Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the Planning Commission after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically they are distributed on the Thursday or Friday preceding the Planning Commission meeting and/or on Monday before the meeting. Supplemental Packets produced on Thursday or Friday are available for public inspection in the Community Development Department, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2). All Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the Planning Commission meeting in the Andrew P. Fox City Council Chambers, 2100 E. Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

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: Steve Kearns, Planning Division Manager for Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director

Date: October 25, 2021

Subject: Regarding Item 07A LU 2019-70504; LD 2020-70272; DAGR 2020-70273; ZC 2020-70275; SP 2020-70276; DP 2020-70277; OTP 2020-70278; LTP 2021-70289; and MND 2020-70279 – Additional Correspondence

Attached is correspondence from the public received subsequent to the printing of the Agenda Packet

CDD:420-46\H:COMMON\Planning Commission\Agenda Packet\2021\10-25-2021.docx
Thousand Oaks Community Development Department

2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd.

Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

October 25, 2021
While the Conejo Climate Coalition commends representatives of the Daylight Apartments project for their outreach to the Thousand Oaks community, including meeting with members of CCC, the project is not designed for a city and world oriented toward climate change solutions. Minimum design inclusions such as “water-efficient fixtures and landscaping; energy-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems; roof overhangs to provide solar shading; and drip irrigation”, have been common features for years and do not make this a sustainable building project.

In the 141 page Attachment 10, “Mitigated Negative Declaration”, multiple pages are devoted to Greenhouse Gas Emissions yet, despite acknowledgement of the City of Thousand Oaks’ CEAP, the project proponents fail to list readily available data that 20% of the City’s GHG emissions are from natural gas (connections in buildings) and 62% are from transportation.

In meeting with the project representatives, the Conejo Climate Coalition advocated for forward-looking, climate-safe building strategies including the elimination of gas usage as an energy source, and it is perplexing why this project fails to address this key impediment to sustainable building. In addition to the obvious climate impacts, children growing up in homes where cooking is done on gas stoves are 42% more likely to have asthma symptoms. Gas infrastructure also increases the risk of fires, especially in earthquake and wildfire-prone regions. And from a financial perspective, building all-electric reduces developers’ construction costs by cutting expensive dual-energy piping infrastructure, while energy-efficient electric appliances also contribute to more affordable utility bills for both residents and businesses.

50 California cities have moved to electrification of new buildings, yet this proposal continues to include gas infrastructure despite acknowledgement of gas pollutants’ contribution to climate destabilization and its health impacts on residents of the project: “Operational Emissions: Operation of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions associated with area sources (i.e., fireplaces, architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping equipment), energy sources (i.e., use of natural gas for space and water heating and cooking), and mobile sources (i.e., vehicle trips to and from the project site).” And the impact: “Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? Sensitive receptors are members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children under 14, elderly over 65, persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site include multi-family residences approximately 30 feet south of the project site.”

Enhanced energy resilience and efficiency would be achieved by combining an all-electric building with solar panels and batteries. Solar panels are referenced in the project documents yet multiple conflicting statements are noted, including as follows: Page 51 states a requirement for solar panels: “The project would be required to comply with Section 150.1(b) 14 of the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, which mandates all new City of Thousand Oaks Daylight Apartments 52 residential uses under three stories must install photovoltaic (PV) solar panels that generate an amount of electricity equal to expected electricity usage.”
Yet page 69 of the Declaration states that solar panels will not be installed: “Photovoltaic Solar System. Although Section 150.1(b)14 of the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards requires all new residential uses under three stories must install PV solar panels that generate an amount of electricity equal to expected electricity usage, the project’s site plans do not include on-site PV solar panels. Therefore, it was not assumed that the project’s electricity usage would be supplied by any PV solar panels.”

