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, Interim Deputy Community Development Director for Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director

Date: November 15, 2021

Subject: Regarding Item 07A Development Permit (DP) 2021-70434; Land Division (LD) 2021-70435; Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) 2021-70436; Development Agreement (DAGR) 2021-70437; Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) 2021-70424; Protected Tree Permit (PTP) 2021-70438; and Land Use Amendment (LU) 2021-70009 – Written Correspondence

Attached are items of correspondence that were received after the printing of the packet.
Hello,

Please see the attached comment letter from Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce President/CEO Danielle Borja in support of item 7A.

Thank you,
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
November 11, 2021

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

Re: Item 7A - TO Lakes LLC Workforce Housing – Support

Dear Chair Buss and members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing today on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce to express our support for Item 7a, the application by TO Lakes LLC to build workforce housing on the site of The Lakes shopping center.

The City of Thousand Oaks has envisioned this type of mixed use development since the development of the Thousand Oaks Boulevard Specific Plan. More recently, the city council adopted a new Land Use Element Map update that allows for this type of use along Thousand Oaks Boulevard.

The Lakes is a perfect location for workforce housing, where residents will have walkable access to local stores, restaurants and the town square that will be developed as part of the Civic Arts Plaza Campus Master Plan. The addition of this workforce housing is essential for the future activation of both the Campus Master Plan and the Specific Plan.

Caruso, the developer of this project, has a stellar reputation for building beautiful, high quality projects. In Thousand Oaks they developed and operate The Lakes and the Promenade at Westlake. These are arguably the two most popular commercial centers in the city.

This workforce housing will help the City of Thousand Oaks meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) housing goals for the current cycle. 2621 housing units must be developed during the 6th cycle and this project will go a long way to meet that need. There are very few places left to build housing in Thousand Oaks and infill is one important way to meet the need.

The City of Thousand Oaks is quickly developing a life science hub in the Rancho Conejo area that will rival Los Angeles, San Diego and the Bay Area. In order to attract the type of talent we need to work for these rapidly expanding companies, we need workforce housing and a vibrant downtown. This project will contribute to help meet both of those goals.
The Board of Directors and over 800 members of the Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce urge the Planning Commission to support workforce housing in Thousand Oaks by approving item 7a.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this project. If you have any questions, please contact me at 805-370-0035 or dborja@conejochamber.org.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Danielle Borja
President/CEO
Greater Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
I am opposed to the following aspects of Caruso’s proposal.

1. Building height. The current Specific Plan #11 allows for heights up to 75’ assuming it meets the needed set-back. However the current specific plan did not allow for any residential so this is a new ballgame. In May the City Council designated this site as Mixed Use Medium which limits height to 58’ & density of 30-45 units. There was a lot of public input & discussion during this process & it would be unfathomable for the Planning Commission to recommend an exception to this height so soon after the City Council made this decision.

2. I don’t see any reference to affordable units. The city admits we have not had an inclusionary policy in the past. NOTHING should be approved not even a 2 story building without an agreement from the developer to include a reasonable amount of affordable units based on the new RHNA #’s. It appalls me that the developer is even putting forth a proposal without this.

3. Less than a week before this is being heard by the commission a tentative deal has been made for Caruso to purchase the property in accordance with the “option to buy” clause in his lease agreement. This still needs to be ratified by the City Council. There has been great outcry by the residents on how this valuation was determined & why the city is agreeing to accept payments over 27 years, where the lease agreement requires him to pay cash up front.

Due to the questions that have arisen on this tentative purchase deal the whole
approval process for building apartments should be put on hold until the citizens & City Council have an opportunity to become satisfied with this sales agreement.

SEE YA IN THE

KAREN
Karenwilburn32@outlook.com
213-216-1937
To whom it may concern,

I am appalled at the news the Caruso Company will have the opportunity to purchase the land at The Lakes development which his company built. Clearly, his plan benefited him as he did not have to pay the city any tax revenue as per the specific particulars were set up in the agreement of this development. Now, he gets the opportunity to not only BLIGHT our town with an absurd 7 story development, but he gets the chance to purchase the land for a ridiculous amount that once again, benefits Caruso. Why is the land/development not being placed on the MLS to procure other offers from the public? Makes a citizen wonder, what the heck is really going on here.

As a realtor in the Conejo Valley, I speak to citizens every day in my work. Not one has voiced a desire for the potential development of a 7 story project. Affordable living is needed in our town. But, our town needs to take a good look at what affordable living really is for our citizens. I have sold multiple homes this year of clients leaving our Conejo Valley because they feel it is being destroyed.

I personally understand the need for growth and homes, but we need to be realistic and make sure it benefits everyone…not just a developer and his connections. We certainly have enough hotels. Seriously, who are these people you are expected to come to the Conejo Valley and fill the vacant rooms?

Please, reconsider this development and the sale of this wonderful parcel to Caruso development.

Sincerely,

Megan Sandoval

Alternative Realty Group
30423 Canwood St. Suite 240
Agoura Hills, Ca. 91301
Cell: 805-405-6918
BRE Lic# 01711175
gonagem@roadrunner.com
Please provide the following information (Memo - Subject: History of the Lakes Project and its Historical Context) to the Planning Commission regarding Item 7A.

Additionally, please forward to members of the City Council.

Thank you,

Mic Farris
To: Members of the Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
   Members of the Thousand Oaks City Council
From: Mic Farris
Date: November 12, 2021
Subject: History of the Lakes Project and its Historical Context

This month, you will be presented with changes that would allow for the development of a residential complex on the East Side parcel next to the Civic Arts Plaza. As with any important decision, the proposal should be judged relative to the city’s history and its decades-long effort by a subset of city leaders to make something more happen in Thousand Oaks than originally planned.

The divisiveness of previous city decision making demonstrates a history of significant time, energy, and money having been invested, leading to a perception of sunk costs in pursuit of a “downtown” area – an area that somehow needed to be created when one didn’t exist before.

This is not the case, as the most natural “downtown” area in Thousand Oaks is the commercial area between Moorpark and Lynn Roads:

- As its first act of expansion, in November 1964, the Council annexed the land comprising Janss Marketplace, then known as the Conejo Village Shopping Center.¹
- The site of the city’s first city hall — 401 Hillcrest — a city landmark,² and now home to the National Park Service — is located in this area.
- Lands on the east side of the Oaks Mall were identified decades ago for the proposed civic arts center.

¹ Resolution 64–19, City of Thousand Oaks, approved November 17, 1964.
² CHB Resolution 1, City of Thousand Oaks Cultural Heritage Board, approved May 6, 1997
The Thousand Oaks Street Fair has been held in this area for the past three decades.
The area is most logical, since this it has long existed as the city’s center — an already vibrant commercial area, able to handle such proposed changes better than other areas.

With the City’s General Plan update proposed for final approval next year, now is the perfect time for leaders to reassess the poor decisions of the past and endeavor not to make similar poor decisions going forward. Rethinking what makes sense for our city’s “downtown” and future growth is a prudent path ahead.

Please review and consider the city’s history in your decision making to guide our city’s future.

**Background**

What follows is the history of the $100 million pursuit to build a “downtown” in the Jungleland area.

- In January 1967, the Council dedicated themselves to building a civic center for the new city.³
  - In the beginning of 1968, the Janss Corporation made an offer of twenty acres north of Hillcrest Drive as the site for a civic center.⁴ The Council accepted the offer in principle, and this site served as the location for the first City Hall.
  - A nationwide design competition was held for the center’s design, and La Jolla architect Robert Houvener’s design was selected, which captured "its

---
strength from the natural hillside” and was dubbed “the eyebrows on the hill.”5 By January 1973, the center was finished. 6

- Thousand Oaks Mayor Ed Jones dedicated the civic center in 1973.7

- Several years later, civic, business, and cultural leaders wanted to build a cultural center in Thousand Oaks through an “ambitious downtown redevelopment project”8

  - Under the plan, there would be “a revenue bonanza, [where] the city plans to spend $53 million on moderate and low-cost housing, $50 million on streets and facilities and $15-18 million to build a scaled-down version of the Los Angeles Music Center.” 9

  - The cultural center was originally planned for the parking lot of the Oaks Mall, furthering the downtown area comprising the Oaks Mall, Janss Marketplace, and City Hall, located at 401 Hillcrest.

  - In late 1983, a group of Thousand Oaks business leaders and the Ventura County Taxpayers Association launched an effort to scale back the redevelopment plan. 10

    - They also questioned the City’s decision to consider the five-mile stretch of Thousand Oaks Boulevard as “blighted” when the section contained more than a dozen high-priced developments including the luxury Westlake Plaza Hotel and the western regional headquarters of Prudential Insurance and Exxon Corporation.11

    - At the time, critics called the actions of the Thousand Oaks City Council, which doubled as the city’s Redevelopment Agency (RDA), as the “greatest scam ever to hit Ventura County,” although they quickly added he had no evidence of criminal wrongdoing.12

---

6 Ibid.
9 Quinn, James, “Cultural Center Plan Hit as Tax Diversion,” Los Angeles Times, September 15, 1983.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
• A Ventura County District Attorney investigation ensued, and while the City was cleared of wrongdoing, the DA’s office did claim that the plans were a “striking example of how an aggressive city staff can legally subvert” state law.\textsuperscript{13}

• In 1984, there were two ballot questions presented to voters on the plan.
  o Critics of the plan started a petition drive to force a vote on the downtown plan, asking “Shall the City of Thousand Oaks or its agencies spend public monies to build a Cultural Center in the City of Thousand Oaks?”\textsuperscript{14}
    • This became Measure A
  o The Council put a competing question on the ballot, asking: “Should the City of Thousand Oaks pursue the development of a Cultural Center if (1) the site for the facility is donated without cost to the City; and (2) only existing or projected redevelopment funds pay for the construction costs; and (3) a private endowment fund is established to offset any potential operating shortfalls?”\textsuperscript{15}
    • This became Measure B
  o The advisory questions resulted in a mixed message about the cultural center’s future:
    • Measure A failed by a 38-62 margin,\textsuperscript{16} indicating that the public did not support spending public money on the cultural center’s development.
    • Measure B passed 61-39,\textsuperscript{17} indicating that public would support the center only under certain conditions.

