to be converted to other uses, when our city's urban boundary is extended, or when significant increases to residential and commercial areas are proposed.

The General Plan and its implementation by city leaders, past and present, have given us the remarkable city we have today, demonstrating our collective desire to preserve the quality of life for the residents of Thousand Oaks.

It is something we should not take for granted.

We certainly can change it, but in our opinion, we should not throw out the General Plan with its goals and policies that provide the foundation for our enviable lifestyle.

The proposal to apply new General Plan designations to nearly every property within the city is far more extensive than is required or desired by the community and presents significant potential risk to the city's historically well-planned approach. Instead, we recommend

a. Locate the new 5,400 units in the following areas of the city only:

b. The Oaks Mall / Janss Marketplace area

i. The economic viability of large retail shopping centers and movie theater complexes are at risk due to online retail companies such as Amazon and streaming entertainment services such as Netflix.

ii. The effects of COVID-19 on the economy have accelerated these changes.

iii. Without changes, the City may be forced to make reactive decisions in the future to maintain the vibrancy of this area.

iv. This area is the most natural "downtown" area in Thousand Oaks, best able to handle such changes allowing for mixture of uses.

c. The Rancho Conejo area, limited to north of the 101 freeway

i. The biotechnology sector is a unique opportunity to keep Thousand Oaks a center of global innovation
ii. The window for supporting a burgeoning biotech industry, whose higher-paying jobs in turn support broader economic activity in the city, is limited, so a window of opportunity should be recognized for any prioritized action.

iii. Remain true to the principle of preserving neighborhoods.

iv. Respects the physical constraints of undevelopable parcels such as steep slopes, flooding, and infrastructure capacity.

v. Incorporate neighborhood parks for the more than ten thousand new residents these new units will bring as we have always done in the past. This allows new residents to enjoy nearby open space with a place to recreate without over-crowding existing parks.

d. Building heights for these areas should be limited, with average building heights limited to 35'

Conclusion

We believe that Thousand Oaks is one of the most remarkable cities in which we've ever had the pleasure to live.

We are proud to have been a part of our city's development, and we offer a path for continued pride in the future.

We should all be proud of the city that has arisen from the plan developed fifty years ago. We hope that the decisions today are viewed fifty years in the future with the same sense of admiration.

Mic Farris
Nora Aldakas
Marilyn Carpenter
Janet Wall
Amy Walker-Davis
Laura Lee Custodio
THE CITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS!

Shawn Moradian <shawndmoradian@gmail.com>
Sun 4/25/2021 10:05 AM
To: Kelvin Parker <KPParker@toaks.org>; Michael Forbes <MForbes@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>; Andrew Powers <APowers@toaks.org>; Tracy Noonan <TNoonan@toaks.org>; Mark Towne <MTowne@toaks.org>; Haider Alawami <HAlawami@toaks.org>
Cc: Al Adam <AAAdam@toaks.org>; Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>; Ed Jones <EJones@toaks.org>; Kevin McNamee <KMcNamee@toaks.org>; claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com>

Dear GP Team:

For the record...

Attached, please find a copy of the flyer that was hand delivered to all of the neighbors in the Casa Conejo area by Karen Wilburn on 4/24/21. Please recall she is the same person that wrote the letter to the planning commission and Acorn last month alleging survey manipulation. Whatever happens from this point on, the City owns responsibly!

This is not a complete statement on this matter; we reserve all rights.
Introducing Conejo Valley Advocates for Sensible Planning
https://cvasp.org/  Email us at cvasp.org@outlook.com
Follow us https://www.facebook.com/cvasp2021/

Our mission is to hold the city accountable for amendments to the General Plan.

We understand more housing is needed & some of it must be affordable. However, we do not agree with the wide-reaching changes proposed to the General Plan land use. We believe it overreaches & the city is using mandates by the State of California as an excuse to change the future look of our city. All that is necessary for the City is to approve the location of the required 2621 units as required for this 8 year RHNA cycle. The suggestion for Newbury Park is an example of what results from such rushed poor planning. Once these changes are made to our General Plan, we may be unable to undo them.

While the mission of our group is citywide, we understand there is significant interest from the residents of Newbury Park for proposals S of the 101. This includes the Borchard property at the end of Alice & sites near Kelley & Newbury Rd. I am happy to inform you that the new survey specifically separates out these areas by asking the following questions. Perhaps this will help put to bed the “The Shenanigans” that there is support for development of the Borchard property.

Rancho Conejo - South of Highway 101

2. Public comments and the survey results indicate support for designating the vacant 37-acre property, south of Highway 101 and west of Borchard Drive, to allow mixed-use development, and also support for retaining the existing single-family residential designation. Which of the following best reflects your vision for the future of the property?

☐ Designate the property for mixed-use development
☒ Retain the existing single-family residential designation
☐ Designate a portion of the property as mixed-use and a portion as residential, as reflected in the preferred land use alternative

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: The preferred land use alternative is generally consistent with my vision for the future of the Rancho Conejo area south of Highway 101.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neutral
☐ Disagree
☒ Strongly disagree

Review the new map & take the new survey before May 12th. Links to these can be found on our website.

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE. THE CITY COUNCIL MEETS ON MAY 18TH & MAY 25TH.
FW: General Plan

Katie Morris <KMorris@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 7:05 AM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

From: Al Adam
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2021 1:37 PM
To: Katie Morris <KMorris@toaks.org>
Subject: Fwd: General Plan

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Denice Stouffer <dstouffer11@verizon.net>
Date: April 25, 2021 at 1:08:07 PM PDT
To: Al Adam <AAdam@toaks.org>
Subject: General Plan

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.

We would like to strongly object to the current changes to the general plan of adding 80,000 plus new residences. This will unalterably change the makeup and living quality of our beautiful Thousand Oaks/Newbury Park communities. I understand that there are legal obligations to provide more housing but there has got to be a better way. This new plan is just unacceptable. Please don't listen to the developers about how wonderful this plan is. Their survey did not enable a vote negatively against any of the options which is why the survey wasn't completed by us.

Denice and Gary Stouffer
FW: Oppose SB 378
Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 6:46 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

-----Original Message-----
From: Michele Patrick <shine4hisglory@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 6:26 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Oppose SB 378

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.

Hello

I oppose SB 378 in our community.

