

From: [Morgan family](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Subject: State housing mandates
Date: Saturday, February 25, 2023 10:43:32 AM
Attachments: [Housing letter to Board of Sup..docx](#)

To the City Clerk of Goleta:

Attached is a letter that we sent this week to the County Board of Supervisors as well as to the SB County Housing Element. We believe that these comments are relevant to the Goleta City Council's discussion of state housing mandates at the special meeting on Monday. Thank you for taking our thoughts and opinions into consideration.

Sincerely,
Carter and Wendy Morgan
6542 Camino Caseta, Goleta

Dear Supervisor Capps:

It is very clear that our state has a severe housing shortage. The limited availability of affordable housing is driving many California residents to move out of our state to seek opportunities elsewhere. It is sad to see this happen, and we understand the rationale for requiring each county to do its part to ease this shortage by creating a building plan. As a retired teachers, we see in our community the great need to address our housing shortage. This could potentially assist those who commute from outside our area and enable them to put down more permanent roots here. They might no longer be stuck on congested roads and highways or forced to leave our area altogether. Many of these commuters are the teachers who educate our children, the nurses and other healthcare workers who keep us healthy, and the first-responders such as firefighters and law enforcement officers who keep us safe. They are also the many workers in the service sector who provide for our needs in grocery stores, restaurants, and at our homes. We must do a better job of caring for these workers!

With all this in mind, you can see that we are not “anti housing.” However, we do have a problem with the current proposal regarding the addition of 5,664 new housing units on the South Coast. Of those, 4270 units are proposed to be built on two sites in the Goleta Valley. **That is a whopping 82.4% of the total!** These 4,270 units will all be on unincorporated land in the county at two sites - the current Glen Annie Golf Course and off of Hollister Avenue and Ward Drive (including some land that is currently used for agriculture). Both of these locations butt right up to the City of Goleta boundaries! **It feels like this proposal is a strategic assault on the residents of Goleta, as well as those living next-door to us in “Noleta.” We should all do our part to ease the housing crisis, but not in such a disproportionate way!**

Now before you claim that our opposition to the size and scope of these projects reeks of NIMBYism, consider these points:

- The City of Goleta has a population of approximately 33,000 people out of the 446,000 or so residents in the entire county. How can it be that 7% of the county residents should be so directly impacted by 82% of the new housing right on their boundaries?
- The City of Carpinteria has a population of approximately 13,000 people. This is about 3% of all county residents. Under the current housing proposal, Carpinteria is being asked to add 416 new units. This equates to about 7% of the South County's suggested total. While still higher than its 3% population, this is nowhere near what Goleta residents are being asked to take on.
- Montecito and Hope Ranch are proposed to add 0 new units!!

So we ask you, how is this equitable?

Here are a few other factors to consider:

- Any project in our foothills pushes the urban line further up into the hills, opening the door to more and more sprawl. Transforming Glen Annie is just bad planning.

- The foothills above Goleta are a high fire hazard area, but golf courses and Ag lands protect Goleta's northern flank.
- The golf course site is currently zoned Ag, and there is no infrastructure in place.
- There is no public transit in that area and amenities aren't within walking distance.
- Traffic is already gridlocked daily at the Glen Annie/Storke off ramp with residents, Dos Pueblos students, and Costco customers. The Hollister Avenue corridor near Ward Drive is also already impacted by high traffic volume.

- **How will the County ensure that those who move into new housing units are currently working in our community** and not private investors or out-of-towners looking to purchase a 2nd home to use as a nice getaway?
- The County of Ventura has its SOAR program (Save Open Space and Agricultural Resources) which requires a popular vote before unincorporated open space can be rezoned for development. **Is Ventura County so much more forward-thinking than Santa Barbara County in terms of environmental protection and quality of life?**
- **And what about the incredible strain on the Goleta Water District to provide for an additional 4,270 homes (housing 10,000-15,000 residents)?**

And finally, let's look at this proposal through the lens of the current Revenue Neutrality Agreement. The City of Goleta is forced to give 30 percent of all sales taxes, 30 percent of all transient occupancy taxes, and 50 percent of property taxes to the County. Every year! Since 2002, Goleta has given Santa Barbara County more than \$140,000,000!! Considering this history with the county, why would Goleta residents not think that proposing huge housing developments just outside our city boundaries is not a strategic money grab? **Goleta residents would feel the impacts of this housing with a strain on our roads and other infrastructure and with an increased population, but the City would not even reap the economic benefits of this new housing.**

So we ask you, Supervisor Capps, if you were a resident of Goleta (or Noleta, for that matter), would you not share our feelings about the unfairness of this housing proposal?! **We urge you to remove the Glen Annie site from the current proposed housing list, reconsider the size of the Ward Drive project, and choose more sites from other parts of the south coast.** We look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,
Carter and Wendy Morgan
6542 Camino Caseta, Goleta

From: [Eric Heidner](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Subject: Opposition to Glen Annie Golf Course rezoning
Date: Saturday, February 25, 2023 5:48:17 PM

To whom it may concern--

I am opposed to rezoning the Glen Annie Golf Course and agricultural lands for the purpose of building low-income housing, and I support the Goleta City Council's decision to send their letter of opposition to the SB County Board of Supervisors.