• In 1986, cultural center proponents put a specific proposal before the voters to gain support.

\textsuperscript{13} Quinn, James, “D.A. Clears City’s Redevelopment Tactics,” \textit{Los Angeles Times}, October 16, 1983.
\textsuperscript{15} Resolution 84-198, Thousand Oaks City Council, July 17, 1984.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
The June 1986 advisory question, on the ballot as Measure C, asked the voters if they supported using $22.3 million in redevelopment funds for the construction of an 1,800-seat main theater, 299-seat theater, 15,000 square foot museum, classrooms/workshops, and high school satellite feeder theaters on regional school sites.  

It also highlighted a location for the center either at city-owned Los Robles Driving Range or donated land at the Oaks Mall, and a funding plan for operations.

The voters rejected the proposal; 54% cast ballots in opposition to Measure C.

Despite these public votes, city leaders who supported the center pressed ahead with different plans, using eminent domain to acquire the current Civic Arts Plaza property (the old Jungleland site), spending time and resources on years of litigation, settling on a purchase price of $17.9 million for the land in 1990.

This now changed the Council’s focus for developing a new downtown area at Jungleland

The land for the cultural center was no longer “donated without cost to the City.”

The City and its RDA eventually spent $63 million to build the Civic Arts Plaza and government center itself with plans that never materialized for a science center on the property.

---

19 Ibid.
After first negotiating with and then rejecting a development agreement with Kilroy Industries in 1997, the City and its RDA entered negotiations with Caruso Affiliated Holdings in 1999.

- The development agreement with Caruso was finalized in 2000.
- The agreement allowed Caruso to lease the 7.5 acres to the east of the Civic Arts Plaza for the Lakes project, negotiating a deal granting free rent for 55 years with four 10-year lease extensions.
- To continue the economic viability of the project, the plans were revised to add options for a cinema and parking structure, reduced parking space requirements, and more recently allowing for residential units on the site.
- The Planning Commission recommended denial of the project in 2004, finding that the project “did not adequately address the protection of the oak trees, General Plan consistency, parking and air quality impact, and that a further study of traffic, geology, hydrology, and utilities be conducted.”
- The Council approved the project in 2004.

---

Dear Commissioners,

We are against the request by the applicant, TO Lakes LLC, to construct a 165-unit apartment building development project at 2200 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, in the City of Thousand Oaks.

We believe that approval of the proposed project is PREMATURE; it is NOT in the City’s best interest.

1. It is premature to consider approval of this project, or any other new development on this property, until the issues concerning the proposed sale of the Lakes Shopping Center and parking lot are resolved.

The recent announcement of a proposed deal to sell the property is a bad idea. The original lease agreement, negotiated 20 years ago, has been a bad deal for the City. The valuation method is spelled out in the July 2000 lease. Even though the Lessee has the option to purchase the property, now is not the time to negotiate a sale. The original July 2000 lease agreement puts the City at a DISADVANTAGE.

At this time, a complete audit of the past 20 years is necessary to determine if the Lessee has complied with the terms of the lease. It is necessary to assure that the City has received all payments that were due, when due. This is to assure that there are no outstanding or overdue payments.

The City should leave the commercial property development business. The City should insist that as a condition for the sale of the Lakes Shopping Center and parking lot property, regardless to whom it is sold, the City will not carry any financing or loans related to the sale.

2. Before the property is offered for sale, the City must get a market-value appraisal. Market-value is to be determined by an independent expert appraiser. Since the property is now zoned Mixed-Use, the value of the property is much higher compared to its previous zoning. The current proposed sale price of the Lakes Shopping Center and parking lot property is TOO LOW.

Thank you,
Thomas White & Allana Stepp
Dear Director Parker - attached please find comments from the Conejo Climate Coalition with regard to the review of The Lakes development by Caruso, Inc.  We respectfully request that this document be shared with all members of the Planning Commission.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Faith Grant and Rose Ann Witt
Conejo Climate Coalition
November 12, 2021

Mr. Kelvin Parker  
Community Development Director  
City of Thousand Oaks  
2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard  
Thousand Oaks, California 91362

Dear Director Parker:

It is clear that climate is a priority for the City of Thousand Oaks as exhibited by the development of, and ongoing commitment to a Climate and Environmental Action Plan, a top 10 priority listed by the City Council in its “Visioning 2064” process. In California, local governments regulate many activities that contribute to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and air pollutants, including industrial permitting, land use and transportation planning, zoning and urban growth decisions, implementation of building codes and other standards, and control of municipal operations.

Although cities have the power to exert local control to ensure projects meet the goals of the community and its residents, building projects gaining approval right now are doing so in advance of finalized CEAP and General Plan Update documents.

The Lakes developer, Caruso, Inc., appears to be mindful of the City of Thousand Oaks’ goal of reducing GHG emissions by developing environmentally sustainable project plans. Caruso representatives reached out and met three times with members of the Conejo Climate Coalition. At the first two meetings, Caruso’s team expressed great interest in discussing information on green building recommendations, benefits, trends and adoption shared by CCC. Although they highlighted their previous LEED-Gold certified projects, they also expressed concern over the marketability of all-electric units, specifically those featuring all-electric cook tops and fireplaces. At Caruso’s express request, CCC responded by providing numerous models of existing, successful all-electric developments on the West Coast. (Please see attached October 20 letter to Bryce Ross and Chris Robertson.)

Prior to our third meeting with Caruso representatives on November 11, CCC reviewed the Notice of Intent, Initial Study/Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Appendices documents filed in October 2021, and noted minimal information was provided regarding sustainable building features. Said MND identified a 250-kilowatt solar photovoltaic system that is estimated to generate 424,201 kWh per year, resulting in a net consumption of 552,081 kWh per year. The generated electricity would be used for multiple purposes including building heating and cooling, lighting, some appliances, and electronics. CCC supports the use of solar for power generation and electrical appliances as these two features will be instrumental in reducing GHG emissions.
generated by building operations. However, we were quite disappointed to read that fossil gas, aka "natural gas"—which is even more potent as a heat-trapping greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide—is also listed for building heating and cooling as well as cooking. Also concerning is the fact that while the MND does reference hybrid cars, it makes no mention of electric vehicles charging infrastructure.

Said MND, which is merely one month old, appears to be inconsistent with verbal assurances conveyed to CCC by Caruso representatives on November 11 which suggest some sustainability features to be incorporated in The Lakes project not mentioned therein, including:

- 50% of covered garage parking spaces to be EV ready, of which 25 spaces are to include installed chargers. (EV charging stations were not quantified in the MND. The 2019 California Green Building Code requires 10% of the total number of parking spaces on a building site, for all types of parking facilities, be EV charging spaces capable of supporting future EV charging stations.)
- Short and long term bike storage to be provided, with an unspecified portion of said bike spaces to be plumbed for charging for e-bikes. (The 2019 California building codes require secure bicycle parking for 5% of the tenant-occupant vehicular parking spaces.)
- Solar to be installed on roofs for heating water in units, in the pool and spa, and possibly other general onsite consumption. (The 2022 CA Energy Code extends solar standards to high-rise multifamily apartments and condos. The PV should be sized to meet a target of 60% of the building's loads.)
- Battery storage to be designed to pair with PhotoVoltaics (PVs) for evening charging of vehicles and water heating. (The 2022 CA Energy Code introduces battery storage standards to high-rise multifamily apartments and condos. The storage should be sized to reduce exports to 10%.)
- Electric heat pumps for space heating/cooling to be utilized throughout the complex. (The 2022 CA Energy Code establishes heat pump space heating/cooling as a performance standard baseline for multifamily homes, including apartment buildings.)
- Lighting to be LED and high efficiency.
- Windows to be double-paned.
- Roof membranes to be reflective (aka “cool” roofing).
- MERV 13 air filters (Per the MND, CARB's 2005 Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective, states sensitive land uses such as residences should not be sited within 500 feet of a freeway. This complex is within 132 feet of Hwy 101 at its closest point and within 201 feet at its farthest point. The 2019 CA Energy Code requires the minimum efficiency value of filters to be MERV 13 in new high-rise residential construction. According to the MND, MERV 13 filters remove 90% of particles ranging from 1 to 10 microns.)
- Material finishes to be low or no volatile organic compounds (VOC)
- All plumbing fixtures to be low-flow in accordance with CALGreen standards.