Thank you
Michele Patrick
FW: High Density, Ow Income Housing

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 6:47 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: William Hicks <william.hicks@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 2:31 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Cc: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com>; Al Adam <AAdam@toaks.org>; Ed Jones <ejassoc@verizon.net>; Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>; Kevin McNamee <KMcNamee@toaks.org>
Subject: High Density, Ow Income Housing

Dear Council Members:

If I had preferred high density/low income housing I would not have moved from The San Fernando Valley over 40 years ago to Thousand Oaks. Please don’t burden the future of Thousand Oaks citizens with attached wall communities that few people desire to live in. If this is what you want for your future in Thousand Oaks set the example; sell your single family dwellings and move into this kind of housing on Thousand Oaks Blvd. By doing so, you can either walk to work on your “pedestrian friendly” streets or use public transportation to go to work and leisure, like you want future citizens of Thousand Oaks to do.

William “Bill” Hicks
377 Knollwood Drive
Newbury Park, CA.91320
1(805) 807-2686

william.hicks@roadrunner.com
FW: Written Comments for Agenda 8A

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 6:50 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Thomas White <tawhitejr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 2:21 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Written Comments for Agenda 8A

**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.

4/26/2021

City of Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
Chair Buss, Vice Chair Newman, and Commissioners Lanson, Link, and McMahon

Dear Commissioners,

Please postpone the recommendation of any alternative for the following reasons:

**A. All the alternatives are presented as a “Beauty Contest”, without cost or environmental impact information.**

Without understanding short-term or long-term impacts, one cannot make a valid choice among alternatives. With the infrastructure costs and the environmental impacts to the quality of life, the public could make an informed choice.

**B. The survey results appears to be biased, as the results are from the interested individuals, not from a “random sample” of the general population of Thousand Oaks.**

Early on, interested individuals participated in the Plan Update process. This survey of alternative preferences should have inputs from the general population, not from the already-involved participants. A new survey, using generally accepted practices, and interviewing a reasonably large “random sample” subset of Thousand Oaks residents, should be performed.

**C. The general information wrongly asserts that the 81,124 maximum number of housing units will not occur.**

This value of 81,124 housing units in Thousand Oaks is determined by summing the products of the residential zoning areas times the allowable units per acre density. The current as-built number of housing units in Thousand Oaks is about 48,159, with fewer remaining buildable lots. These alternatives add about 22,460 units, to a new allowable build-out of 70,619 units. However, experience shows that given a financial opportunity, creative people will find ways to achieve increases in housing density, or ways to build in previously set-aside land. All long-term planning should be based upon the 81,124 maximum number of housing units.

**D. All assumptions about economic growth are obsolete & unrealistic.**

The entire United States, and even the global economy, has been turned on its head for the last 12-plus months, due to the COVID-19 restrictions.

The consequences have been upsets and changes to the way many Americans work, buy consumer goods, and socialize. A significant number of American workers now work from home, and no longer need commercial office space. People are now buying a significant percentage of their consumer purchases over the internet: cars, refrigerators, TV sets, etc. The consequences have been a major downsizing, with impacts to the alternatives, rendering them obsolete & unrealistic.

**E. All of these alternatives do not appear to offer low-cost housing for people working in the restaurant or similar service businesses, or in early-career white-collar jobs.**

The alternatives propose that low-cost housing could be obtained via a higher units per acre, but this only one of many factors. There is no discussion of the other factors that impact housing costs. Using a system-approach to identify the path to
low-cost housing must be a part of this alternative land uses effort.

Thank you,
Thomas White
3735 Bailey Court, Thousand Oaks 91320
FW: COMMENT ON THE GENERAL PLAN

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 6:52 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: amcneill@hush.com <amcneill@hush.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 12:07 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: COMMENT ON THE GENERAL PLAN

Dear City Council,

Increasingly the citizenry is witnessing over reach of elected officials on a daily basis. It has become apparent there is a not so subtle and outright hostile war between those that have been elected to represent the people and the people themselves. Elected officials, such as the city council and I include the board of supervisors seem to have forgotten that they are servants of the people and they take orders from the citizenry.

As my employee I charge you to end the General Plan for it is being foisted upon the citizens of Thousand Oaks without public discussion or open debate with the majority. Your idea to double the population and to crowd the main street with over 80,000 units is not up to you to decide such a mammoth undertaking that uproots the lives of an entire community. There is no need at this juncture to go through the obvious problems with such a plan. It is your duty to bring together the community for public discussion. You have failed to do this. This plan must be aborted immediately. Until the citizens have had a vote on a matter of such proportion and expense not one more movement forward shall be made.

I do not appreciate your deciding when and how we, the citizenry, may address you. I now charge you to give the public reasonable notification of meetings of at least 14 days prior to meetings. We are to be present at all meetings and emails must be accepted at any time leading up to the meeting not a 10 am deadline on the day of the meeting with a two day notice. This is obstruction of the public's right to involvement and supervision of the management of the community for which they subsidize. It is now time for the public to lay down new rules given the elected public representatives have found ways to prevent the public FULL and EASY ACCESS.

We will be following this further as the numbers of outraged and dissatisfied citizens are expecting responsive action to this most significant matter.

Al McNeill
Thousand Oaks
FW: SB 378

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 7:42 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: chris cheehan <glasswizard2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 7:39 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: SB 378

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 am writing to strongly oppose the hearing concerning SB 378 with only a few days notice to the public. I am a long term resident of Thousand Oaks, and believe this topic should be taken up for a public hearing with enough notice that ALL residents of Thousand Oaks can present their voice against this expansion without public discourse and review of all aspects of its' impact to our community. Many people who own property here STILL feel uncomfortable in public settings, and many more DON'T have access to Zoom to be able to comment and watch with the feedback that is needed and required for public hearings.

I ask, at the very least, this matter be sidelined until the government offices can be open for in person discussions, where elected officials can SEE and HEAR their constituents.
We are at a crossroads as a community. We can either choose purposeful, progressive growth, or stay stagnant in classist and elitist values.

There has been a growing fear heard during GPAC meetings and seen in the survey results regarding the land use map: “you’re turning us into the Valley.” The only way that will happen is if we do not purposefully plan and create flexibility for growth, because growth will happen. The San Fernando Valley did not grow with purpose; it grew out of crisis and necessity without the forethought and planning needed to support it.

Along with this unsubstantiated fear of urban sprawl, community members have been voicing “not in my backyard” sentiments about more flexible zoning. Some residents of Newbury Park are fervently against mixed-use zoning at the vacant lot in Rancho Conejo, which has the most potential to be built out with care and purpose by a lifetime resident who cares deeply about the vision of our city.

**We at 805 Resistance** are asking that this lot at Rancho Conejo be given complete mixed-use, low to medium density zoning and that any issues with the community are discussed at the project planning level. Split zoning acts as an immediate barrier to the potential of this lot, which will prevent the ability for affordable housing due to cost and division of plans.