Referencing apartment and hotel parking, the plan does cite “spaces” for electric vehicle charging, however it does not state that EV charging infrastructure will in fact be constructed. And, again, with a state requirement that bans new gasoline-powered car sales by 2035, the number of EV parking spaces for both the apartments and hotel is totally inadequate.

Page 20 states, “The project would include subterranean and at-grade parking areas with a total of 554 parking spaces, which is 21 spaces more than required by the City. The subterranean parking area would include 277 spaces and the surface parking area would include 277 spaces. The subterranean parking area would be exclusively used by apartment tenants. Of the 554 parking spaces, 21 would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant, which is three more ADA spaces than required. Additionally, hotel parking would include 10 “spaces” for electric vehicle charging and apartment parking would include 41 electric vehicle charging “spaces”.

The City of Thousand Oaks continues to face ongoing severe drought and water scarcity challenges. This project provides a crucial opportunity to install a greywater reuse system for irrigation now, rather than requiring an expensive retrofit at a later date. Why isn’t this water conservation measure required by this project?

In evaluating this project purely from a financial standpoint, by neglecting to include the above-noted water and energy-efficiency upgrades, it is apparent that, as proposed, this building will be more expensive to build and operate, and less desirable for renters who expect either a healthy, pollutant-free living environment or amenities that make it easy and convenient to charge electric vehicles, bikes and scooters. Future renters will be burdened with higher gas utility bills as gas declines in usage and stranded gas fees are spread over a declining customer base. At a future date, the owner of the property will be forced to retrofit the building for electrification (a process which is significantly more expensive post-construction than during construction), and again these costs will be added to rental fees (not to mention the preventable disruption to tenants’ lives). Why not implement these essential amenities NOW at a lower cost?

What is most disturbing about this report is the final determination by the City’s Community Development Department: “I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.” Again going back to the City’s own data that 62% of GHG emissions are produced from transportation and 20% from natural gas use in housing, approval of this project as proposed will definitely result in significant, mitigatable environmental impacts to Thousand Oaks’ residents in the form of degraded air quality, increasing health risks, decreasing water supply, and accelerating climate instability, and the City is missing a critical opportunity, and obligation, by failing to require available mitigation steps NOW.
Sincerely,

Faith Grant
Rose Ann Witt
Co-Founders
Conejo Climate Coalition
Dear Sirs:

I would like to incorporate the attached pdf document for tonight’s meeting record for the discussion of the development by Daylight Thousand Oaks, LLC of the property surrounding the Timber School and Auditorium Landmarks.

Sincerely,

William Maple

241 Marjori Ave,
Newbury Park, CA 91320-4023
(805) 750-7636
wmaple@icloud.com
City #12: Former Timber School House and Timber School Auditorium (Designated Landmarks by Ventura County and Thousand Oaks Cultural Heritage Boards 2004)
CHAPTER 5: CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. Archaeological Resources

Archaeological, historical and cultural resources are important, and their protection is appropriately addressed in the Conservation Element. These resources represent the history of Thousand Oaks and the Conejo Valley. Ensuring their proper management and protection will contribute to the City’s aesthetics, its civic pride and will provide a valuable link between the past and future.

The Conejo Corridor, which includes significant portions of the Planning Area, holds a bountiful legacy of archaeological resources. For over 1,000 years prior to European occupation, the Conejo Corridor was an integral part of a much larger Chumash territory that extended well inland from the coast and channel islands to include all of Santa Barbara, most of Ventura and parts of San Luis Obispo, Kern and Los Angeles counties. Locally, sites related to Late Prehistoric period occupation dating from approximately AD. 500 to historic contact yield abundant evidence about the ecological equilibrium which characterized the lifeways of these indigenous native people before the arrival of foreign explorers.