Sincerely,

Eric C. Heidner
5844 Stow Canyon Rd.
Goleta, CA 93117
805-967-2594
echeidner@gmail.com

From: Jennifer Fullerton <goletaspring@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 4:33 AM
To: City Clerk Group
Cc: Kyle Richards; James Kyriaco; Paula Perotte; Luz Reyes-Martin; Stuart Kasdin
Subject: Housing Element letter to send to the county

Dear Mayor Perotte and Councilmembers,

I strongly support the letter proposed to be sent to the County in regards to their draft housing element.

As a resident of Western Goleta who has reviewed their draft housing element in detail, I feel strongly that the approach that the county has taken is flawed, and the proposed allocations for housing are not fair and balanced across the south county. They are proposing to build over 1400 units in an area unfit for this density, while completely leaving Montecito and Hope Ranch off the hook. There is much too much focus on converting ag land, and not enough consideration of other ways of fulfilling the RHENA, such as rezoning existing areas for mixed-use or increased densities. The rush to come up with a plan is going to result in devastating consequences for those of us here in Goleta.

Especially concerning was a response from Das Williams from a comment letter I submitted to the County. His response - "The best time for you to direct comments to the Board on specific parcels will be during the rezone process that will begin this summer. There will be an Programmatic Environmental Impact Report with a full public hearing as well as a Planning Commission hearing and a Board of Supervisor hearing. Because we cannot avoid state law on the numbers required, I suggest that if there is a site you are urging us not to rezone, that you identify a specific site (address or APN) we should rezone or suggest a higher density on one of the sites that you view as a lesser problem.".

From this response, it appears that he has already made his mind made up, is assuming they are not making any changes to their plan, and is already assuming that zoning change meetings will happen. And based on prior experience with the way he pushed the cannabis ordinances through with little input and transparency, I have no doubt he intends to do the same with the RHNA.

I appreciate the City stepping up and fighting for the best interests of everyone in the city, and for the future of this entire area, as what the county is proposing will vastly change all of our quality of life for the worse.

Thank you for your consideration,
Jennifer Fullerton

From: [Melanie Rogers](#)
To: [City Clerk Group](#)
Subject: Comment for Monday's (2/27) City Council Meeting
Date: Saturday, February 25, 2023 5:54:19 PM

Dear City Clerk,

I am submitting a comment in support of the Goleta City Council's sending their letter to the SB County Board of Supervisors, "County 6th Cycle Draft Housing Element Comment Letter." I oppose the County's plan to rezone the Glen Annie Golf Course and agricultural lands around the City of Goleta for housing. I commend the members of the Goleta City Council for thoughtfully identifying 2,580 potential units for housing that include vacant and underutilized lots. This is a much better use of existing resources than rezoning our precious green spaces which, once lost, will be gone forever.

Not only do we value our green spaces and agricultural lands in and around Goleta, our infrastructure simply does not support the additional residences that the County BoS is proposing in its ill-fated plan. Furthermore, the Glen Annie Golf Course provides a natural fire break for the communities situated below Cathedral Oaks Road and it is a stopover location for migrating Canadian Geese.

Sincerely,
Melanie Rogers

Dear SB County Supervisors and Goleta City Council:

I was born and raised in Santa Barbara/Goleta. My family has roots here since the 1920's and my wife's family since the 1940's. We have children and grandchildren living in "Noleta".

We are writing to ask that you remove the South Patterson agricultural lands and the Glen Annie Golf Course from any and all site lists.

Please do not target agricultural land no matter how small. These are the most precious resources in the area and in the county. We have already lost too much Ag land in Santa Barbara, Goleta, Santa Maria, and Santa Ynez.

Glen Annie Golf (We are not golfers) serves the community in many ways and its loss would be most serious. Goleta already has too much high density housing and commercial building that has congested the entire West Goleta valley. The Glen Annie/Storke off ramp is a traffic disaster every morning and evening.

All this still doesn't address our already extremely limited water resources. It is nearly criminal to consider new housing in light of our already diminishing resources at Gibraltar and Cachuma (silting in particular).

In addition, shouldn't we concede that Santa Barbara/Goleta has never been a cheap housing market? It has always been, and likely always will be, a market driven by the quality of living here. Because of that, the County and cities should fight "state mandates" at every turn. Commuting workers has been the norm for nearly three decades. It is a sad commentary, but very real.