**We also ask** that focus be shifted from rezoning at The Oaks Mall and the Westlake Village Promenade, and put towards the village centers and Kmart property. The village centers are an opportunity to create more housing for empty nesters, older citizens, and young professionals, which will create more inventory of single-family homes for families looking to grow. Increasing the density allowance at the Kmart property is critical to create more affordable housing.

**Exclusionary zoning perpetuates segregation.** If the City of Thousand Oaks is committed to equity and racial justice, it will create a new General Plan that allows for purposeful growth, affordable housing, and supporting folks of all identities.

Sources and further reading:
1. Habitat for Humanity: 5 Policy Solutions to Advance Racial Equity in Housing
   https://www.habitat.org/stories/5-policy-solutions-advance-racial-equity-housing
2. National Low Income Housing Coalition: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH)
   https://nlihc.org/racial-equity-and-fair-housing
Equity means affordable housing
Call for mixed-use zoning and higher density at Rancho Conejo, Kmart, and Village Center

1. Johanna Jones    Thousand Oaks
2. Linda Jones      Thousand Oaks
5. Nissa Able       Thousand Oaks
6. Christer Schmidt Thousand Oaks
7. Kat Selm         Thousand Oaks
8. Rachel Schmidt   Thousand Oaks
10. Carolina Robles Thousand Oaks
11. Sarah Bunter    Thousand Oaks
12. Ryan Bunter     Thousand Oaks
13. Sarah Halloran  Thousand Oaks
14. Jessica Quintanilla Thousand Oaks
15. Chelsea Mitchell Thousand Oaks
16. Erin Bell       Thousand Oaks
17. Carissa Shaw    Thousand Oaks
18. Kimberly Candreva Thousand Oaks
19. Nicole Living   Thousand Oaks
20. Sara Capella    Thousand Oaks
22. Katelin Johnson Thousand Oaks
23. Anna Guerin     Newbury Park
24. Ava Coates      Newbury Park
25. Chris Tieman    Newbury Park
26. Amanda Thomas   Newbury Park
27. Karrie DeMarco  Newbury Park
28. Thomas Krueger  Westlake Village
29. Rebekah Hinckley Camarillo
30. Grant Keller    Moorpark
31. Ian Schantz     Simi Valley
32. Karen Wolff     Simi Valley
33. Rebecca Albarran Simi Valley
34. Margaret Sanborn Simi Valley
35. Elizabeth Stagner Simi Valley
36. Joe Ayala       Simi Valley
37. Sofia Bagdasaryan Simi Valley
38. Natasha Banks   Port Hueneume
39. Michele Quain   Ventura
40. Meghan Kwast    Ventura
FW: 8A General Plan Update (GPA) 2019-70760 - Consideration of the Preferred Land Use Map

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 8:08 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Brie Zenl <briezentl@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 8:06 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: 8A General Plan Update (GPA) 2019-70760 - Consideration of the Preferred Land Use Map

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 am writing in on behalf of my family, who have been casa conejo homeowners since 2007. We purchased our home due to it's price and location on a quiet culdesac tucked back off Alice drive because we desired this type of quiet, single home neighborhood for raising a family.

My concern with the development of the area of Borchard and the 101 freeway, is that Alice drive is currently the only access point. I have not been able to find any framework for infrastructure and planned access to this piece of land, and would like to have some sort of idea what amount of increased traffic (if any) this would bring to our established neighborhood as well as those surrounding (ie. Casa conejo and Cameo tracts).

While I would love to keep the area off 101 and Borchard open space, I do understand that the argument is not whether to allow building on it, but rather, what type. I would prefer, out of all the options provided thus far, to keep the lower density single family home designation for this land. I hope whatever is built will maintain the same small town feel my family loves about the area we chose to buy our home in.

I am opposed to high and medium density mixed use buildings, and find that we already have quite a bit within walking distance in terms of services, local bars and restaurants. With that said, I don't feel we need to build the Borchard/101 area into a busy hub.

Brie Zenl (casa conejo resident)
The people on the pro-growth side of the General Plan seem to be a coordinated group that has had time to become familiar with the planning procedures. Those of us against it were unfortunately complacent, thinking that most people want preserve our views and what's left of the semi-rural atmosphere, as has been shown by every previous survey of residents.

This puts us at a disadvantage because we are learning the process now. For instance, the 10 AM deadline for submitting a comment is in the agenda, seems to be nowhere else, and I had no reason to read the agenda.

I'm going to address the surveys, the plan to redistribute existing density, and a new (at least to me) idea on mixed use.

I think the two recent surveys were incredibly biased in favor of height and density. Asking if people prefer a hypothetical 4, 6, 8 or 10 story building and then interpreting votes for the minimum option as people being in favor of high density construction seems...creative. Questions that only asking about density numbers but don't mention the impact on building heights is deceptive to those that haven't had time or inclination to read all of the background documents.

I believe the non-built density in single family home neighborhoods should remain where it is.

The state says that cities can't stop the building of ADUs, but building them adds density to existing neighborhoods. It initially said that those units don't count towards meeting building requirements. But the state considering changing it so that they would count. Leaving the density spread out would allow any new ADUs to help meet mandated building requirements if the state makes that change.

The city's approach of gathering any unused DUs and consolidating them results in high density in a few areas. If that is done, SB 330 would mean that the density in those areas couldn't be lowered later. It also makes high buildings a requirement, since that will be the only way to meet that approved density.

Most people are against those high buildings, but surveys that take hours to prepare for and over an hour to take are an impediment to getting results from most people.

In spite of the commendable outreach by the GPAC, many people are only now finding out that the plans include high density and high buildings, and about the scope of the changes. I don't know how the outreach could have been done better, but the fact remains that it didn't work. If you browse comments on Nextdoor, especially in the Newbury Park area, you'll find hundreds of comments asking how did this happen and how do we stop it.
Those of us that don't normally deal with this process are baffled as to why we can't get answers about how traffic, water and other infrastructure issues addressed. We have to approve high density and then figure out how to do it? That doesn't make sense to us. We already have traffic gridlock and a water shortage, so adding housing seems contrary to common sense.

I've read many comments from people that we should used existing empty buildings for housing.

While it obviously can't be immediately converted, I suspect that current zoning would make it impossible. I would like to suggest adding a new land use designation that would allow adding dwelling units within industrial areas.

This is not "mixed-use" as it is being defined in the the proposed General Plan update. All of those come with changes to allowed height. This would merely allow dwellings within existing buildings.

Thanks for the work that has been done. I know this has been a long process and many hours have been spent trying to get it right. However a lot of people feel like they are not being heard at this point.

Paul Blakelock

OPunWide@hotmail.com

Newbury Park
FW: CITY Planning meeting TONIGHT!

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 9:31 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: chris Bailey <pumperone793@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: CITY Planning meeting TONIGHT!

