

From: [Kelsey Perry](#)
To: [Christina McGuire](#); [PER Meetings](#)
Subject: Comment: Mixed-Use Project with 46 Residential Units at 5955 Calle Real
Date: Friday, July 3, 2026 11:34:53 PM

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

Hello,

I am writing to express my belief that City Ventures should NOT be able to include the following in their plans:

Exceeding the height limits by 4' for a maximum height of 39' height (35' maximum height allowed in CC zone);

Reducing common bicycle charging outlets from five to zero (Goleta Municipal Code Section 17.38.090(C));

Reducing parking lot heat island standards from 480 square feet to zero square feet (Goleta Municipal Code Section 17.38.110.J).

I would ask that the 480 sf parking lot heat island consideration increased to 480 sf from the currently proposed 0 SF. Climate change is making our city hotter - we must plan for the future.

I would ask that the outlets for bike charging are increased from zero to five. We must reduce fossil fuel dependency and support bicycle commute. Ease of charging does this.

Additionally, will an environmental impact report be created for this development and will the public have the opportunity to review?

Thank you,
Kelsey

From: [ARTHUR OLGUIN](#)
To: [PER Meetings](#)
Subject: Public Comment—7/14/26 For Conceptual/Preliminary Review: New Housing Development Project with 44 Units and 2 Mixed-Use Units 5955 Calle Real (APN 069-110-018) Case Nos. 26-0010-DP/25-0004-SUB/25-0044-DRB (former SB Motorsports location)
Date: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 5:21:16 PM

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.

City of Goleta Planning and Environmental Design Review Board
City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

Re: 7/14/26 For Conceptual/Preliminary Review: New Housing Development Project with 44 Units and 2 Mixed-Use Units 5955 Calle Real (APN 069-110-018) Case Nos. 26-0010-DP/25-0004-SUB/25-0044-DRB (former SB Motorsports location).

Dear Board Members,

I'm generally aware of both the County's Housing Element and Goleta City's Housing Element (General Plan Ch. 10). Although I didn't endorse all the final location decisions the county made to jam too much housing into the Noleta (eastern Goleta) area making it an unofficial unincorporated ghetto, rather than spreading it around more equitably, including to the elite neighborhoods and high-valued properties of Montecito, I do understand the goal to build more housing in the county. I'll also admit that I was opposed to the two-roundabouts on Hollister near Highway 217, but I must say that their operation is not as confusing as they appeared in the initial plans. However, the pedestrian crossings for these round-about structures are unquestionably hazardous and dangerous for those walking on foot. Clearly a liability waiting to happen, not to mention human injury.

Today, I write about another project planned for Goleta—the 46 home proposal at 5955 Calle Real (former SB Motorsports location). For weeks, I've wondered about the towering yellow flags that went up on this space next to the car wash. I thought it might be a proposed new business development, e.g., office suites, a shopping venue, or a hotel. But I read in the *SB Independent* that it is coming for your review of consisting of 7 three-story buildings with 46 dense developments for “very-low-income households” for families earning \$91,050 or less. I walked the property today to check the reasonableness for my opposition to using this space for high-density housing.

It's an understatement to say how disappointed I am about this proposed project. At the other end of Calle Real (on the corner of Patterson) is another dwelling unit eyesore. What a mistake to fill in the small avocado farm with row-housing that looks like an extension of the storage units to the southeast and crossing to the other side of Patterson. Was your designer the same firm that created the 1950s Howard Johnson chain? The green and tan industrial warehouses are a cheap-looking, frightening visual blight, and clearly ill-suited and degrading for the neighborhood.

As I visited the Calle Real site location to imagine 7 buildings of dense housing pushed up

against the car wash and athletic club (formerly a bank) I conclude the project will only add another eyesore for the community. Moreover, apart from the ocular trauma, the dense housing will undoubtedly increase safety hazards for residents and commuters in the area. The space is too small for so many dwelling units, and there is insufficient parking and driveways to service that many residents. Further, the buildings are set far too close to the street (Calle Real) and far too close to the intersection (Fairview) that cars pulling out of or into the complex are at increased risk of accidents, i.e., the Chick-Fil-A effect. The lack of setback from the street of the front building will make an unattractive edifice.

The article in the *Independent* was not clear whether these will be homes or apartments, but there are negatives arising from either option.