"Pigeon Coop" housing, and forgiving local codes and permitting is a farce forced upon us by the horrible governance at the state level. It doesn't take much to see that San Francisco, LA, and other large communities have become so overly congested that the declining quality of life in addition to evermore flawed regulation has driven people to leave the state. Perhaps that and future emigration should be a factor?

And who will pay for the necessary, massive infrastructure elements needed by this forced growth?....certainly not the low income housing developers.

This is so seriously flawed on so many fronts it is unimaginable that local governments would so readily bow to the State.

Respectfully,

Dennis and Kathleen Kittle

4957 Yapple Ave.
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

From: Andrea Haupt <abhaupt@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 12:04:35 PM
To: Kyle Richards <krichards@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Concern re Goleta housing development

Dear Mr. Richards,

I am a resident of Goleta who is very concerned about the proposed development adjacent to the Goleta boundaries. The county did not sufficiently consider the impacts to the city of Goleta when proposing the locations, in particular the proposed housing off Glen Annie.

Please act to remove the Glen Annie Golf Course rezoning from its current agricultural zoning to housing. The County should revise its draft to include other parts of the South Coast parcels. Allocating 4,270 of the 5,664 required South Coast Units to various parcels immediately adjoining Goleta is too great a burden for the city. By contrast, Carpinteria area has been allocated only 416 units in the current draft, leaving virtually all surrounding agricultural parcels untouched. Similarly, no Montecito or Hope Ranch area parcels are currently identified for potential rezones.

Please consider:

--The proposed high number of units will impact our city in negative ways and is beyond reasonable. The proposed location of Glen Annie would further exacerbate an already problematic traffic situation, i.e. the freeway backing up by the Cathedral Oaks and Glen Annie offramps-- not to mention the high risks associated with an emergency situation that requires evacuation.

--There are additional concerns: adding additional housing in the foothills will entail increased fire hazard, and set into motion further sprawl. There have to be smarter ways to develop.

Thank you for your time,

Andrea B. Haupt

-----Original Message-----

From: <cdg55@earthlink.net>

Sent: Feb 27, 2023 9:07 AM

To: <cityclerkgroup@cityofgoleta.org>

Cc: Dave G <cdg55@earthlink.net>

Subject: Written Submittal Regarding Agenda Item "A.1 23-109 County 6th Cycle Draft Housing Element Comment Letter," meeting date February 27, 2023

Dear City Clerk – please distribution the attached written submittal regarding Agenda Item "A.1 23-109 County 6th Cycle Draft Housing Element Comment Letter," meeting date February 7, 2023.

My name is David Gaughen, email address of cdg55@earthlink.net, and phone number of (805) 985 - 7229.

At present, I do not plan on speaking on this Agenda Item.

Thank you, David Gaughen

DAVID GAUGHEN
7456 Evergreen Drive
Goleta, CA 93117
Telephone: (805) 985 – 7229
Email: cdg55@earthlink.net

February 27, 2023

To: The Mayor and Council Members
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Subj: Support of Agenda Item “A.1 23-109 County 6th Cycle Draft Housing Element Comment Letter,”
meeting date February 27, 2023

Ref. (1) David Gaughen’s written submittal entitled “Concerns Regarding Agenda Item C.1 23-007
Housing Element 2023-2031 Adoption,” meeting date January 17, 2023

Dear Madam Mayor and Council Members:

I have reviewed the County 6th Cycle Draft Housing Element Comment Letter (“Comment Letter”), excellent work! In particular, I was impressed with: 1) Identifying the removal of the Glenn Annie Golf Course from the inventory, 2) Clearly stating the Goleta Water District currently has a moratorium on new water connections, 3) “Housing Element goals, policies, and programs addressing the impacts on Goleta, its residents, and existing housing services from this magnitude of development on our borders will be massive ... existing roads, public transit, parks, open space, schools, libraries, emergency response services, utility providers, affordable housing service providers, and adjacent neighborhoods will bear the impacts and costs of the new housing ..., and 4) “Converting agricultural lands should be a last resort, not the first option ... remove these agricultural lands from your inventory and instead protect agriculturally zoned lands from conversion.”

Please approve and submit the Draft Letter to Santa Barbara County.

Additionally, please remember that several of the key concerns stated in the Comment Letter equally apply to the upcoming Council meeting regarding the Heritage Ridge 332 Residential Apartment Project.

Thank you for your time,

David Gaughen

From: Cristina Prichard <crissyprichard@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 10:33 AM
To: City Clerk Group <cityclerkgroup@cityofgoleta.org>
Subject: Keep Goleta Country

Dear Supervisor Capps:

We are aware that our state has a severe housing shortage. It is difficult for our children as well as others in the community to find affordable housing. Many teachers, healthcare workers, first responders, and those in the service industry must commute to work in Santa Barbara and Goleta.