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.

Very concerned when I heard a hearing has been set for TODAY concerning SB 378 with NO NOTICE. My understanding is the notice went out on Friday, 3 DAYS AGO!!

Is that even legal? If it is, with the pandemic the notification process should at least be 14 days. This makes it impossible to be able to prepare and present arguments against the decision. Zoom isn't adequate for public conversations. I moved here 5 years ago, and if I had any idea Thousand Oaks would consider high density housing, and destroy the small town feel of this community I would have NEVER moved here.

Now I feel trapped because I bought a home here.

I think this item should be taken off calendar until a more adequate notice can be given to the public, and more work done to see what the costs of high density housing will do to Thousand Oaks.

The city should be fully open before this matter is put on any agenda

Thank you
FW: Housing Comments For Tonight's Agenda

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 9:32 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Kimmarie Taylor <kimmarietaylor@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 9:24 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Housing Comments For Tonight’s Agenda

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.

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Kimmarie Taylor and I live at 2625 Michael Drive. This is the home I lived in as a child and I currently reside here with my husband and three children. My house is directly across from EARThS Elementary School and backs up to the "wetlands." The amount of traffic that has increased on my street, along Borchard Road, and Wendy Road throughout the years is very concerning. We no longer walk to the park across from the library as we have had too many close calls with the amount of traffic in the intersection and I do not allow my children to cross Wendy for the same reason. Getting from Newbury Park to the other side of Thousand Oaks on the freeway is slow going throughout most of the day due to the bottleneck of traffic that occurs from Borchard to the 23 freeway. It is frustrating that on a recent 6 hour drive to Northern California that the most traffic and slowing we faced during the entire drive was the traffic on the freeway closest to our house both going and coming.

I share the traffic and congestion concerns with you in light of the city's housing and mixed-use plans. I realize that the city is tasked with finding housing. However, it is imperative that the city step back and support the slow-growth desires of the residents that moved here in the first place, not the desires of developers out to make a profit on putting as many living spaces into a small parcel of land as possible. Allowing mid to high density housing on the "wetlands" parcel will do just this. The only access to the land will turn a quiet neighborhood into a busy thoroughfare and an already congested street (Michael Drive) into an even bigger traffic problem. During the school year, the traffic light at Borchard is already backed up into the residential area of Michael Drive every morning and every afternoon. Adding mid-to high density housing traffic trying to turn left onto Michael Drive will drive the car traffic even further into the neighborhood and make dropping off and picking up students at EARThS even more difficult. The safety of young children will definitely be at stake. Please, this needs to be a bigger consideration than just trying to meet housing numbers required by the state. If the "wetlands" needs to be developed, then please only allow development that is consistent with the neighborhood that is immediately adjacent and across the wash---- low density, single family homes.

I took the first survey that was put out by the city. While I appreciate the efforts of the city, the amount of time and information overload it required for a resident to read through the materials and then take the survey was very time consuming. Since I am directly impacted, I was happy to spend the time looking at the survey. My number one complaint was that the survey was set up so residents could vote no to their own backyard areas, but turn around and vote yes to areas that don't affect them. This promotes NIMBYism and skews data collection.

Please, please, please do not approve any mixed-use or medium to high density housing in the wetlands area. This area should be low density, single family homes only.

Thank you for your consideration,
FW: Tonight's Planning Hearing

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 9:37 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: concrete pumper <biodieselpumper@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Tonight's Planning Hearing

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 looked online today to discover there is a hearing tonight to discuss high density housing in Thousand Oaks.

I am blown away!

I am very involved in the environment, and most definitely oppose high density housing in the CONEJO Valley. Have you seen the traffic in the valley?

With such short notice. I can't call in tonight, or be involved in any Zoom effort to participate.

Are you aware that ZOOM doesn't meet the requirements of a public hearing? It's just a stopgap to get government workings through the pandemic.

There is litigation currently being worked in a number of municipalities that will demand many municipalities in various States walk back long term decisions made in the Zoom environment, because it denies access to constituents in even the best circumstances. Please postpone this hearing until Thousand Oaks opens up.
**FW: Monday night planning meeting**

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 9:37 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

---

From: Family Chabot <family@chabots.org>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 9:31 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Monday night planning meeting

**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.

Dear City Council,

I moved to Newbury Park in 1990 and have witnessed this lovely community be over developed for years now. I strongly oppose the General Plan and its huge emphasis on high density, low income housing. Thousand Oaks is too crowded already and you want to double its population!

I don't appreciate a 48 hour notice of the Monday night planning meeting. It's as if you want to steamroll ahead regardless of what the citizens want.

Laura Chabot
4018 Barcelona Place
Newbury Park, CA 91320
FW: Agenda item 8A general planning

Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 9:39 AM
To: Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>
Cc: Michael Forbes <MForbes@toaks.org>

From: Stephanie Steiner <slpytc@live.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 9:09 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Agenda item 8A general planning

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.

To the city council of Thousand Oaks

I am wanting to bring to light and question the petition that will be presented at tonight's meeting. In my opinion this petition will show a biased and skewed vision of support for high density development mainly in the area of Borchard (north and south).

I have a few questions regarding the validity of the results.

1. Where was the petition offered for signing?
   *if areas of lower income were targeted the validity of the petition should be questioned.
2. What was said to individuals to promote signatures?
   *if rent amounts were given then this immediately invalidates signatures due to US code 1038 False information and hoaxes. These amounts can not be substantiated and if promise of amounts were given individuals presenting the petition should be held liable for spreading false information.

I understand the need for growth and providing affordable housing for individuals who are of lower income. However, I question the definition being used to distinguish these projects as "affordable". Unless the rent/ cost of living is equal to the definition of low income housing provided by the Ventura County low income housing standards, one should question validity of the assumption this will fulfill the state mandates.

Stephanie Steiner

Get Outlook for Android
Good morning Planning Commission Members,

I appreciate your time in reading my comment on the current land use planning for the General Plan. I am sure you have received many comments and your consideration is appreciated.

I am writing to express my support for including additional mixed-use residential in the General Plan update to allow for smart growth that includes affordable housing and non-exclusionary zoning to support our entire community, including people of all identities and income ranges. As the City of Thousand Oaks has set equity, diversity and inclusion as a top goal for the General Plan update, housing zoning, and the ability to create more affordable housing, will be a large component towards that goal.

Specifically, I am requesting that the Rancho Conejo Alice property be zoned for full mixed-use residential. Split zoning or residential zoning will not allow for the flexibility needed to meet the needs of our community. We cannot afford to waste the largest undeveloped space in our community, when we desperately need various types of housing for members of our community at all income levels.