I object to the:

- excessive traffic densely-packed housing will bring to the area. It will serve to motivate people to stay away from the businesses in that area of town. There is already reason to avoid the Hollister corridor in Old Town due to the lengthy traffic stops. This choice makes me wonder whether it was selected as part of the City's plan to reduce vehicular travel. Yet, public transportation is insufficient for this area;
- increased difficulty to access the existing businesses in the area (car wash, gas station, athletic club, and the small strip-mall businesses on the east side of that parking lot);
- continued uglification of the city;
- false expectation that these residents will revitalize the Calle Real corridor for the city. The vacant businesses along Calle Real suffer from redundancy with other similar businesses (an over-supply of restaurants) and a lack of vision by the city planners. Furthermore, it's unclear the extent to which extremely low-income individuals living in these units will shop in the Calle Real area.
- unrealistic and insufficient setback from Calle Real for a project consisting of 7 buildings. The location seems incompatible with existing surrounding businesses. Plus there is insufficient space for a community park or other congregate gathering so as to foster opportunities for interacting and communing rather than domiciled isolation. Given the compact area of the project, I seriously doubt whether developers can build the 7 buildings, parking, etc., without turning the occupants into experimental lab-rat residences.

I hope you will carefully scrutinize the proposal for the Calle Real project, especially the safety risk profile that arises from its location so close to the Fairview intersection. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Art Olguin

PO Box 6246

Santa Barbara, CA 93160

From: [Ravid Raphael](#)
To: [PER Meetings](#)
Subject: 5955 Calle Real Housing Development Project
Date: Monday, July 13, 2026 12:49:16 AM

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 Goleta Design Review Board,

The 5955 Calle Real Housing Development Project does not fit its surroundings. The site is too constrained for such a massive development. It is too large and, as proposed at 3 stories, too tall for this location. It will abut the sidewalk and dominate the area in an adverse way. There are no buildings in the immediate area that are taller than 2 stories. Given the size, bulk and scale of this project, no height limit adjustment should be allowed. Even at 35' this will loom over the surrounding area.

The plan to include open space at the rear, immediately adjacent Hwy 101 and the Fairview off ramp is poorly located given the air and noise pollution it would be subject to.

Since parking will be constrained, particularly guest parking, it would be important to have the full number of required bicycle charging outlets in order to support alternative transportation.

Since much of the surrounding area is paved, reducing the heat island standards from 480 square feet to 0 is not appropriate, as this will exacerbate heat island effects.

If this project is to be sited at this location, it needs significant modification.

Sincerely,
Ravid and Arlene Raphael
Goleta

Date: July 13, 2026

To: Design Review Board, City of Goleta, CA

RE: Comments to Goleta DRB Hearing (July 14, 2026)

RE: Mixed-Use Project at 5955 Calle Real, Goleta

From: Thomas Edson, Resident / Property Owner, City of Goleta

Summary: The mixed-use proposal for 46 domestic condo units, to be tentatively located at 5955 Calle Real, Goleta, poses specific, irremediable adverse health and safety risks to the public. It should not be approved in its current configuration because the project would adversely and irremediably impact traffic and pedestrian health and safety. The project as initially proffered violates both Findings #1 and 2 of Provision #1 of California's Housing and Affordability Act.

I. This proposal for a mixed-use project at 5955 Calle Real fails to meet Provision #1, Findings 1 and 2, of the Housing Accountability Act (2026).

A. This proposal does not meet Finding #1 because the proposed development creates a "specific, adverse impact upon the public health [and] safety" of the public.

1. The vehicular traffic to and from the proposed development introduces adverse safety and health impacts upon the immediate intersection and streets adjacent to the property, Calle Real, N. Fairview Ave, and probable impact upon Encina Rd.

2. The mixed development at 5955 Calle Real proposes to locate 97 vehicle spaces, which in all likelihood will significantly cause adverse safety and health impacts because the volume of vehicle trips per unit (avg. 530 daily vehicle trips) will exceed the already inefficient road design and vehicular flow of the three adjacent streets: Calle Real, N. Fairview Ave., and Encina Rd.

