## Westly, Austin

From: Dan <dbt33@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 2:05 PM

To: PLANNING COMMISSION

**Subject:** Rezoning 600Park Av apartments

## Commission members

I am Daniel Benvenuti my home is at 105 Wesley Street for the past 40 years. The 600 Park Ave. apartments are directly behind my home. Since becoming aware 11 days ago, of the rezoning of multiple areas throughout Capitola, I have been very busy trying to educate myself on this issue. I hope the commission realizes that the decisions before them will have an everlasting impact on the citizens of our community. That being said, I would hope that more time can be made available so that the public can educate themselves and better express their concerns. These are my concerns. I received information that the property was on the market several months ago. The listing included a possible representation of a new development. Since then, the property has sold to a large developer. According to your draft zoning code amendment approximately 300 pages under chapter 17.04 proposed affect section item number one states preserve and enhance Capitola small town feel coastal Village charm number two ensure that all development exhibits high-quality design that supports a unique sense of place, and finally number three protect and enhance the quality of life and residential neighborhoods. The conceptual renditions, which I have included, obviously do not adhere to Purpose and effect section. In January 14, 2010, the coastal commission held the hearing and one of the topics was a public hearing and action on request by the city of Capitola to amend the LCP to add an affordable housing overlay district design to allow increased density of up to 20 units per acre for projects with a minimum of 50% affordable units to apply to the new district to a site at 600 Park Ave. in Capitola Santa Cruz, California. It is my recollection that at that time we as residence were assured that if such increase was allowed that there would never be more than two-story units on the property property. This is not the case, presently with the new representation. Obviously, I am strongly opposed to changing the existing RM 10 to RM 40 zoning, not only for the reasons outlined above, but in addition this property currently offers some of the last low income available housing in Capitola this would all change. Secondly, there is already concerned over the traffic conditions on Park Avenue this last year you asked for public input for potential softening of traffic on Park Avenue based on four proposals, I personally responded. All four proposals were not adequate enforcement of the existing 25 mile an hour speed limit would be much more affective and possibly making Park Avenue one way in and Monterey Avenue one way out of Capitola. I never received a response and obviously now by the recent changes on Bay Avenue at the Nob Hill shopping center that some of these proposals is being tested. Third, Park Avenue property presently only has one entrance. This would be a major safety issue if an immediate evacuation had to be made. If a second access would be mandated it would most likely be at the cul-de-sac at the end Wesley Street. The impact potentially an additional 540 vehicles would pose an even greater unsafe condition in our neighborhood. Forth, Parking would obviously be an additional issue presently with 80 unit occupancy and multiple parking at the site vehicles continue to park along Park Avenue and Wesley Street. The the additional impact of 540 vehicles would only exasperate this problem. Fifth I am sure you realize that the property lies in a natural drainage. Most likely parking would be below ground level. The potential for flooding would exist. Finally potential solutions might be to develop the lower parking lot where a Mobil home community once existed. The lot has never been utilized to any extent it now serves as storage and parking for Capitola employees perhaps on a very few occasions visitors utilize the lot. It offers two entrances. A two-story development could exist with little to no impact on surrounding properties. The

addition of ADU is very popular if the city would consider incentives to further promote these dwellings this would help meet the demand. Enclosing I am sure given time with public input there are many more potential solutions to the housing mandate. But time, education and communication must take place I urge the commission to reconsider the unprecedented increase to the zoning of 600 Park Ave. I have included a petition signed by the effected residents. This proposed increase is in direct opposition to purpose and effect section chapter 17.04 items one ,two and three. My hope is that we can all work together to find a solution to this challenge. Sincerely Daniel Benvenuti.