According to the MND and discussions on November 11, redundant dual-energy electric and fossil (aka natural) gas systems are planned. Fossil gas is to be used for fireplaces/fire pits in the penthouse, lobby and landscaping, additional water heating, and residential cooking appliances. Installation of 220 volt outlets to allow for future conversion from gas to electric induction cooking is NOT planned and will inevitably result in expensive, near future energy-efficiency retrofits along with associated reconstruction disruptions to tenants, as well as avoidable greenhouse gas emissions and indoor air pollutants injurious to human health. The energy source for residential clothes dryers was not discussed.
If Caruso were to actually incorporate all of the above features, prepare a significantly greater percentage of covered garage parking spaces to be EV ready and install actual EV charging stations in significantly higher numbers (to prepare for California’s 2035 ban on car sales with internal combustion engines), and install all-electric fireplaces, fire pits, water heaters, clothes dryers, and cooking appliances (or at least install conduit for all residential cooking appliances to be electric-ready), the project could be eligible for LEED Gold certification, and would rival the sustainable building features of the competing developer designing the T.O. Ranch project at the K-Mart site.

Doing so would certainly better align with Caruso’s own Operating Principles 3, to “Find the win-win for everyone involved”, and 7, to “Invest in the future and never stop evolving”, as well as the firm’s stated objective of “doing what’s right for the next 100 years.” It would also better fulfill the City of Thousand Oaks’ Community Benefits evaluation criteria which, as restated on December 15, 2020 by then Community Development Director Mark Towne, asks whether developers, “will commit to constructing new buildings to exceed green building standards”. And it would solidify Caruso’s architectural leadership by creating a state-of-the-art, environmentally-forward-thinking, climate-safe, multifamily apartment complex as befitting the soon to be upgraded “crown jewel” of Thousand Oaks --- the Civics Art Center and Promenade.

Although CCC was pleased to receive more information about The Lakes’ intended green building features, Caruso’s representatives indicated that they couldn’t yet provide written documentation to support their verbal assertions -- which could prove cause for concern and raises questions about how to ensure developers follow through on actual installation of promised energy efficiency and pollution mitigation features.

At the CEAP update presented on October 26, the City Council clearly focused on and approved the necessity of strategies to reduce the City’s GHG emissions from transportation (62%) and building operations (20%) and to future-proof our community from the ever-worsening impacts of climate destabilization. It was clear from the comments and questions of several council members that there is growing interest in approving projects that meet and exceed California green building standards. The current climate reality is that every opportunity that goes beyond Title 24 energy efficiency building codes should be considered an essential community benefit. Let’s not waste this opportunity to build real sustainability into all new construction in Thousand Oaks. Research shows every dollar spent now on disaster mitigation saves six dollars in recovery from climate impacts, saves lives, and creates jobs.

Sincerely,

Faith Grant and Rose Ann Witt
on behalf of the Conejo Climate Coalition
October 20, 2021

Mr. Bryce Ross  
Senior Vice President, Development and Acquisitions  

Ms. Chris Robertson  
Vice President of Planning, Government and Community Relations  

Caruso, Inc.  
101 The Grove Drive  
Los Angeles, California 90036  

Dear Bryce and Chris,

The Conejo Climate Coalition has previously emphasized that Rick Caruso’s reputation for excellence makes him precisely the developer to lead climate-forward, all-electric construction in Thousand Oaks. As such, we challenged Caruso, Inc. to commit to designing The Lakes apartments as a LEED-certified project featuring energy-efficient windows and insulation, heat-reflective building materials, permeable pavers and a greywater system; equipped with all-electric appliances, induction cooktops and EV-charging stations all powered by rooftop solar paired with battery storage; and wrapped in a park-like setting, with abundant native trees for enhanced shade and evapotranspiration. In short, we invited Caruso, Inc. to forego climate and health damaging natural gas infrastructure in favor of a cleaner, healthier, climate-safe, people-centered living community. In response, Caruso Inc. requested examples of existing all-electric apartment complexes which demonstrate market adoption and acceptance of the concept. We submit the following for review and consideration:

In its July 2020 letter to the CEC Commissioners regarding the 2022 Energy Code, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District noted it had previously helped to construct 235 single-family and multifamily new homes within its service area. Looking ahead, SMUD has commitments from 37 unique developers and builders to construct 46 new all-electric developments. Of these, 38 are single-family and 8 are multifamily
projects, representing a total of 1,138 new single-family homes and 898 multifamily housing units that are being actively designed and constructed as all-electric.

In Oakland, two projects include Electric Lofts and Ice House. The Electric Lofts are GreenPoint Rated to ensure best building practices in systems that enhance energy efficiency, health and air quality, water conservation, resource conservation and liveable communities. The sold-out, all-electric, solar-powered Ice House comes pre-plumbed for all-electric cars in every residence.

Redwood Energy specializes in Zero Net Energy, multifamily housing projects in California and nationwide. The firm has led the design of more than 1500 ZNE all-electric affordable housing projects, and 200 all-electric market rate residences. Its website highlights several of these projects and their amenities, including LEED certification, electric heat pumps, photovoltaic systems, LED lighting, tenant energy usage monitors, insulated buildings, low-flow toilets, water-saving showerheads, and drought tolerant landscaping.

Locally, client Pacific Communities worked with Redwood Energy in 2014 to develop The Colonial House Apartments. A LEED Platinum, 90% Zero Net Energy mixed-use, affordable housing complex in Oxnard, it contains 44 large family units. Each apartment features electric resistance baseboard heaters, heat pump water heaters with insulated hot water piping, a radiant barrier in the attic, and a cool roof.

The Redwood Energy website also includes three zero emission “pocket guides”, including this one on Zero Carbon Commercial Construction and another intended to assist developers of fossil-free multifamily housing: A Zero Emissions All-Electric Multifamily Construction Guide. The latter guide notes that the “growing trend of new multifamily developments going all-electric across the U.S. and globally, [is] providing significant cost savings, reducing pollution, and improving tenant comfort, health, and safety.”

Construction cost savings for California developers specifically amount to $3,300/unit on average just from excluding gas infrastructure, and more than $20,000 per 8-plex for gas installations, laterals, interior piping, appliances, and venting. In downtown Los Angeles, just trenching and piping gas to an apartment building can cost $140,000. In a 2017 comment to the California Energy Commission, Stone Energy Associates stated that piping to gas appliances creates added costs ranging from $200-800 per gas appliance: https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=217420&DocumentContentId=26959

It’s no wonder then that all-electric housing, both single-family and multifamily, now accounts for 1 in 4 homes nation-wide; and that, as Figure 3 of Redwood’s All-Electric Multifamily Construction Guide shows, “electric heating, both heat pumps and resistance, has been the market share growth leader for heating energy in almost every county in the U.S. since 2010.”

For a higher-end example of all-electric multifamily housing, “The Ultimate in Sustainable Luxury Living” is the tagline for an all-electric, four-unit condo project in San Francisco that may be of interest to you. “Sol-Lux Alpha generates, stores, and manages energy independently from the electric grid”; each unit includes photovoltaics, battery storage, is “passive house” certified, and highly energy efficient.

The following link offers several more examples of Multifamily Building Electrification in various areas of Northern California; student housing projects at Stanford University and University of California campuses which, as of 2019, are no longer using on-site fossil fuel combustion, such as natural gas, for space and water heating; as well as references to all-electric restaurants at LAX.

Malcolm Harris, of Seattle- and San Francisco-based design firm Mithun, is quoted in the above powerpoint as asserting the change to multifamily electric housing greatly simplifies the energy system and is better in every way, as it allows for cost savings that pay for a lot of higher performance upgrades, less maintenance and better sustainability. Non-profit Bridge Housing represents and details more than 70 all-electric multifamily properties on the U.S. West Coast, of which over 30 are either GreenPoint Rated or LEED Certified projects: Sustainable Development.
Tim Kohut, director of sustainable design for National CORE, one of America’s largest affordable housing developers, wrote in his February 2021 Special to CalMatters that all of his company’s developments currently under construction, as well as those in planning this year, will be built all-electric. Agnostic to fuel choice, Kohut’s decisions are strictly economics-based; as he says, if National CORE “can make all-electric buildings work with affordable housing budgets, where every dollar counts, anyone can.”

Why Induction Cooking is the Hottest Trend to Hit Restaurant Kitchens explains that, “Both chefs and manufacturers are endorsing this trendy new method [electric-powered induction cooktops], finding it to be a more efficient, more precise, safer and more flexible way to cook than conventional methods such as gas or electric.”

Finally, Electrify Now, based in Oregon, also provides a lot of good information about the multiple facets of all-electric construction, including all-electric fireplaces (as does Redwood). According to Homestatosphere’s Fireplace Guide, “electric fireplaces are quickly catching on as the most popular fuel type available.” Benefits include overall cost-effectiveness, affordability, lowest installation costs, adjustability, ease of use and customization, minimal maintenance, and greatest safety. For residents who prefer an actual flame, alternatives include gel and ethanol fireplaces, or several candles placed on a hearth.

More than 50 California cities have passed, or are considering, measures to eliminate natural gas connections in new housing. As governments act to limit their climate impacts, they are driving changes that could substantially affect developers, who need to be ready when additional municipalities follow suit. Even if it means higher prices, people are willing to pay more for upgrades like energy efficiency, LED lights, low water utilization, smart energy technology, and other socially-conscious features. As noted by Eric Rohner, national practice leader for renewable energy at accounting firm Moss Adams, “What people want is social responsibility.” Business clients and often their employees are demanding these amenities.

Experts at Mithun and elsewhere agree that eliminating gas can be cost-neutral or even less costly than traditional construction. And, according to research compiled in a Rocky Mountain Institute report entitled The Economics of Electrifying Buildings, all-electric buildings employing heat pumps for space heating and cooling are not only less expensive to construct but are also less expensive to operate than buildings using natural gas. Both installation and maintenance of all-electric systems are low-cost; and consumer demand is growing, from individuals as well as from corporations seeking to lower their carbon footprints in anticipation of government regulations requiring disclosure of sustainability data. Grist published the following article on RMI’s report: Hot real estate tip: An all-electric home will probably save you money.