I am also requesting that the city focus on mixed use in the village centers and increase the density at the Kmart property.

As a lifelong Newbury Park resident, raising my young family here, I want to see our community grow smartly and continue to diversify. The elitist and NIMBY attitudes that have been expressed by many community members are a detriment to our growth. Thousand Oaks needs to attract young people and people of diverse backgrounds and income levels to live here in order to keep tax revenues here and continue to grow into the next 20 years. Affordable housing and more types of housing options are desperately needed, and if we refuse to rise to this challenge we will suffer as a city in the years to come. I look forward to Thousand Oaks growing and thriving and being a wonderful place for my children to grow up, just as it was for me.

Thank you.
Brittany Starkey
Form Submission - Comment Form

Squarespace <form-submission@squarespace.info>
Mon 4/26/2021 9:54 AM
To: General Plan <GP@toaks.org>

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.

Sent via form submission from Toaks2045

Name: William Utermohlen

Email: wilute@verizon.net

Message: If your plan is to traffic torture the residents of Newbury Park along the Borchard Road/Rancho Conejo corridor, you couldn't have come up with a more excellent plan. This area already sees a large influx of traffic from Amgen every weekday morning. In addition, the traffic from the EARTHS magnet school combined with the Sequoia Middle School dropoffs make it easily the busiest confluence of traffic in this city. To this, your genius planners added how many car trips from the density concentrations on both sides of the Borchard/Rancho Conejo/101 interchange? You place 35-50% of the population density increase within a 1.5 square mile area. I've seen this kind of lack of forethought on traffic planning before-and please spare us the public transportation pablum for a native Southern Californian. It doesn't happen here. By the way where are you putting the new elementary school north of the 101?
I will join the inevitable lawsuit this color coded cluster fart of an "urban plan" will initiate. If you must grow, spread it out so the residents of Lang Ranch and Dos Vientos can share in the wealth of new residents. Or are those your neighborhoods?
Good Morning,

I am very upset that I am learning about this last minute general plan meeting with the new revisions. I participated in 2 zooms, did the survey, big book research, and even emailed a couple times with questions.

So why did I not receive notification of the new plan revisions that were released and I hear it through a panicked community forum at the last minute? Are you trying to hide it from people that worked hard to provide honest and careful feedback, who truly care about our past, present and future?

Some of us have full time jobs and the fact this is being rushed through is an indication, once again, that you don't want to hear what the majority of people want to say, only the people pre-loaded with answers to fit a narrative of build outs.

I am not against development as I know we need more housing but a major challenge is the where, and when. This is becoming another divisive situation and it should not be. Those that are NO growth due not understand economics and sustainability of life and businesses. But many of us are slow growth, and with thoughtfulness put into where, when these developments and expansion take place.

Now, you also have County Supervisor (Linda Parks) pushing her distribution on what she wants. This is not her business and that is going to change the percentages. You do not have a way to prove that only residents in Thousand Oaks are submitting comments so it can be anyone, from anywhere.

I request this meeting be delayed for at least 30 days for proper communications to be sent out for community involvement, and that we (The People) have a chance to review it and ask questions. This should not be rushed since it has a huge impact. It is unfortunate the consultants / and their lobbyists did a poor job of proper engagement at the beginning.

Thank you in advance for doing the right thing (for all the community).

Tim McCarthy
1626 Valley High Ave, T.O.
FW: PC Meeting - Agenda Item 8A

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>

Mon 4/26/2021 10:13 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

1 attachments (124 KB)
Ltr to PC re Item 8A & SCCSDA Property.pdf;

From: Greg Regier <GRegier@jacksontidus.law>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 9:59 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: PC Meeting - Agenda Item 8A

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.

Please see attached letter for tonight’s meeting.

Greg Regier
Shareholder

gregier@jacksontidus.law
D: 805.418.1910

Jackson Tidus
A LAW CORPORATION

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

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

******************************************************************************************

Jackson Tidus is a recognized Partner in ABA-EPA's Law Office Climate Challenge
April 26, 2021

Via E-mail communitydevelopment@toaks.org

Planning Commission
City of Thousand Oaks
2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Agenda Item 8A - Request Concerning Land Use Designation

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We represent the Southern California Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (“SDA”) in respect of its interests in the vacant property generally located at the end of Academy Drive in Newbury Park, generally in the shape of a fish (the “Property”). More specifically, the Property which is within Specific Plan No. 13, is generally bounded by Conejo Ridge on its westerly flank, open space to the northerly boundary, the Rancho Conejo Industrial Park to the east, and the existing SDA School and Academy and The Village at Newbury Park regional shopping center on the south. We write to you today because of concerns the SDA has over the “industrial flex” designation set forth in the recently released “preferred land use alternative” Map.

For over 50 years, the SDA has owned the Property in Newbury Park, and has educated thousands of children at its schools located nearby. In 1996, the City approved Specific Plan 13 to establish a long-range development plan for the over 450 acres of land owned by the SDA on the north side of the 101 freeway at Wendy Drive. Specific Plan 13 established land use, development and design standards within that plan area. In 2006, the City Council approved Specific Plan 13 Amendment No. 1, and in 2011, the City Council approved Specific Plan Amendment No. 2. Under the guidance of the Specific Plan, the City has seen the construction of among other community contributing uses, Home Depot, Target, Lowes, Pet Smart and other commercial and retail facilities.

The Specific Plan also contemplated residential uses on the “North Campus” or the Property. This discussion has primarily centered around faculty housing and a residential retirement center, but the fact of the matter is that residential use has always been considered. Placing any industrial use on the Property causes SDA concerns about industrial truck noise generation, exhaust invading, and chemicals and hazardous materials passing by and ending up at an industrial facility near to the existing SDA School and Academy. We feel designating the Property for industrial uses is not good planning. In addition, the City’s objective for a residential use on the North Campus was to “break-up of large building masses into smaller...
building components” with a “strong integration of building mass to the terrain through the use of building materials, elevated land formations, building wing walls, extended roof overhangs, sloped roof elements, cantilevered horizontal projections commensurate with the hillside and elevated planters and landscaping treatment to lessen visual impacts from the east.” (Specific Plan 13, Section 15, c-d). Placing large industrial buildings on this visually sensitive site defeats and undermines those goals. The opportunity for attractive flexible residential development working with the terrain we feel makes more sense and should be recognized and explored. The Property could provide for a variety of residential uses including single family homes and townhouses, and is, by size and location, capable of delivering a variety of housing products including customary and reasonable allocation of affordable units that could address the City’s housing needs and assist in its goals of meeting RHNA compliance.