However, the current proposal for 4,270 units to be built on two sites in the Goleta Valley is not a sound solution. These 4,270 units will all be on unincorporated land in the county at two sites - the current Glen Annie Golf Course and off of Hollister Avenue and Ward Drive (including some land that is currently used for agriculture).

It's not equitable

* The City of Goleta has a population of approximately 33,000 people out of approximately 446,000 residents in the entire county. This small percentage of the county population should not be responsible for 83% of the new housing.

* The City of Carpinteria has a population of approximately 13,000 people. This is about 3% of all county residents. Under the current housing proposal, Carpinteria is being asked to add 416 new units. This equates to about 7% of the South County's suggested total. While still higher than its 3% population, this is nowhere near what Goleta residents are being asked to take on.

* Montecito and Hope Ranch are proposed to add 0 new units.

Significant negative environmental impacts

* Any project in the Goleta foothills pushes the urban line further up into the hills, opening the door to more and more sprawl. Transforming Glen Annie is just bad planning.

* The foothills above Goleta are a high fire hazard area, but golf courses and Ag lands protect Goleta's northern flank.

* The golf course site is currently zoned Ag, and there is no infrastructure in place.

* There is no public transit in that area and amenities are not within walking distance.

* Traffic is already gridlocked daily at the Glen Annie/Storke off ramp with residents, Dos Pueblos students, and Costco customers. The Hollister Avenue corridor near Ward Drive is also already impacted by high traffic volume.

* The strain on the Goleta Water District to provide for an additional 4,270 homes (housing 10,000-15,000 residents) would be incredible.

* The County of Ventura has its SOAR program (Save Open Space and Agricultural Resources) which requires a popular vote before unincorporated open space can be rezoned for development. Is Ventura County so much more forward-thinking than Santa Barbara County in terms of environmental protection and quality of life?

Adverse community and financial impact

- * How will the County ensure that those who move into new housing units are currently working in our community and not private investors or out-of-towners looking to purchase a second home to use as a vacation house?
- * Since the closure of Ocean Meadows Golf Course several years ago, Glenn Annie is the only affordable public course in Goleta. It is used by many members of the community from senior citizens to high school students. We need more healthy recreation options, not less.
- * Glenn Annie is used by many non-profits for charitable events utilizing both the golf course and the clubhouse. Many families have events from weddings to memorial services at the club house. This is a well-used and much-loved resource for our community.
- * Glenn Annie is draw for golfers from all over California. Their visits to Goleta boost tourism filling our hotels and restaurants generating tax revenue.

Revenue Neutrality Agreement

- * Currently, the City of Goleta must give 30 percent of all sales taxes, 30 percent of all transient occupancy taxes, and 50 percent of property taxes to the County. Every year! Since 2002, Goleta has given Santa Barbara County more than \$140 million! Considering this history with the county, many Goleta residents consider proposing huge housing developments just outside our city boundaries is a strategic money grab.
- * Goleta residents would feel the impacts of this housing with a strain on our roads and other infrastructure and with an increased population, but the City would not reap the economic benefits of this new housing.

We urge you to remove the Glen Annie site from the current proposed housing list, reconsider the size of the Ward Drive project, and choose more sites from other parts of the South Coast. We look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,

Cristina and David Prichard
846 Santa Marguerita Dr
Goleta 93117



Citizens Planning Association

916 Anacapa Street

Santa Barbara, CA 93101

February 27, 2023

TO: Goleta City Council

FROM: Citizens Planning Association

Re: Support for the Goleta Letter to SB County re Housing Element Update

Dear Goleta City Council Members:

Citizens Planning Association is writing today in support of the letter you hopefully will submit as part of the Housing Element update. CPA has been expressing its disappointment in the County Housing Element process since the release of the RHNA numbers at SBCAG a year and a half ago. CPA has submitted several letters and has attended the few workshops and the Board of Supervisors recent de-briefing, asking for more public input opportunities and fewer behind-the-scenes meetings with land owners.

The letter you are presenting today clearly states what CPA has been saying all along. The process was flawed from the start and consequently, the current draft does not reflect long-standing County land use policies regarding the preservation of our agricultural lands, adherence to existing Community Plans, and most importantly, listening to the voice of residents in our County.

As we watched the debriefing held for the Board of Supervisors on Tuesday, February 14th we realized this public discussion was exactly what we had been asking for since the process began last year. Your own City representatives succinctly expressed their frustration of a flawed and almost secretive process which resulted in the unincorporated Goleta area carrying the load of more than 5000 units for the entire South Coast. At the same time, they offered realistic suggestions which would provide affordable housing where it is most needed.

CPA supports the City of Goleta in what your staff is recommending today and we believe the entire County will benefit from the positions you are taking in the letter. You will be proud of this 'legacy'.

Marell Brooks, President

Citizens Planning Association