Federal tax incentives make the economics of all-electric buildings even more compelling, especially when pairing all-electric construction with renewable energy sources. Some developers are even eligible for a 30% federal tax credit for solar panel installations. According to LADWP’s Meeting California’s Climate Change Goals Through Building Electrification webpage, “electrification can reduce greenhouse gas emissions in homes by up to 60 percent in 2020 and by up to 90 percent in 2050 compared to mixed-fuel homes.” Even better news, according to a study released by consulting firm Energy + Environmental Economics (E3) and entitled, “Residential Building Electrification in California,” home electrification will also provide cost savings for most homeowners and developer even without state or utility incentives. An article the LA Times published last December covers this trending topic: Should California ban gas in new homes? A climate battle heats up.

Lastly, industry training resources are available locally through the Tri-County Regional Energy Network (3C-REN). 3C-REN offers capacity-building services including workforce training and technical code support. Examples of training workshops include: all-electric homes 101, passive solar homes, HVAC and lighting best practices, heat-pumps, and Title 24. Their upcoming events and workshops, as well as links to recordings of past events can be found here: Calendar of Events and Trainings.
The Conejo Climate Coalition challenges Caruso, Inc. to seize this opportunity and take the lead in setting a new standard for green-building in Thousand Oaks. We trust that between the two documents previously shared, "Environmentally Conscious Recommendations for New Building Development" and "Green Buildings - Benefits, Trends and Adoption," and all of the additional resources provided herewith, Caruso, Inc. should have no difficulty designing a trend-setting project in which it could take pride and which CCC could enthusiastically endorse.

We look forward to reviewing your proposal.

Sincerely,
Rose Ann Witt
Conejo Climate Coalition
Dear Commissioners,

I have signed up to speak at the Nov 15th meeting, but will be undergoing minor surgery in the AM. In the event I am not able to speak I wanted my comments to go into the public record. The photo below represents what my Zoom background would look like.

Good evening Commissioners. My name is Karen Wilburn. I am a resident of Newbury Park and a member of Conejo Valley Advocates for Sensible Planning. The Zoom background you’re seeing was taken from page 193 of the Mitigated Declaration. It’s simulation of the building as viewed from the freeway. I have to ask why wasn’t a similar simulation provided with a view from the parking lot or Thousand Oaks Blvd. That picture would have been worth 1000 words. Instead I had sit in the parking lot & visualize what a building which extends above the sound wall would look like. It wasn’t pretty.

I am against this proposal for 3 reasons:

1. The 75’ building height exceeds the 58’ height approved by the City Council in May for the pending General Plan update. To begin making exceptions less than 6 months after the vote is unconscionable & sets a dangerous precedent.

2. Everyone agrees we need more affordable housing. The city has conceded it has done a poor job in the past of requiring inclusionary conditions. Caruso’s proposal contains no promise of affordable units. Now is the time for the city to draw a line in the sand. NOTHING should be approved, not even 30 units without the developers providing a reasonable amount affordable units based on RHNA #’s.

3. This last minute deal to sell the property throws a monkey wrench into this whole project. Everyone but Caruso agrees the original lease agreement negotiated 20 years ago was a bad deal for the city. He has the right to purchase the property. The only question is how much should he pay. The valuation method is spelled out in his July 2000 lease. Some of us question if the sales prices & terms are reasonable. We should not be rushing into approval for a new project at the same time we’re negotiating a sales price. This whole approval process should be put on hold until the citizens & City Council have time to become satisfied that the sales agreement benefits more than just Mr. Caruso.

Thank you
Dear Planning Commissioners and City Staff:

The Thousand Oaks City Code is the Thousand Oaks City Code--for EVERYONE. The height limit is 58 feet no matter who your name is or what else you own in the City. Thousand Oaks has purposely kept height limits low so that ALL of us can enjoy views of our open spaces and ridgelines and not have to look at in the windows of tall buildings as we drive along the 101 Freeway and other streets throughout Thousand Oaks.

Caruso's proposed apartment building in back of the Lakes should NOT be an exception to the rule. If Caruso gets his way we will all have to see his apartments as we drive down the freeway and related streets. We will all have our views obstructed by them when we walk down the related streets. Caruso can, and MUST, follow the rules. If you grant this developer an exception, you will have to consider granting other developers exceptions or face charges of discrimination. NOW is the time to hold the line and say NO to a residential complex that is too tall. There is nothing so important in this proposal that it warrants that exception and the demands that will follow. If you do this, we will have a blocked and cluttered skyline, not the open space views we treasure.

Further, this project, like all other new apartment buildings, must provide affordable housing units. You cannot keep postponing these needed, and required units. The City needs to have affordable housing built along the way. That is the smart way to achieve our goals and incorporate those who are less wealthy into our neighborhoods and society. And no, you cannot grant the height exception to do this, they must be included in the units that can be built in the 58' limit.

Since it was built, the Lakes has been a mostly useless shopping complex for most of our local population. The overpriced, snooty stores and restaurants provide little benefit for most of us. It is time to make that shopping center functional and accessible and of better service to the citizens of Thousand Oaks. The vacancy rates at the Lakes have been consistently high. The list of businesses at that location that have failed is long. Time for Caruso to pay the piper, so to speak, and make this project better for all of us. No special treatment. He doesn't deserve it and will not provide the City with good value for it. From my perspective, the best
thing The Lakes does is provide overflow parking for meetings at City Hall and events at the Civic Arts Plaza. The potential sales price is way TOO LOW.

Additionally, the planned project provides too few parking places. Rents are too high to think that households in two bedroom units, and even one bedroom units only have one car. Transit is lacking so almost every adult in this City who can drive, does drive, and does own a car. That is life in Thousand Oaks and the Conejo Valley. It will not change anytime soon. If you lop off a story, you may have enough as planned, but otherwise there are not enough.

Reduce the building height so that it conforms with our zoning. We want to see ridgelines and open space skylines, not buildings obstructing our views.

I am not opposed to apartments at that location. I am opposed to apartment buildings that exceed the height limits. Do not play favorites. The limits are for everyone’s benefit. Do not allow him to obstruct our views. If you do, we will all pay for your mistake in annoyance and ugliness in perpetuity every time we pass by.

VOTE NO.

Thank you,

Wendy Zimmerman
Newbury Park CA
Building/Planning - #11116952

CDD - ADMIN - Adrienne Sosner

CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO - Adrienne Sosner in CDD - Admin
DESCRIPTION - What is going to happen to these native oaks?
How can the city make another decision (to sell this lot) without giving others the opportunity to bid?
Do you know Caruso already has this on his website? Why are we even going through the steps?

Workflow

STEP NAME - Review and handle Building/Planning request
ASSIGNEE - Adrienne Sosner
DEPARTMENT - CDD - Admin
DESCRIPTION - N/A

Details

STATUS - Submitted
PRIORITY - None
SUBMITTED BY - [Resident] Karen Martin
SUBMITTED THROUGH - Iframe
FOLLOWERS - N/A

Dates

DATE SUBMITTED - November 12, 2021, 9:19 am
DUE DATE - N/A

Contact

NAME - Karen Martin
EMAIL - takeodogg@aol.com
PHONE - N/A

Comments

There are no comments on this request yet.

Change Log

Nov 12, 2021 9:19am  ●  Request was submitted
Review and handle Building/Planning request was created
There is a large concern in our community about what is going on with Mr. Caruso and that deal he made in the early 2000’s for the Lakes and now with the proposed 7 or 6 story apartment building. It’s been written about in the Ventura County Star, Thousand Oaks Acorn, it’s all over the Nextdoor site and there was even someone outside my church yesterday (Sunday) handing out flyers. Wait until they start standing outside of markets, shopping centers, etc. A lot of people may not know about this but many may know very soon.

You had better think twice about giving Mr. Caruso what he wants. From what I’ve seen and read there are a lot more people against that high raise he wants to build next to the Lakes. If you allow him to do this, how are you going to stop other developers? I want to remind you there were various elections through this country on November 3 and the people spoke out. From the city governments to the federal government people have had it and are starting to fight back. Listen to the citizens of Thousand Oaks and don’t give Mr. Caruso (worth $4 billion) what he wants! He is playing our city leaders like fools, are you?

Peggy Burns
1290 Alessandro Drive
Newbury Park, CA  91320
805 499-6116
I have been a resident here since 1981 and do not want to lose the semi rural feel that we have here in Thousand Oaks.

MOUNTAIN RIDGE LINE RULE

I have a proposal I call "The Mountain Ridge Line Rule" that I would like to see included in our General Plan regarding all new buildings that will be built in Thousand Oaks.

It states that if you are sitting in your parked car on Thousand Oaks Blvd. you should not have any new buildings block your ability to see the tops of the nearby mountains.

The only exception is where a one story building still blocks the view. That would be allowed but higher buildings should not. Higher buildings can be accommodated by adjusting the building height as the structure gets farther away from the street. In this way a 2 story building would be set back a little. A 3 story building back more and in some cases a 4 story building can be accommodated if 100s of feet back from the street towards the mountains.

Unfortunately the new structures on the old Lupe’s site violate this rule but could have been built to comply. If the front building was 1 story instead of 3 you could still see the southern mountain ridges. The further buildings which are 3 story are fine as they are far enough back that the angle of view still allows the mountains to be seen. The capacity removed from the front building could have been added to the back buildings and still comply with the rule. See photo at the bottom.