To that end, that property should be designated in such a way to allow for design flexibility for clustering of residential development that would tie in with the natural amenities of that land. We believe a more appropriate designation is Neighborhood Medium or Neighborhood Medium High.

SDA has relied on that residential use in processing its entitlements for the remainder of their Specific Plan land for years, had recent inquiries from developers for a residential project on the Property, but no inquiry for any industrial project, so SDA was totally surprised to see this new land use concept. Please accept this letter as SDA’s request for the Property to have the opportunity to have a residential land use designation and, if needed, inclusion in the City of Thousand Oaks TO2045 Housing Element inventory of land suitable for housing development. If you have any questions, or require additional information, please feel free to contact us. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Gregory P. Regier

GPR:sh

cc: Velino Salazar, SCCSDA
Mark Sellers, Esq.
Hello Members of the Planning Commission,

My name is Lee Ann Holland, and I am a resident of Newbury Park. I am writing to express my support for the idea of including Village Centers in the final version of the Land Use Map for the General Plan.

My support for the Village Centers is based on several reasons.

First, I think it is a good idea to have more density spread throughout the city rather than focused in just a few places, for equity, for access and for practical reasons.

Second, I love the idea of creating hubs of community activity at various centers around our city. When my daughter was born, our family lived in Oak Park, and my husband worked in Malibu. At least once per week, my daughter and I would drive into Malibu for lunch and a play date with her dad at the Malibu Country Mart. There is a wonderful play space there, as well as shops, restaurants and lots of outdoor seating for eating and relaxing. It was something we looked forward to as a family every week and improved our quality of life.

Attracting young families to Thousand Oaks is vital to maintain positive growth and excellent schools, and I imagine village centers like that could draw in families and young professionals and be a real hub of economic, shopping and recreational activity for those communities.

Third, mixed use village centers would provide additional opportunities for affordable housing with community supports for people with disabilities like my daughter. Having access to an affordable apartment in a safe environment where she could live and work at one of the stores or restaurants might be her best chance to live an independent and fulfilling life as an adult.

Finally, village centers could serve as transportation hubs for our city and provide opportunities for an improved and more equitable transit system for all those residents in our city who don’t have cars or cannot drive.

In short, I believe that village centers could drastically improve the livability of Thousand Oaks for so many residents: young families, professionals, and those who need more affordable housing, including people with disabilities.

I hope you will consider adding this option back into the final Land Use Map for the General Plan.

Thank you,
Lee Ann Holland
Leader, THRIVE Conejo
My name is Virginia Uslan, I have been a Thousand Oaks resident for 27 years. First of all I am not happy with the short notice you’ve given us. We have a reasonable size population. You need to allow time for the residents to respond.

I moved to Thousand Oaks for the family oriented culture and safe neighborhood.

Our neighborhood is suffering from loss of businesses, more than half of which will never re-open. Thousand Oaks has always been for controlled growth. Why are we advocating for so many housing that will continue to deteriorate the city.

In my area we have a problem with sewer and power outages, Why aren’t you taking care of the current problems instead of creating new ones. Sacramento has NOT stipulated a buildout of 30000 units. Rami and consultants, that is paid with our taxpayer dollar made these decisions. The data that Rami Consulting is using is highly biased taking only 2000 people's input out of 120000, that is just 1%.

Since I’ve lived here for a long time, I know most of the population of Thousand Oaks have moved to Thousand Oaks for the same reason, low crime and safety. You cannot base decisions on 1% of the population. Even the "2000" people, had identical comments online. It is clear that the input of the residents are totally being ignored, only the input of Commercial Real Estate Developers and the like are taken into account. Also, the questions asked are skewed to what the consultants want NOT what the
residents want. We, as I speak for most of the residents oppose high rise, sky rises, increased traffic. ARE YOU LISTENING? 
Take a new poll with at least 20% of the Thousand Oaks current residents giving residents real options. We do not want to be another San Fernando Valley. TO is not able to handle the influx of day visitors hiking in Wildwood. Crime rates have increased. How do you think you can survive doubling our population? We certainly do not want increase in crime.
We do not want this! Start again. The consulting company has FAILED the RESIDENTS of Thousand Oaks. We elected you to this commission, to do what is right for the residents. LISTEN!!!!. The outcome of your survey has been manufactured. I know this because I am a resident and echo the sentiment of most of the residents living here.
FW: I oppose

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 11:12 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Nicole Gates <nicolemgates23@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 11:09 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: I oppose

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 strongly oppose the general plan to double the population. The perk of living in this area is that we are not overcrowded. We don’t have buildings and housing packed into every available space. I work at a local school and I will be very vocal about the city council plan to double our population. My coworkers and the parents and families of the students will know exactly who is responsible for steamrolling this atrocity. As people who NEED votes to be in your position, I strongly suggest changing direction on this growth plan.

Respectfully,
Nicole Gates
Thousand Oaks resident.
Dear City Council Members and Planning Commissioners,

I am a 20 year resident, home owner, small business owner, voter, and parent in Thousand Oaks. I support the approval of mixed-use zoning throughout the city, including at all of the village centers, at the vacant Rancho Conejo/Borchard site, at the K-Mart site, and the Janss Marketplace district. I urge you to prioritize opportunities for the development of more affordable and diverse housing. These options will bring greater vitality, economic activity, cultural richness, equity, and inclusion to our city. I strongly oppose the notion that our city should be like an exclusive first class cabin with no seats available for passengers in coach. Please set a course for our future that values all the people who live and work here.

Sincerely,

Willie Lubka
805-218-1189
FW: Borchard Development Site

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 11:16 AM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Jennifer Sugden <jennifer.marie.sugden@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 11:14 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Borchard Development Site

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.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing today as a Newbury Park resident who has been in the community for 10 years this June. My husband and I moved here from the suburbs in Wisconsin and one of the biggest things that we have missed since moving is having a “downtown” feel. The communities we grew up in and moved around to always had a central area where people could gather, walk to and listen to music. It is what made the community bond with each other. Newbury Park does not have this unless you are a member of a church! The towns we lived in always had town celebrations held in the areas I mentioned. I have been following the plans for the use of the land just off the Borchard exit ramp and want to express our support for using this area for adding in restaurants, shops, a potential small outdoor amphitheater as well as housing.

In addition, we believe our community could benefit from having apartment/condos or small houses where families can have “starter homes/condos” that are not $700k. Also, we have a serious need for enticing our senior residents to move out of their 4-5 bedroom homes into something more appropriate, allowing younger growing families to move in. As the PFA president and active member of our school, I can tell you student numbers are suffering because of neighborhoods like my own. On our street alone, we have many people who should be moving into senior housing but have found they can’t stay in the immediate area. I beg of you to please help give our local seniors (55+) a housing option that will entice movement in our community. Do this by providing them the ability to walk to a grocery store, library, pharmacy and coffee shop. All of which could be accomplished in the Borchard area. I would love to see studios, 1 bed + den/2 bedroom options. Let’s help our community and support the natural growth and needs we currently have. Change is not bad and we support this!