The earliest known inhabitants of this general area of Southern California were transient hunters that arrived sometime around 12,000 B.C. Eventually, they would become the cultural ancestors of the modern Chumash who imprinted the Conejo Corridor with signs of continuous habitation for the past 7,000 years. In particular, the Millingstone (5,500 B.C. - 1000 A.D.) people were indigenous to the Conejo Corridor and are well represented in archaeological sites throughout the area.
Form of Budget required under provisions of Section 1612a of Political Code, and approved by Superintendent of Public Instruction, Feb. 5, 1925. NO OTHER FORM SHALL BE USED without specific approval by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Do not endanger your budget by using an unauthorized form.

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUDGET**


*To the County Superintendent of Schools of [Ventura] County, State of California:*

By order of the governing board of [Dinter] School District made at a regularly held meeting on 15 of June, 1925, the undersigned were instructed to submit the following budget for the school year ending June 30, 1926.

**TOTAL PROPOSED EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expended for Year 1924-1925</th>
<th>Estimated for Year 1925-1926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Control</td>
<td>$1360.00</td>
<td>$1440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers' Salaries</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Expenses of Instruction</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Library</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Operation of School Plant</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Maintenance of School Plant</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fixed Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Capital Outlays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Auxiliary Agencies and Sundry Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total</td>
<td>$20,060.00</td>
<td>$18,530.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—The various items to be considered under the above headings are noted in detail in the following; the sequence of headings is different, the arrangement above being in harmony with the U. S. Bureau of Education and the Annual Report; that below being planned on the basis of the fund provisions of law.

**PART I. TEACHERS' SALARIES.**

**2. Teachers' Salaries**

A. Salaries of teachers

B. Salaries of principals and supervisors

Total Teachers' Salaries

---

Timber School Budget 1925 - 1926
Top Row: Teachers, Maggie Parker, Wesley Lewis, Frank Hays, Adolph Friedrich, Robert Borcherd

2nd Row from top: Margaret Friedrich, Fay Borcherd, Reba Hays, Anna Friedrich, Blanche, Sororro Gonzales, Ottie

XX. 04. 19
Class of 1947
Timber School – Front 1942
Lunch Pavilion and Tank House - 1942
Timber School Gets Auditorium

Timber School in Newbury Park will open on Sept. 6. Seventy-five pupils are expected to register for the fall term according to Joel Traylor, a member of the board of trustees.

The school has three teachers this year, Dwight Sergent, the principal, in his third year, who also teaches, Mrs. Lila Wheeler, and one other who is expected but whose contract is not definitely filed.

Timber has a fine new auditorium, which is also serving for classrooms and cafeteria. Mr. and Mrs. Albert Anderson will serve again this year as custodian and cafeteria manager. Mrs. Anderson served a well balanced meal for the children last year for 15 cents, and she plans on doing so again.

There is a new bus at Timber. Hicks body on a Ford chassis, which carries 49 pupils. Alan Hayes, son of Sime Hayes, is contracted as bus driver. The bus will be delivered Sept. 1.

The school has all new desks this year and underground gasoline storage and a new steam table for the cafeteria.

The Board of Trustees consists of Ed Borcherd Jr., Traylor, and John Williams. The latter replaced Lee Bates after his resignation. Mrs. Mary Ann Mahan is acting secretary.
Timber School 2nd Grade – 1957 -1958 (T.O. incorporated in 1964)
Timber School is the Oldest Remaining Public Structure in the Conejo Valley
COMMENDATION IN HONOR OF
TIMBER SCHOOL
90TH ANNIVERSARY

WHEREAS, Conejo School located at the northwest corner of present day Westlake Boulevard and Hampshire Road was Conejo Valley's first school site; and

WHEREAS, Timber School, the Conejo Valley's original framed building, was conceived ten years after Conejo School was built in 1877, by concerned citizens when they recognized the need for another school in the western end of the valley; and

WHEREAS, In December 1888, Cecil Haigh sold two acres of his land for $50.00 for a school site; the building was completed in 1889, and designed as one room with two smaller anterooms; and