This concept can allow us to comply with the new construction requirements AND keep much of the cozy rural feel we all love about Thousand Oaks.

You’ll notice in the photo that the 3 story buildings in back don’t look any higher than the 1 story building that is close on T. O. Blvd. and do not block the mountain ridge line view.

The "Mountain Ridge Line Rule" is easy to understand also relevant to the proposed 75 ft. high Caruso Lakes Apartment complex being discussed.

That proposed height should be reduced with the additional apartment units allocated on other available sites.

STORY POLES
Please see attachments at the bottom.

The city of Malibu uses what they call Story Poles to demonstrate the outline of new proposed buildings. These are vertical poles with ribbons attached between them that create an outline of the proposed building. This is from the actual sight lines of citizens on the ground which is not always obvious in architectural drawings.

This is a brilliant, easily created, low cost method and evaluated common sense approach to determining acceptable building height.

This technique can be used here in Thousand Oaks during the design phase to verify the proposed new building will not violate the Mountain Ridge Line Rule by allowing anyone to visit the proposed site and actually look at the surrounding mountains and see what building heights and where would be acceptable.

It also is an excellent method of making our city residents aware of the new proposed construction as it can be seen by anyone in the area. Thus raising awareness that something is in the works.

THE FOLLOWING ARE MY RESPONSES TO THE CITY STAFF’S RESPONSES TO MY PREVIOUS EMAIL

Where do I find the text defining “Subjective” and “Objective”? No Answer from T. O, City Staff yet.

From T. O. City Staff:

Another consideration is that Thousand Oaks Boulevard Specific Plan allows up to three stories by right and the suggested rule with varied heights and setbacks would impact property owners ability to build under the uniform standards of the Specific Plan.

My Response:

We have different zoned areas with different height allowances. How is that any different?

Also, according to the Staff statement above, the Specific Plan allows three stories. Then Caruso’s proposal of 7 stories is in violation.

Currently at The Lakes the shops are 1 story structures set very far back from T. O. Blvd. If we abide by the T. O. rules as you state above the height limit is 3 stories. I assume that extends all the way back to the freeway? If so, that would comply with the Mountain Ridge Line Rule and the additional proposed apartments set behind the shops would not block the view of the mountains from T. O. Blvd.

Therefore it would allow the city to provide housing (no higher than 3 stories) which would contribute to satisfying the states mandates.

The state is not mandating we change our zoning. They are allowing each city to deal with the details as long as the end result of more housing is satisfied. Additional housing units will be added at various sites throughout our city.

From T. O. City Staff:
Furthermore, the introduction of rules that further restrict the development of property are viewed as an impediment to housing by the State Department of Housing and Community Development, which can jeopardize certification of City’s Housing Element and open the City up to lawsuits.

My Response:
The Mountain Ridge Line Rule doesn’t "restrict the development of property". It simply directs where it is placed. It’s no more restrictive than “Set Back” requirements.

Again, additional housing will be spread throughout the city thereby satisfying the states mandates.

The state is mandating specific numbers of housing built, not exactly where or how it is distributed throughout our city. There would be no basis for a lawsuit if we are showing good faith in complying with the state’s requirements.

They don’t need to be overbuilt at The Lakes site specifically requiring a zoning change.

From T.O. City Staff:
Staff reviewed your suggestion and rules that protect views are subjective in nature.

My Response:
I disagree. If the rule is based on easily verified Geometry and consistent with all properties in it’s application it is Objective, not Subjective.

If the rules regarding "views" (Mountain Ridge Line Rule) using Story Poles (as a tool) are carefully defined regarding viewing angle, pole placement, and other "objective" parameters that are measurable, that is by definition “Objective”.

Story Poles are a tool just like a tape measure or traffic cone. They can be drawn on an Architectural Side View drawing using simple Geometry to show where the Vertical Setbacks meet the viewing angle. This is Objective Geometry. Not subjective Judgement calls.

They have no implied “Subjective” quality.

The City of Malibu has sent me their Story Pole Standards. As they are already written, T. O. can copy them verbatim.

My Request:
How can we rewrite the Mountain Ridge Line Rule to comply with our current, relevant laws (in other words, make it “Objective”)? it can be done!

TRAFFIC CONCERNS

Another very important issue is how will the increase in Apartments impact traffic congestion?

Heaven forbid we have an emergency such as a large fire or other event.

How will all the residents escape on what are already congested streets?

Let’s keep Thousand Oaks the special place it is.

Gary Raymond
Thousand Oaks
PHOTOS:

The photos below are from a current proposed project in Malibu that beautifully illustrates the use of Story Poles. The address is 24855 Pacific Coast Hwy., Malibu, CA 90265.

This photo shows the Project Name and Proposed Building Additions. This is posted at the site so any public bystander can learn the projects name, additions and or changes and intended impact.
This photo shows the proposed building outline and how it would successfully pass the Mountain Ridge Line Rule by allowing the top of the mountains to be seen over the building from a person's point of view on the ground.
This photo shows that the mountains are not an issue and the Mountain Ridge Line Rule would not apply here.
This photo shows a numbered “marker stake” which identifies each specific Story Pole on the site and architectural drawings. All poles have separately numbered markers.
Lupe’s Site.
You’ll notice in the photo that the 3 story buildings in back don’t look any higher than the 1 story building that is close on
T. O. Blvd. and do not block the mountain ridge line view.
If the front building was 1 story instead of 3 you could still see the southern mountain ridges. The further buildings
which are 3 story are fine as they are far enough back that the angle of view still allows the mountains to be seen.
Fyi

Kelvin Parker
Community Development Director
City of Thousand Oaks

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: Thomas White <tawhitejr@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Comments for November 15 City of TO Planning Commission Meeting

Date: November 15, 2021 at 1:07:22 PM PST

To: Gary Raymond <glraymond@earthlink.net>

Yes! We, I and Allana, are ok with you sharing the letter.

Thomas

Allana and Thomas’ iPhone

On Nov 15, 2021, at 8:06 AM, Gary Raymond <glraymond@earthlink.net> wrote:

Hi Tom,

Great letter!

Are you ok with me sharing this with our TOSG Group?

Gary

Gary and Cathy Raymond
2406 Sirius St.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
glraymond@earthlink.net
H 805-492-5858
On Nov 14, 2021, at 10:28 PM, Thomas White <tawhitejr@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Commissioners,

We are against the request by the applicant, TO Lakes LLC, to construct a 165-unit apartment building development project at 2200 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, in the City of Thousand Oaks.

We believe that approval of the proposed project is PREMATURE; it is NOT in the City’s best interest.

1. It is premature to consider approval of this project, or any other new development on this property, until the issues concerning the proposed sale of the Lakes Shopping Center and parking lot are resolved.

The recent announcement of a proposed deal to sell the property is a bad idea. The original lease agreement, negotiated 20 years ago, has been a bad deal for the City. The valuation method is spelled out in the July 2000 lease. Even though the Lessee has the option to purchase the property, now is not the time to negotiate a sale. The original July 2000 lease agreement puts the City at a DISADVANTAGE.

At this time, a complete audit of the past 20 years is necessary to determine if the Lessee has complied with the terms of the lease. It is necessary to assure that the City has received all payments that were due, when due. This is to assure that there are no outstanding or overdue payments.

The City should leave the commercial property development business. The City should insist that as a condition for the sale of the Lakes Shopping Center and parking lot property, regardless to whom it is sold, the City will not carry any financing or loans related to the sale.
2. Before the property is offered for sale, the City must get a market-value appraisal. Market-value is to be determined by an independent expert appraiser. Since the property is now zoned Mixed-Use, the value of the property is much higher compared to its previous zoning. The current proposed sale price of the Lakes Shopping Center and parking lot property is TOO LOW.

Thank you,
Thomas White & Allana Stepp
Dear Planning Commission and staff:

Given the abysmal job the City of Thousand Oaks has done in developing new housing opportunities in recent years, as well as the RHNA targets our city must meet, I support the proposal for an apartment building at the Lakes.

I'm concerned that there do not seem to be any affordable units as a part of this proposal. While we need more housing at all income levels, we are in particular need of options that qualify for very low income and low income residents. I'm looking at the numbers for the RHNA allocations and comparing what has been achieved at moderate and above moderate in comparison to our VLI and LI. Developing affordable housing options need to be a priority of our city.

I anticipate this issue will come up in the discussion tonight at the meeting and I look forward to it. I realize there will be folks who may complain about building height. My argument is that this is an ideal location for a 75 foot building...next to the freeway and alongside the CAP which is over 100 feet. We will never achieve the level of housing we need without some higher density housing.

Truly Yours,
Lisa Powell
Thousand Oaks
Hello,
I am a homeowner at the Camelot Condominium Complex, adjacent to The Lakes. I also have been a resident of our beautiful Conejo Valley since 1964. I am extremely concerned, and do NOT support, the proposed apartment complex at The Lakes.

This building will affect our homeowners community directly by affecting our view and possible blockage of the sun. This is a possible health hazard for the hundreds of residents here, due to the possible seasonal affect disorder it may cause.

Also, the traffic on Thousand Oaks Blvd is already at an all time high, and we simply do not have the capability of adding more traffic on this thoroughfare without causing long delays and traffic accidents/hazards.

We request this plan to build to be stopped immediately! This will create a precedent of taller buildings being allowed and built in our beautiful little town. WHERE is our small town feel going??!! This is NOT Los Angeles!