Thank you for your time,

Jennifer Sugden
(414) 840-9743
jennifer.marie.sugden@gmail.com
Planning Commission and Staff,

In advance of tonight’s Planning Commission meeting, please see the attached letter on behalf of Macerich and The Oaks.

Thank you.

Jon Stoeckly | Assistant Vice President, Development

Macerich
401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700
Santa Monica, CA 90401
p. 424.229.3392
APRIL 25, 2021

Chair Nelson Buss
Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: Preferred Land Use Alternative Map – Comments Provided

Dear Chair Buss and Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Preferred Land Use Alternative Map’s “Mixed-Use Low” designation for The Oaks mall.

For over four decades, The Oaks and its approximately eighty-acre site has functioned as the preeminent hub for retail activity within the City of Thousand Oaks and the greater Conejo Valley.

As the City of Thousand Oaks has grown and evolved, so too has The Oaks. Today, The Oaks features world-class shopping, dining, and entertainment across approximately 1.3M square feet and continues to develop to the needs of its customers and the broader community.

However, the future success of The Oaks is not guaranteed, and The Oaks must evolve to allow for new exciting uses that will ensure its viability and success for decades to come.

Unfortunately, the proposed “Mixed-Use Low” designation fails to provide the opportunity for The Oaks to evolve and transform into a true mixed-use destination that will guarantee its future success.

What the Commission may not be aware of is that Macerich has been in discussions with the City administration and planning staff regarding additions and changes to The Oaks in recognition of the transformational change in retail sales and our industry. And since February 2020, Covid-19 has amplified the need for greater planning flexibility for The Oaks.

Those factors coincide with the City addressing adding infill housing to meet local industry and business employee needs and State housing requirements in planning the near future of The Oaks.

It is immediately apparent that the consultant recommended “Mixed-Use Low” use, density and development standards unduly constrict the practical repurposing of The Oaks under discussion.

It is also apparent from listening to community input that residents see The Oaks as a key opportunity site for housing and special uses due to its location, physical attributes, and functional history.

Consequently, please take into consideration the following comments prior to finalizing the final land use designation for The Oaks:

- The Mixed-Use Low designation does not allow for maximum flexibility and a variety of uses in a rapidly shifting retail environment. As consumer habits quickly shift, The Oaks must evolve into a true mixed-use destination where the community lives, works, and plays within a highly amenitized, pedestrian friendly environment.
Ideally, the entirety of The Oaks will be designated as “Mixed-Use High” to accommodate retail, entertainment, residential, office, and hospitality uses within a horizontally and vertically integrated mixed-use setting.

Unfortunately, the “Mixed-Use Low” designation only allows for the addition of residential to The Oaks which fails to appreciate the variety of symbiotic uses that create a true mixed-use environment.

- **The Mixed Use Low 50’ height limit unnecessarily replaces the currently allowed 75’ height limit.** The Oaks is currently zoned C-4 and has a 75’ height limit for any allowed commercial uses. We ask that the final land use designation maintains this height limit as it moves forward with the zoning process after adoption of the updated General Plan. The Mixed Use Low 50’ limit unnecessarily lowers the allowable height limit despite no known height issues at The Oaks. Moreover, this proposed 50’ height limit fails to appreciate that The Oaks currently has buildings higher than 50’ and would unnecessarily limit contemplated projects – including a proposed Life Time Fitness health club (Pre-App submitted) – to a height that ultimately fails to account for The Oaks’ topography and the height impacts to the surrounding areas.

- **The Mixed-Use Low designation prematurely limits densities, uses, FAR, and height prior to Macerich, the City, and the community creating a comprehensive land use plan for The Oaks.** We ask that the “Mixed-Use High” designation or a hybrid designation of “Regional Commercial” plus residential is chosen so land use standards at The Oaks aren’t prematurely limited before a comprehensive land use plan for The Oaks is created. A collaborative zoning and specific plan process will ultimately give all stakeholders, including Macerich, the City, and the community, a better opportunity to create a more strategic and sustainable land use designation for The Oaks.

- **The entirety of The Oaks’ eighty-acre site must be treated as one land use designation.** The Oaks currently functions as one unified site and a single land use designation will allow Macerich and other parcel owners to continue to develop and operate The Oaks as a cohesive project.

The proposed “Mixed-Use Low” designation unnecessarily denotes the parcels east of Wilbur Road – the former Armstrong Garden and Black Angus sites – as Commercial Regional which is incongruent with the mixed-use designation for the balance of The Oaks.

*With the foregoing in mind, we respectfully offer that no action be taken by the Commission tonight nor until consideration is given to individually and specifically planning the entire Oaks site.*

We have appreciated the City’s collaborative engagement with us throughout this process and look forward to the Planning Commission’s input as the Land Use Element is finalized.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jon Stoeckly
Assistant Vice President, Development

Cc: Drew Powers, City Manager
Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director
Haider Alawami, Economic Development Manager
Michael Forbes, Deputy Community Development Director
Tabitha McAtee, Assistant Planner, Community Development Department
I am Bill Casey. My wife Jackie and I moved to Newbury Park three and a half years ago and love our new home located in the area west of the Borchard 37 acreage. We are not new to the Conejo Valley. I began my professional career after college as an aerospace illustrator at the old Northrop Ventura facility on Rancho Conejo Blvd in 1965 until 1970. My son and his family live in the Wildwood area of the Conejo Valley and my mother lived in Newbury Park. We have witnessed the tremendous growth of the Conejo Valley area over the years and are very much interested in its future growth and specifically our area, the Borchard property!

When I look at that property, I see a blank sheet of paper with the potential to be something very special and unique that could make us all very proud and eager to enjoy. My perspective comes from a thirty year career working for Walt Disney Imagineering as a Principal Industrial Designer, now retired. Our team was responsible for the design and construction of Disney theme parks all over the world that all started with a story...

I visualize a village on that property with walking and bike paths and planted buffer zones from existing properties. No high-rise buildings to mar sightlines. Water streams and a lake for canoes and kayaks to rent, or band concerts and picnics. Homes could be architecturally themed individual blocks such as Victorian, craftsman and contemporary meandering along tree-lined streets and small parks. Electrically and Hydrogen powered, non-polluting Trams that take passengers around the perimeter to restaurants and shops running on schedule to limit traffic and parking congestion...