3. The entrance and exit for this development is located on Calle Real, 82.98 yards from the Calle Real and N. Fairview Ave. intersection. The development will intensify unresolved traffic congestion at one of the city's most problematic intersections during the morning and early evening commute time periods. This adverse impact of significant road congestion upon immediate road and traffic infrastructure creates multiple public safety issues not presently identified and addressed by this proposal, and there are "no feasible method(s) to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact[s] without rendering the development...infeasible."

a. **Negative Safety and Health Impacts Traffic Patterns, N and S 101; Case #1:** The Calle Real and North Fairview Ave. intersection serves as a primary exit and entrance for the ramps of the North and Southbound 101 freeway. During the morning and evening commute periods, traffic

proceeding north from Hollister Ave. queue on the entire bridge to wait for the traffic signal located at the interchange with the N101 exit. The waiting period may include 3-4 light transitions. Often, however, traffic on this section cannot proceed into the Calle Real and Fairview intersection because too many vehicles are already queued in the 50 yards leading to the traffic lights at Calle Real. The input from Hollister and the vehicular traffic from the northbound 101 exit overwhelms the capacity of the traffic control system.

b. **Negative Safety and Health Impacts Traffic Patterns, N and S 101; Case #2:** Similarly, traffic on N. Fairview Ave. travelling south to the freeway and to Hollister Ave. forms beyond Encina Rd. in an 8 to 10-minute (or more) queue.

c. The entrance and exits to this proposed development are located 83 yards from the Calle Real and N. Fairview Rd. intersection. Specific turn and direction lanes are enforced with white solid lines approximately 100 yards before the intersection entrance.

i. Entering the development: Proceeding east-bound on Calle Real, residents could enter the development in the right-hand lane after crossing the Calle Real / N. Fairview Ave. intersection; however, residents proceeding west-bound on Calle Real would need to enter one of two demarcated left turn lanes that serve as entrances to the 101 freeway and to Hollister Ave. Dedicated lanes begin approximately 100 yards before the intersection. This left turn into the proposed development would necessitate blocking other vehicles from proceeding into the Calle Real / N. Fairview Rd. intersection and completing their connection to the north and southbound entrances of the 101 freeway.

ii. Exiting the development (1): The exit from this proposed development would require that all vehicles proceed only to the right, or east-bound on Calle Real. Vehicles, attempting to exit to the left on Calle Real, cannot safely or legally cross multiple lanes designated by white lines (3) by exiting to the left. They can only exit to the right on east-bound Calle Real.

iii. Exiting the development (2): Proceeding the right on Calle Real, east-bound, vehicles are essentially “captured” by the Calle Real business district road design. Drivers, however, have two immediate options for direction: one, they might legally execute a left turn at Encina Ln. or, two, proceed through the Calle Real business district and exit at Kingston Ave., 0.41 miles; N. Kellogg

Ave., 0.57 miles; or Patterson Ave., 1.25 miles distant. No U-turns within the Calle Real business district are legal. U-turns at Encina Ln. are prohibited (and posted) for a variety of safety reasons. Encina Ln. contains one bus stop, a pedestrian cross-walk and bike path; the Bank of America on this northeast corner has a bank teller exit that pushes traffic directly into the intersection. Vehicular traffic would most likely use the short Encina Ln. as a common exit choice, dramatically increasing traffic flow to the four-way stop at Encina Rd. to something between 340 to 620 vehicle trips per day.¹ Encina Rd. at this location is designated as a "Senior Zone," with a maximum speed limit of 25 mi/hr. The Encina Ln. and Encina Rd. intersection contains demarcated crosswalks for seniors living in Encina Royale, HOA.

B. This development, in order to mitigate likely health and safety impacts, will require a full traffic review by the city AND a complementary and necessary study by the traffic engineers for CalTrans. Because the entrance and exit to this development are problematically close to the major intersection (80-100 yards), the impacts pose significant chance of increased traffic accidents and harm to drivers and pedestrians.

C. The current proposal fails, at this early stage of review, Finding #2. The extant road configurations in place on Calle Real, at the Calle Real / N. Fairview Rd. intersection, and at Encina Rd. pose limited, if not negligible, remediation; therefore, Finding #2 is not satisfactorily addressed. The draft plan offers "no feasible method(s) to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impacts" identified as furthering traffic congestion and creating significant safety and health impacts over and above the current levels (above: A, B, and C).

¹ **Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation Manual:** For an urban condo development with 92 units in CA, standard national estimates using the [Institute of Transportation Engineers \(ITE\) Trip Generation Manual](#) predict an average approximate of **530 daily vehicle trips** (using an average rate of ≈ 5.75 trips per unit. Rates for High-Rise/Low-Rise Residential Condominiums/Townhouses (ITE Land Use Codes 231/232) may yield approximately **340 to 620 daily vehicle trips** depending on unit density.