Thank you for your time.

Suzanne E. Huberth
Hi Nizar, I hope you are well on this Veterans day (you may have the day off) Holiday.

I wanted to voice my opposition to this project and have my concerns recorded as a matter of record. Not sure how that process happens.

My reason(s) for my opposition is articulated below.

1) Height- 7 stories high is significantly to high. Should be 3 stories with underground parking. The entire plan does not fit our community goal of less growth or planned controlled growth.

2) Parking concerns- I don't believe the math they are using is accurate.

3) Traffic- The project will result in a lot more traffic on the Boulevard and 1 light fixture to get in and out of the project we clog the Boulevard (which already has traffic challenges during busy times).

4) Precedent- the project if approved will establish a precedent for future large projects and does not fit our community goals.

Please add my concerns to the November 15 meeting as matter of record. Thank You.
Hello,

Please see below. Thank you.

Judy

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com> On Behalf Of Claudia Bill-de la Peña
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:36 PM
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>
Cc: Claudia Bill de la Pena <ClaudiaBDLP@toaks.org>

For tonight’s PC Hearing.

Thank you.

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

805.449.2103
Biography
Twitter
Facebook
Instagram
From: Shawn Moradian <toba.bid@gmail.com>
Subject: T.O.B.A. Letter of Support for Planning Commission Hearing - November 15, 2021
Date: November 15, 2021 at 11:11:24 AM PST
To: Kelvin Parker <KPark@toaks.org>
Cc: Andrew Powers <apowers@toaks.org>, Haider Alawami <HAlawami@toaks.org>, Patrick Hehir <PHehir@toaks.org>, NSlim@toaks.org, aadam@toaks.org, claudia4slowgrowth@roadrunner.com, BEngler@toaks.org, EJones@toaks.org, KMcNamee@toaks.org

RE: Planning Commission Hearing - Agenda Item 7A: TO Lakes, LLC. ("Applicant"); 2200 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd ("Property")

Dear Mr. Parker:

Please see attached. Kindly confirm receipt?

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Moradian
Chairman & President

Thousand Oaks Boulevard Association
"Dedicated to the Beautification and Revitalization of the Boulevard"
2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 200 - Westlake Village, CA 91361
website: www.thousandoaksboulevard.com

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that this material is Private & Confidential. The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.
November 15, 2021

City of Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
c/o Community Development Dept.
Attn: Mr. Kelvin Parker, Director
2100 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

RE: Request for Planning Commission Recommendation of Approval
Applicant: TO Lakes, LLC. (Caruso)
Case No's: (DP) 2021-70434; (LD) 2021-70435; (SPA) 2021-70437; (DAGR) 2021-70437; (MND) 2021-70424; (PTP) 2021-70438; and (LU) 2021-700009 (“Project”)
Property Address: 2200 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd. (“Property”)

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of our Board of Directors of the Thousand Oaks Boulevard Association, this letter is intended to serve as formal support for the above-referenced Project.

We respectfully request full recommendation of approval in accordance with staff findings, as this Project meets the spirit and intent of the Thousand Oaks Boulevard Specific Plan. Notably, the Project has its own specific plan which compliments ours, with one significant exception, which is height. The Lakes specific plan expressly contemplates and allows for development within 75 feet as compared to an average of 50 feet for the remainder of Thousand Oaks Blvd. This intentional height variation was permitted do to many unique and exclusive factors of the Lakes Property.

1. The Property is located immediately adjacent to the Civil Arts Plaza (CAP), which houses our beloved music and performing arts companies, in addition to our City Hall and public hearing chambers. The CAP is over 100 feet in height, making it the only development on Thousand Oaks Blvd built to that height, therefore for proper scaling, aesthetics, and other visual benefits, the Lakes Property needed to be built to tailor off that scale;

2. The Property is located in the core area of the Thousand Oaks Blvd Specific Plan, which has repeatedly been the location where the majority of our community wanted and supported housing and more efficient development to support the aforementioned uses, activities, and other venues taking place at the CAP;
3. The Property has its own specific plan and development standards that cannot and will not set a precedent in other parts of the City or the Thousand Oaks Blvd Specific Plan area.

With the pending housing crisis in Thousand Oaks, the vast community benefits of this Project are self-evident. Not merely because much needed rental units will be available to the underserved segment of our community, including the 270 applicants that were denied the ability to secure a residence at 1710 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd, but rather the Lakes Property itself and the CAP would benefit significantly from this injection of new life and activity.

This Project should be the easiest YES this Commission has ever had to grant! The members of T.O.B.A. are grateful to Caruso and the City of Thousand Oaks for bringing the Project to near realization. Much of the uncertainty surrounding development applications stem from the “unknown” of the applicant, not the actual project. Here, we have the privilege to partner with Caruso – a world renowned developer famous for excellence and first-in-class standard that no one else in the industry has been able to achieve.

Caruso’s reputation and track record go beyond generic classifications of retail, commercial, or residential developments. Each of his projects has a unique theme, a sense of place, an immersive experience leaving the visitor desiring to experience more. His projects have won awards not for their size or location, but rather his ability to create place making wherever he goes. We in Thousand Oaks have been the recipients of his masterpieces like the Promenade at Westlake.

Nearly 20 years ago, the City tried its hand as developer with the Lakes Property and the results have been felt, criticized, and regretted ever since. We should learn and build from the missteps of the past and look forward at the promise and potential this Project has on our downtown, CAP, and the vision of our namesake Boulevard.

If anyone believes they can build, design, operate, and/or modify a Caruso project better than Caruso himself, they clearly don’t know and have not done their homework on this company. We point this out respectfully for one reason. This Project’s main beneficiary is us, the residences, businesses, and community here in Thousand Oaks. 165 units will not change anything in the life, company, and/or finances of the applicant, however each one of those units will change the life of someone here in our community, including our rapidly expanding bio-tech sector. If we want to continue to be competitive and attract these types of companies, which bring good paying jobs, then we need to provide them this same caliber of housing and amenities, as they provide us in their respective fields.

We urge this Commission to look beyond simple numerical numbers like 165 or 75, and rather focus on the vast community benefits, social benefits, environmental benefits, equitable benefits, and synergy this Project will deliver to our community.

The only opposition we anticipate for this Project is based on the building height, however as stated above, this Project WILL NOT set a precedent for height. Its set back off the Boulevard against the freeway which will not be visible from Thousand Oaks Blvd, nor the freeway, and will not block and/or obstruct any of our community’s viewshed. The Property has its own specific plan expressly allowing 75 feet building height, which this Project complies with.
Please consider that we do not have an endless supply of land or the luxury to build less on the scarce remaining pieces available. Any recommendation to reduce the number of units and/or height of this Project will be to the detriment of the City and its residents, not Caruso.

The City Council has already allocated and given prescreen approval for this Project. This Commission is tasked with evaluating the Project within the strict and narrow parameters of that approval, nothing more, nothing less. Questions relating to the sale of the Property amongst other economic considerations are to be addressed solely by the City Council. The City’s financial determinations are not to be considered when deliberating and making recommendations to City Council.

Accordingly, we respectfully request full recommendation for approval of the applications before you. We thank the City and its Planning Commissioners for their continued support and commitment to transforming the Boulevard into a premier destination for our community to enjoy for generations to come.

Respectfully yours,

T.O.B.A.

Shawa Moradian
President

Cc: Thousand Oaks City Council
Mr. Andrew Powers – City Manager
Mr. Haider Alawami – Economic Development Manager
Mr. Patrick J. Hehir – Assistant City Attorney
T.O.B.A. Board of Directors
RE: Issue #7

To the Planning Committee

The TRAFFIC IMPACT of this 7 story, 75 foot, 165 unit high rise does not accurately and fully address what is happening at Thousand Oaks Blvd and Conejo School Road. The impact in the immediate area does fully address:

Other businesses right across the street in the SELECT PLAZA at 2436 Thousand Oaks Blvd. which include:
- BANGKOK AVENUE
- SARAI BAKERY PANDERIA & TAQUERIA
- TOP NAILS SPA & WAXING
- TAIYO RAMEN
- DONUT DEPOT
- REBEL VIOLET
- BECKMAN CLEANERS
- ZEN DAY SPA

This strip center is already impacted with traffic and parking issues.

A short distance up from and behind the strip center on South Conejo School Road is a Child Care Center & Thunderbird Mobile Home Park. The mobile home park alone has over 160 mobile homes. These two properties alone would be directly across from the entrance of the Caruso High Rise and pose an even greater traffic impact on those people entering and exiting. If you continue around this road, which is two-lanes, there are additional businesses and homes which brings traffic along Willow Lane to Hampshire Road. This intersection is extremely busy everyday and at all times of the day.

These are just a few examples that only BEGIN discuss the the traffic impact presented by this structure at Thousand Oaks Blvd and Conejo School Road.

Thousand Oaks Blvd is the Main Street in the city. The traffic presently is very congested, morning, noon and in the evening. The other street greatly impacted is Hillcrest Drive, which has been impacted by additional housing on: Los Feliz Dr., Skyline Drive, and Dusenburg Dr. —89 bed Assisted Living Facility. All of these streets are already affected by traffic and more traffic will be added with this 75 ft., 7 story, 165 unit apartment building. Everyone of these units will have 1,2 maybe even 3 cars. Traffic will be constant. There are limited places people can go on foot in this town. Most people do not walk to the grocery store. Moreover, from this structure just a simple drive to the grocery store requires a car in Thousand Oaks.