I have seen Shawn’s proposed land use concept map with all of its elements of that vision and support the rezoning of the entire property to mixed use. I would emphasize that the current proposal for split-zoning sounds good in concept, but doesn’t work for a design, planning, or flexibility standpoint. I think that the committee should consider a single mixed-use zoning for the entire site to bring this vision to reality.

Folks, this is an unusually excellent opportunity to create an exciting mixed use concept that would compliment the area with a fun residential area, restaurants and shops, some, or all, overlooking the lake...maybe even an island for band concerts...Lets not turn this area into another visionless and boring housing and commercial development!

Thank you for this time and opportunity to present my response.

Bill Casey
(805) 716-3598
FW: General Plan to double the population

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 12:08 PM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Christina Peloquin <thepeloquinfamily@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 11:58 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: General Plan to double the population

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.

To Whom it Concerns:

I am writing you to strongly encourage to go against the general plan to double the population in Ventura County. Please know that if this passes that I will not vote to re-elect your position.

Sincerely,
Christina Peloquin
FW: Marin Simgo PC letter 42621

Kelvin Parker <KParker@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 1:04 PM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>
Cc: Michael Forbes <MForbes@toaks.org>; Mark Towne <MTowne@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>; Iain Holt <IHolt@toaks.org>

1 attachments (157 KB)
Marin Simgo PC letter 42621.pdf;

FYI

From: Thomas Cohen <tcohen@cohenlanduselaw.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 11:11 AM
To: Kelvin Parker <KParker@toaks.org>; Stephen Kearns <SKearns@toaks.org>; Haider Alawami <HAlawami@toaks.org>
Subject: Marin Simgo PC letter 42621

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.

Gents: please see attached letter on behalf of property owner Marin Simgo, LLC. Please provide to the Planning Commission for this evening’s Agenda Item 8A.

Thank you.

Tom

---

Cohen Land Use Law

Thomas S. Cohen
Cohen Land Use Law
1534 N. Moorpark Road, #337
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
tcohen@cohenlanduselaw.com
805.292.1622 | Main
805.292.9662 | Fax
805.712.1586 | Cell
www.cohenlanduselaw.com
April 26, 2021

Chair Nelson Buss and Commissioners
City of Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
2100 E. Thousand Oaks, Boulevard
Thousand Oaks, CA  91362

Attn:  Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director

Re:  Request For Inclusion On Housing Element Preferred Land Use Map

Dear Chair Buss and Commissioners:

On behalf of our client, Marin Simgo, LLC ("Marin Simgo"), we respectfully request the General Plan Advisory Committee ("GPAC") (1) include Marin Simgo’s 501-509 Marin Street property (the “Property”) Preferred Land Use Map and (2) include the property for redesignation from its current General Plan designation of “C-O Commercial Office” to “Mixed Use-Low” or some other appropriate designation to allow the 4.45 acre (193,671 square feet) site to be developed with multi-family residential units.

As we understand it, the TO2045 Housing Element is required to include a land inventory of sites that are suitable for affordable housing. The purpose of the inventory is to identify specific sites that are suitable for residential development in order to compare the City’s regional housing needs allocation ("RHNA") with its residential development capacity. Identified sites that require rezoning may be included in the inventory. Marin Simgo’s property requires rezoning to provide for residential use.

The inventory can also include sites that are in the process of being made available (i.e. planned) for residential uses via rezones or specific plans, provided the housing element which includes a program that commits the local government to completing all necessary
administrative and legislative actions early in the planning period. Marin Simgo purchased the property in August 2019.

Preparation of a site-suitability analysis is the second step in addressing the adequate sites requirement. In addition to providing a listing of sites, local governments must prepare an analysis that demonstrates which identified sites can accommodate the city's housing needs, by income level.

Marin Simgo will play a significant role in accommodating the city's housing needs and is willing to contribute to the City's affordable housing stock.

Marin Simgo’s property is located at 501-509 Marin Street. It sits at the foot of Fireworks Hill at the highest point on Marin Street, between West Hillcrest Drive and West Wilbur Road. It is equidistant to the Oaks Mall and Janss Marketplace giving it an excellent walkability score. The 4.45-acre property is developed with two, 1983 office buildings with approximately 52,000 square feet of rental space. The property used to have as its major tenant California State University Channel Islands, but this space has been vacant for several years. Several doctors and dentist offices have recently closed, and the property's occupancy has fallen below 40%. The property, although well maintained has suffered significant functional obsolescence. Its position above the two Thousand Oaks shopping centers provides spectacular views of Thousand Oaks, the Conejo Valley and Camarillo and the Coastal Plains.

The re-zoning to residential housing at this location will be served by a multitude of jobs, retail and service uses that will be easily walkable for the future occupants of these residential units thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled and minimizing its environmental impact.

While Marin Simgo has not yet developed a plan for residential development due to its recent acquisition, it plans to and is committed to providing affordable units which will serve an extraordinary public benefit and aid the City’s compliance with RHNA mandates.

We understand that the State legislature has imposed the burden on each municipality to address the housing crisis and deliver suitable affordable housing opportunities. We also understand that top quality projects are important for the cities and we know Marin Simgo is committed to meeting and exceeding this standard.

It is, therefore, of paramount importance that the site inventory for the upcoming planning period includes only sites on which housing projects with quality affordable components can be achieved.

Marin Simgo’s Marin Street property is one of those sites. It should be identified in the land inventory of sites that are suitable for affordable housing because it is compliant with Government Code requirements by providing suitable land for housing development, as land
“suitable for residential development includes...sites that are not zoned for residential development, but can be redeveloped for, and/or rezoned for, residential use.”

Marin Simgo is excited to re-envision this incredible property located at the mid-point of the two largest retail centers in the city. Marin Simgo anticipates that the property can be available for housing development during the planning period.

Sincerely,

ss//Tom Cohen

Thomas S. Cohen
for Cohen Land Use Law, LLP
FW: General Plan

Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Mon 4/26/2021 1:14 PM
To: Lori Goor <LGoor@toaks.org>; Krystin Rice <KRice@toaks.org>

From: Peggy Burns <pjburnsusa@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 12:57 PM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: General Plan

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 am opposed to the Thousand Oaks General Plan. I did the survey and find it hard to believe that you received only 2,000 replies. I read the Acorn, the Guardian and I'm on the Nextdoor site. So many people are "up in arms" about this issue. Many knew nothing about this plan. To make ALL the citizens of Thousand Oaks happy this needs to put up for a vote, and NOT by the City Council!! The only people that stand to benefit from this are the developers. WE DO NOT WANT ANOTHER SAN FERNANDO VALLEY.

A Concerned Citizen

Peggy Burns
1290 Alessandro Drive
Newbury Park, CA 91320
(805) 499-6116