WHEREAS, Around 1921, the 1889 schoolhouse was condemned and the need arose for another structure; a school bond election was held in order to raise funds for a new building to be built on the original site; and

WHEREAS, Timber School House and Timber School Auditorium, respectively, were constructed in 1924 and 1948 and are part of the current Conejo Valley High School campus; and

WHEREAS, Children of early Conejo Valley ranchers, including the Borchard, Haigh, Hays, Kelley, Janss, and Olsen families, attended Timber School; and

WHEREAS, Timber School is the oldest original school and public building in the Conejo Valley; and

WHEREAS, Timber School represents one of the few remaining two-room schoolhouse structures of the Mission Revival architectural style in Ventura County; and

WHEREAS, Timber School was designed by Roy C. Wilson, the first licensed architect in Ventura County who is credited with designing seven other County landmarks; and

WHEREAS, The school is of particular historic, cultural, and aesthetic significance to the City of Thousand Oaks, in which the cultural and social history of the community is reflected; and

WHEREAS, Former Timber School House and Timber School Auditorium were designated by Thousand Oaks Cultural Heritage Board Resolution No. 3, July 13, 2004 and are City of Thousand Oaks historical landmark # 12.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, AL ADAM, Mayor of the City of Thousand Oaks, on behalf of the entire City Council, do hereby recognize Timber School on its Anniversary.

CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS

ATTEST:

AL ADAM
Mayor

LINDA D. LAWRENCE
City Clerk
Dated this 6th day of January, 2015

100th Anniversary in 2024 (3yrs)
City of T.O 60th Anniversary
Dear Chair Buss and members of the planning commission,

On behalf of the homeowners that live on Galway Lane please **DO NOT PASS** the resolution as presented by Daylight Thousand Oaks LLC. This current plan is not considerate of the existing homeowners and will severely affect our families in a negative way. I have lived on Galway for 14 years and our neighbors are realtors, therapists, pilots, nurses, pastors, hairdressers, and business men and women. Most have lived here for 10+ years. We are not opposed to the entire proposal, but strongly recommend a few adaptations be made so this development doesn’t adversely affect the surrounding community.

I recommend the commission implement the following changes to the proposal: **All buildings within 120 ft of the Galway lane property line be restricted to 30 ft.** Some of the buildings have been brought into this compliance, but other buildings on the southern edge need to be modified as well. This would prevent from having 4 story buildings windows peering down into our backyards.

To eliminate light and sound pollution that will come from having 228 residents and parking touching our backyards, **Daylight LLC must repair and increase the height of the existing retaining wall.** All parking lot lighting and exterior lighting needs to be installed at a lower height than this wall. As a medium density housing neighborhood our parking is already tight and we cannot afford to have apartment visitors parking on our already crowded street. Therefore, **Daylight must increase the parking spaces available per unit.** This needs to not only cover the tenants, but to accommodate the guests as well. Does the city want cars to line Newbury Rd. And E.Kelly Rd?

We also are aware that the property on East Kelly behind the Kohl’s shopping center is being considered for development. The impact of this development needs to be taken in consideration with any future additional developments. To add a significant apartment complex as proposed and then do the same a mere 200 ft. Would be highly irresponsible by the planning commission. **I would also recommend the city reduce the number of total apartments to 200 but keep the same number of parking spaces as planned.**
This development process has been incredibly difficult for residents on Galway to have places where our voice is heard. Daylight has made opportunities to see their existing plans, but there have not been avenues to give feedback to them. The only encouragement is to make our voice heard at public forums with sometimes only 5 days notice. These comments here and your response is our neighborhoods only chance to be heard. I am lending my voice, but know that most residents agree with my concerns, but cannot attend the meeting. Please do not destroy our neighborhood by overcrowding this lot. We see many of the advantages of this proposal, but make the necessary changes to build this part of the city in a way that goes in line with the existing neighborhoods.

~Robert Patterson
Galway Lane Resident
rwpatterson26@gmail.com