Most people will still need to drive, to work, to schools, to stores, to shopping, etc.
This is just a brief illustration of what is NOT being addressed. This is not about one area in the city of Thousand Oaks—this is about the entire city of Thousand Oaks. This apartment building at The Lakes will forever change this city. This apartment building is NOT the wish of the people of Thousand Oaks. PLEASE DO NOT GO FORWARD WITH THIS APARTMENT BUILDING.

Thank you,
Beth Flugard
Thousand Oaks Resident since 1989

Time sent: 11:30am/11/15/21
From: Max Ghenis <mghenis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:00 PM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Item 7A: Support for more homes at The Lakes

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Our community is in a housing crisis that’s pushing up rents, displacing low-income people, and damaging the environment. Projects like The Lakes are the solution. We need more homes, and we need them to be dense. With more housing developments like these, we can achieve more walkability, affordability, and inclusiveness to build the sustainable community we want and need.

On behalf of Ventura County YIMBY, I urge you to support this project.

Thank you,
Max Ghenis
From: Paula Gallegos <Paula@go2gallegos.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:59 AM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Agenda 7A - The Lakes

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:

Our main issue with the proposed Lake project is the density of such a huge building with so little access. Not only does 7 stories violate the City ordinance of a 4-story limit, but Thousand Oaks Blvd coming out of the Lakes and Conejo School Road cannot accommodate the potential traffic from so many units. Conejo School Rd up to Wilbur is already crazy with traffic, as many people use this as a shortcut to the 101 freeway. I reside in the Thunderbird Oaks Mobile Home Community, and for the seniors entering and leaving our park it will make it much more dangerous. There was recently an accident there. I heard there will be no crosswalk, stop sign or light at our entrance. (The recently extended median up to the entrance of our entrance has created difficulty for large vehicles to enter and exit).

We don’t need or want this kind of density at this location. Many of our residents are very upset with these plans. We need to protect and preserve our precious hometown community, and this location is not appropriate for such an aggressive high-rise structure.

Fred & Paula Gallegos
Thunderbird Dr.
Thousand Oaks, CA
I am all for the development at The Lakes as a companion work/life balance to provide employees and added employment for the Civic Arts Plaza and surrounding businesses.

I am concerned if TO keeps saying no to new development Thousand Oaks will be left with no tax base, no young people for our schools and our housing will be old and we will be left with lots of memory units.

And when offered development of the old Kmart site, it has been no,no,no all the while that eyesore gets more decrepit and it is a gateway to our city. What a shame it has been left to rot for over 15 years!

I support Rick Caruso and his offer to our community.

Narda Fargotstein
23 Faculty Court
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
805-493-2138
From: calabdog <calabdog@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Community Development Department <CommunityDevelopment@toaks.org>
Subject: Fw: Caruso Development Public Hearing: 11/15 21

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.

CORRECTION from 11:30am/11/15/21 note: First paragraph...the impact in the immediate area does NOT fully address....

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Begin forwarded message:

On Monday, November 15, 2021, 11:42 AM, calabdog <calabdog@aol.com> wrote:

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Begin forwarded message:

On Monday, November 15, 2021, 11:32 AM, calabdog <calabdog@aol.com> wrote:

RE: Issue #7

To the Planning Committee

The TRAFFIC IMPACT of this 7 story, 75 foot, 165 unit high rise does not accurately and fully address what is happening at Thousand Oaks Blvd and Conejo School Road. The impact in the immediate area does NOT fully address:
Other businesses right across the street in the SELECT PLAZA at 2436 Thousand Oaks Blvd. which include:
BANGKOK AVENUE
SARAI BAKERY PANDERIA & TAQUERIA
TOP NAILS SPA & WAXING
TAIYO RAMEN
This strip center is already impacted with traffic and parking issues.

A short distance up from and behind the strip center on South Conejo School Road is a Child Care Center & Thunderbird Mobile Home Park. The mobile home park alone has over 160 mobile homes. These two properties alone would be directly across from the entrance of the Caruso High Rise and pose an even greater traffic impact on those people entering and exiting. If you continue around this road, which is two-lanes, there are additional businesses and homes which brings traffic along Willow Lane to Hampshire Road. This intersection is extremely busy everyday and at all times of the day.

These are just a few examples that only BEGIN discuss the the traffic impact presented by this structure at Thousand Oaks Blvd and Conejo School Road.

Thousand Oaks Blvd is the Main Street in the city. The traffic presently is very congested, morning, noon and in the evening. The other street greatly impacted is Hillcrest Drive, which has been impacted by additional housing on: Los Feliz Dr., Skyline Drive, and Dusenburg Dr.—89 bed Assisted Living Facility. All of these streets are already affected by traffic and more traffic will be added with this 75 ft., 7 story, 165 unit apartment building Everyone of these units will have 1,2 maybe even 3 cars. Traffic will be constant. There are limited places people can go on foot in this town. Most people do not walk to the grocery store. Moreover, from this structure just a simple drive to the grocery store requires a car in Thousand Oaks.

Most people will still need to drive, to work, to schools, to stores, to shopping, etc.

This is just a brief illustration of what is NOT being addressed. This is not about one area in the city of Thousand Oaks—this is about the entire city of Thousand Oaks. This apartment building at The Lakes will forever change this city. This apartment building is NOT the wish of the people of Thousand Oaks. PLEASE DO NOT GO FORWARD WITH THIS APARTMENT BUILDING.

Thank you,
Beth Flugard
Thousand Oaks Resident since 1989
Time sent: 11:30am/11/15/21

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS
Hello,

Please see below. Thank you.

Judy

---

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com> On Behalf Of Claudia Bill-de la Peña
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:25 AM
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>
Subject: Fwd: Say NO to 7 story apartment bldg

Could this be included for the PC hearing Monday?

Thank you.

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

805.449.2103
Biography
Twitter
Facebook
Instagram

Begin forwarded message:

From: Louise Mathews <lhmathews@gmail.com>
Subject: Say NO to 7 story apartment bldg
Dear Claudia

My husband and I have been residents of this city for the past 38 years. Thank you for all you have done during that time to slow and cap the growth of our community.

Please say NO to Rick Caruso's proposal to build a 7 story apartment complex behind the Lakes.

What is happening to our city? Why is the city council approving so many high rise projects? How did CLU get away with a 4 story building in a residential area? That's what I see from my kitchen window now, a huge 4 story building that is lit up like Las Vegas 24/7. How did that happen? Does anyone care anymore?

Our city will be apartment dense when the mixed building across from Tarantula Bar is finished. Four stories of apartments! Have you looked at the monstrosity lately? It's awful!
And there is another mixed use apartment building up the boulevard, too.

No more. Stop it. Control our city's growth. None of us that live here want this city to end up like the San Fernando Valley.

I'd rather pay higher taxes than have a 7 story apartment complex go in which will destroy the view from the Lakes of the hills and add a density factor that is unfathomable.

Please!

Thank you

Louise Mathews
193 Cedar Heights Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA  91360
Hello,

Please see below. Thank you.

Judy

---

From: Claudia Bill de la Peña  
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:29 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>  
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Caruso Structure behind Lake

For Monday’s PC hearing.

Thank you.

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

805.449.2103  
Biography  
Twitter  
Facebook  
Instagram

Begin forwarded message:

From: Whitney Renner <whitneytrenner@gmail.com>  
Date: November 12, 2021 at 08:14:38 PST  
To: Claudia Bill de la Pena <ClaudiaBDLP@toaks.org>  
Subject: Proposed Caruso Structure behind Lake

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 Claudia,

I am writing as a concerned Thousand Oaks resident. I’ve heard that there is a proposal for Caruso to build a 7 story apartment complex behind the Lakes and I am incredibly concerned. This is not only an eye sore, but will completely change the volume of
traffic, population density and overall Thousand Oaks quiet suburban vibe that residents love so much. As a former citizen of the city of Los Angeles I am happy to share the horror stories of such developments. I cannot name a single one that benefited anyone other than the developer and the minority of folks that could afford the astronomical rents.

Should there be a compromise to build reasonably priced apartments please consider a limit on the height to no more than 3-4 stories.

I appreciate your time and consideration to this matter.

Kind regards,

Whitney Renner
Hello,

Please see below. Thank you!

Judy

---

From: Claudia Bill de la Peña  
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:31 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>  
Subject: Fwd: Concerned about the pending Caruso deal

For Monday’s PC hearing.

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

805.449.2103  
Biography  
Twitter  
Facebook  
Instagram

Begin forwarded message:

From: John Pendergast <jpenderg1@yahoo.com>  
Date: November 11, 2021 at 15:44:13 PST  
To: Claudia Bill de la Pena <ClaudiaBDLP@toaks.org>, Ed Jones <EJones@toaks.org>, Bob Engler <BEngler@toaks.org>, Kevin McNamee <kmcnamee@toaks.org>, Al Adam <aadam@toaks.org>  
Subject: Re: Concerned about the pending Caruso deal

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 agree with the concerns expressed in this communication.
It is apparent to me the Council is determined to 'sell-out' the residents of Thousand Oaks to further the interests of the developers and business interests.

On Thursday, November 11, 2021, 03:07:20 PM PST, karen wilburn <karenwilburn32@outlook.com> wrote:

Honorable Council Members,

I was very dismayed to see today’s headline in the Acorn. This looks like a really bad deal for the city but perhaps you can educate me. I would like to point out & ask the following questions.

1. The 10 acre Kmart site recently sold for $37MM or $3.7MM per acre  
2. The Lakes site is 7.5 acre so the sales price of up to $15MM is only $2MM per acre. And we would give him 27 years to pay the purchase price. The city is not in the bank business. He should get this loan from a private bank not the city & we should be paid up front. 
3. The lease agreement with Caruso has not yielded any income.

City Manager Powers says this deal will allow us to get out of this 95 year lease deal & that the property has been devalued because of the terms of the lease agreement. That would make sense to me if the proposed buyer was someone other than Caruso. That new buyer would be bound by the terms of the lease. However if Caruso wants to buy it, it seems the city should be in the driver’s seat. The city has no obligation to sell the property. Why would we sell a parcel at below market value at the same time we are considering a proposal for 165 apartments? This whole deal looks suspicious & as a taxpayer I need to understand in more detail how this benefits the city & not just Caruso?
One other comment. Today’s Acorn is misleading in that it refers to previous city approval of a 75’ height limit at that site. That was part of the Specific Plan #11 adopted in 1989 & at that time there was no approval for residential at this site. The 75’ height had to be beyond 150’ from the boulevard & I believe it was intended for a multi-plex theater which was never built. In May the Council voted to make this parcel Mixed Use Medium which would allow for residential up to 58’ not 75’. Caruso’s plan. Now Caruso’s PR firm says it would be open to discussing reducing the bldg height to 65’. Well isn’t that generous of him. We don’t have to give him 65’. We are in the driver’s seat here. BTW I have yet to hear anything about affordable units. This all needs to be ironed out before we make a deal to sell. Don’t make the same mistake a prior city council made 20 years ago when they approved this lease.

PS-I have bcc’d this email to a large email list I have of other concerned citizens.

KAREN WILBURN
Karenwilburn32@outlook.com
213-216-1937
Hello,

Please see below. Thank you.

Judy

From: Claudia Bill de la Peña
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2021 8:55 AM
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>
Subject: Fwd: The Lakes

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

805.449.2103
Biography
Twitter
Facebook
Instagram

Begin forwarded message:

From: Karen Martin <takeodogg@aol.com>
Date: November 13, 2021 at 16:13:19 PST
To: Claudia Bill de la Pena <ClaudiaBDLP@toaks.org>
Subject: The Lakes

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 Claudia,
I believe we should slow this process down. It really feels like the citizens of this community haven’t had time to review and respond to this sale. This is a Chumash historical site the city gained by eminent domain. Should other options be considered?
It isn’t that the council hasn’t shown great judgement in the past.
Karen
Hello,

Please see below. Thank you.

Judy

---

From: Claudia Bill de la Peña
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2021 8:59 AM
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>
Subject: Fwd: The Lakes

Also for the planning commission.

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

805.449.2103
Biography
Twitter
Facebook
Instagram

Begin forwarded message:

From: Gil Prowler <gprowler@gmail.com>
Date: November 13, 2021 at 16:11:41 PST
To: Claudia Bill de la Pena <ClaudiaBDLP@toaks.org>
Subject: The Lakes

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 Claudia Bill-de la Peña,

Reading about yet another deal with Rick Caruso I can’t help but think about the similarities from the play ‘The Music Man’. To refresh your memory, it’s the
story about a city slicker con man who snookers a small town and its starry-eyed elected officials with his flash and bravado.

Now, while it’s not an exact representation of how Caruso played the City Council and Planning Commission it certainly makes one think about the sweetheart deal he got. Honestly, who offers a free lease and other concessions to a developer if they can’t manage to make a profit on their investment? Well, I guess the City of Thousand Oaks does.

Now, after what a city official described as a ‘hard fought’ agreement in renegotiating the disastrous fifty-five-year plus lease, the city is willing to sell the Lakes to Caruso’s company for just two million dollars.

That’s due to the fiscal blundering by past city council members, including Andy Fox who said, “the Lakes was never meant to be a moneymaking venture for the city.” Well, he was right, the results are a sizable discount for a property that’s worth well over that. And though Drew Powers says about the current Lakes deal, “As much as we’d like to, we can’t change the provisions and the terms’ of the existing lease agreement”, apparently we can.

Which brings us to the latest Caruso project and his proposal to develop an apartment complex right behind his other ‘failed’ undertaking. One question that should be asked, among others, is why the city is allowing Caruso to skate some thirty-seven years to pay the city the eleven to thirteen million dollars he offered to complete the deal.

Well, as Jamie Boscarino, our city’s finance director is quoted as saying, the first payment of only 1% isn’t due for four years after completion because “we wanted to give them time to get the building leased out.” That’s sweet of him but why is the city willing to let Caruso wait over three decades to fulfill his obligation.

So, before you, as a member of the city council, find yourself marching behind Caruso’s latest pied piper act, please reexamine the proposal to be sure this offer, unlike the last one, fairly compensates the people of Thousand Oaks.

Gil Prowler
From: Community Development Department  
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:16 PM  
To: Nizar Slim <NSlim@toaks.org>; Stephen Kearns <SKearns@toaks.org>  
Subject: FW: Say NO to 7 story apartment bldg

Hello,

Please see below. Thank you.

Judy

---

From: Claudia Bill-de la Peña <claudia4slowgrowth@gmail.com> On Behalf Of Claudia Bill-de la Peña  
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:25 AM  
To: City Clerk's Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>  
Subject: Fwd: Say NO to 7 story apartment bldg

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.

Could this be included for the PC hearing Monday?

Thank you.

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

805.449.2103  
Biography
Begin forwarded message:

From: Louise Mathews <lhmathews@gmail.com>
Subject: Say NO to 7 story apartment bldg
Date: November 11, 2021 at 4:25:01 PM PST
To: Claudia Bill User <claudia4slowgrowth@adelphia.net>

Dear Claudia

My husband and I have been residents of this city for the past 38 years. Thank you for all you have done during that time to slow and cap the growth of our community.

Please say NO to Rick Caruso's proposal to build a 7 story apartment complex behind the Lakes.

What is happening to our city? Why is the city council approving so many high rise projects? How did CLU get away with a 4 story building in a residential area? That’s what I see from my kitchen window now, a huge 4 story building that is lit up like Las Vegas 24/7. How did that happen? Does anyone care anymore?

Our city will be apartment dense when the mixed building across from Tarantula Bar is finished. Four stories of apartments! Have you looked at the monstrosity lately? It's awful!
And there is another mixed use apartment building up the boulevard, too.

No more. Stop it. Control our city's growth. None of us that live here want this city to end up like the San Fernando Valley.

I'd rather pay higher taxes than have a 7 story apartment complex go in which will destroy the view from the Lakes of the hills and add a density factor that is unfathomable.

Please!

Thank you
Louise Mathews
193 Cedar Heights Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
From: Community Development Department  
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:17 PM  
To: Nizar Slim <NSlim@toaks.org>; Stephen Kearns <SKearns@toaks.org>  
Subject: FW: Concerned about the pending Caruso deal

Hello,

Please see below. Thank you!

Judy

From: Claudia Bill de la Pena  
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 10:31 AM  
To: City Clerk’s Office <cityclerk@toaks.org>  
Subject: Fwd: Concerned about the pending Caruso deal

For Monday’s PC hearing.

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

805.449.2103

Biography  
Twitter  
Facebook  
Instagram
I agree with the concerns expressed in this communication.

It is apparent to me the Council is determined to 'sell-out' the residents of Thousand Oaks to further the interests of the developers and business interests.

On Thursday, November 11, 2021, 03:07:20 PM PST, karen wilburn <karenwilburn32@outlook.com> wrote:

Honorable Council Members,

I was very dismayed to see today’s headline in the Acorn. This looks like a really bad deal for the city but perhaps you can educate me. I would like to point out & ask the following questions.

1. The 10 acre Kmart site recently sold for $37MM or $3.7MM per acre
2. The Lakes site is 7.5 acre so the sales price of up to $15MM is only $2MM per acre. And we would give him 27 years to pay the purchase price. The city is not in the bank business. He should get this loan from a private bank not the city & we should be paid up front.
3. The lease agreement with Caruso has not yielded any income.

City Manager Powers says this deal will allow us to get out
of this 95 year lease deal & that the property has been
devalued because of the terms of the lease agreement. That
would make sense to me if the proposed buyer was
someone other than Caruso. That new buyer would be
bound by the terms of the lease. However if Caruso wants to
buy it, it seems the city should be in the driver’s seat. The
city has no obligation to sell the property. Why would we sell
a parcel at below market value at the same time we are
considering a proposal for 165 apartments? This whole deal
looks suspicious & as a taxpayer I need to understand in
more detail how this benefits the city & not just Caruso?

One other comment. Today’s Acorn is misleading in that it
refers to previous city approval of a 75’ height limit at that
site. That was part of the Specific Plan #11 adopted in 1989
& at that time there was no approval for residential at this
site. The 75’ height had to be beyond 150’ from the
boulevard & I believe it was intended for a multi-plex theater
which was never built. In May the Council voted to make
this parcel Mixed Use Medium which would allow for
residential up to 58’ not 75’. Caruso’s plan. Now Caruso’s
PR firm says it would be open to discussing reducing the
bldg height to 65’. Well isn’t that generous of him. We don’t
have to give him 65’. We are in the driver’s seat here. BTW I
have yet to hear anything about affordable units. This all
needs to be ironed out before we make a deal to sell. Don’t
make the same mistake a prior city council made 20 years
ago when they approved this lease.

PS-I have bcc’d this email to a large email list I have of other
concerned citizens.
KAREN WILBURN
Karenwilburn32@outlook.com
213-216-1937