

Plan Santa Paula
Residential Land Use Community Survey
SUMMARY
September 19, 2006

Total of 333 surveys received
About 4% of 8100 households (Census 2000)
In Spanish: 12 surveys
From mobile home parks: 25 surveys

Question 1: What are your concerns about developing new housing in Santa Paula?

Items earning a rating of "very concerned" from at least one third of respondents:

- Increased traffic - 204
- Impacts to water resources - 161
- Large scale development - 145
- Impacts to air quality - 128
- Loss of agriculture - 122
- Loss of open space - 117
- Threat to small town character - 116

Overall, respondents had concerns about developing new housing; almost every item earned a rating of 1 ("very concerned") or 2 from at least one third of the respondents.

The two items that were of least concern, earning a 1 or 2 from fewer than one third of the respondents, were:

- Grading - 97
- Impacts to existing businesses - 101

Other concerns that respondents added: noise, impacts on public services or infrastructure, and crime.

Question 2: What do you think about the potential benefits of developing new housing in Santa Paula?

Items earning a rating of "most beneficial" from at least one third of respondents:

- Increased tax dollars - 160
- New schools - 133
- New jobs - 122

Also, the two items earning the rating of "not a benefit" from the most respondents (nearly ¼):

- New affordable housing - 77
- New residents in the city - 75

Overall, respondents did feel that the items could be potential benefits of developing new housing. Every item earned a rating of 1 ("most beneficial") or 2 from at least one third of the respondents.

The item earning a 1 or 2 from the most respondents was:

- Attractive new neighborhoods - 264

In the blank space for listing other benefits, some respondents indicated skepticism about potential benefits, or wrote that an effort needed to be made to improve existing neighborhoods. Respondents did add these benefits: new trails, residents with higher income, and a golf course.

Fagan Canyon Analysis

Question 3: How do you feel about residential development in Fagan Canyon? What kind of housing should be built here (apartments, small homes, large homes)? How many units of housing should be built?

In summary:

- 77 respondents opposed development, or felt development should be very limited, or wanted certain conditions to be met
- 215 respondents were favorable towards development at some scale
- 33 respondents did not give a clear preference

Breakdown:

- No development - 55 respondents
- Limited development - 10 respondents
- Conditions must be met first - 12 respondents
- Yes, didn't specify number - 67 respondents
- Yes, specified number (see below) - 139 respondents
- OK with large development - 9 respondents
- No clear preference - 33 respondents

Maximum units that respondents would consider acceptable*:

- 100-300 - 17 respondents
- 400-450 - 35 respondents
- 450-500 - 25 respondents
- 600-900 - 14 respondents
- 1000-1300 - 16 respondents
- 1400-1700 - 14 respondents
- 2000-2155 - 18 respondents

*Includes numbers suggested, numbers suggested and described as a maximum number of units, and the high end of suggested ranges.

Sixty respondents indicated support for a maximum between 400 and 500 units, near the figure of 450 units indicated as the maximum build-out in the General Plan. Meanwhile, 32 respondents indicated support for a number of units between 2000 and the 2155/2165 units in the recent proposal for Fagan Canyon.

In specifying the kind of housing that should be built, respondents gave a wide variety of answers but at least 120 of them suggested that Fagan Canyon should be developed with a mix of housing. However, respondents had different ideas about the mix of housing types and prices that should be included.

Home types suggested:

- Large homes on large lots
- Different sizes of single family homes
- Small homes
- Medium to large homes
- Mix of all types of housing
- Mix of apartments, small homes, large homes
- Mix of condos or townhouses, small homes, large homes
- No apartments or limited apartments
- Senior housing or senior community
- Like recent proposal

Home prices suggested:

- High end
- Homes for middle- to upper-income families
- Homes for a range of incomes from affordable to high-end
- Homes that current Santa Paula residents can afford
- Affordable homes

Respondents also suggested the following uses to be included in Fagan Canyon development:

- Golf course
- Public parks
- Schools
- Resort hotel
- New roads
- Inn
- Public bikeways, walking paths, hiking trails
- Recreation/sports complex
- Commercial, shopping

Adams Canyon Analysis

Question 4: How do you feel about residential development in Adams Canyon? What kind of housing should be built here (apartments, small homes, large homes)? How many units of housing should be built?

In summary:

- 84 respondents opposed development, or felt development should be very limited, or wanted certain conditions to be met
- 198 respondents were favorable towards development at some scale
- 43 respondents did not give a clear preference

Breakdown:

- No development - 64 respondents
- Limited development - 14 respondents
- Conditions must be met first - 6 respondents
- Yes, didn't specify number - 64 respondents
- Yes, specified number (see below) - 119 respondents
- OK with large development - 15 respondents
- No clear preference - 43 respondents

Maximum units that respondents would consider acceptable*:

- 35-150 - 7 respondents
- 200-350 - 11 respondents
- 400-450 - 19 respondents
- 495-500 - 54 respondents
- 600-900 - 12 respondents
- 1000-1500 - 10 respondents
- 2000-2500 - 6 respondents

*Includes numbers suggested, numbers suggested and described as a maximum number of units, and the high end of suggested ranges.

Seventy-three respondents indicated support for a maximum between 400 and 500 units, near the figure of 495 units in the recent proposal for Adams Canyon. Only six respondents indicated support for a number between 2000 and 2500 units, even though the General Plan shows maximum build-out for the area at 2250 units.

In specifying the kind of housing that should be built, respondents gave a variety of answers but at least 95 respondents suggested only building large or high end homes. Most did not give a reason for this preference, but reasons included a lower impact because of fewer homes, attracting new residents with higher incomes, and revenue from property taxes. Fifty-six respondents suggested a variety of home sizes instead.

Home types:

- Large homes
- Large homes on large lots
- Different sizes of single family homes
- Small homes
- Medium to large homes
- Mix of apartments, small homes, large homes
- Mix of condos or townhouses, small homes, large homes
- Like recent proposal

Home prices:

- High end
- Homes for middle- to upper-income families
- Homes for a range of incomes from affordable to high-end
- Affordable homes

In addition to housing, respondents suggested other uses in Adams Canyon. The most popular:

- Golf course
- Resort
- Hotel
- Inn
- Recreation areas
- Parks

East Area 1 Analysis

Question 5: How do you feel about residential development in East Area I (Limoneira property)? What kind of housing should be built here (apartments, small homes, large homes)? How many units of housing should be built?

In summary:

- 58 respondents opposed development, or felt development should be very limited, or wanted certain conditions to be met
- 203 respondents were favorable towards development at some scale
- 63 respondents did not give a clear preference

Breakdown:

- No development - 34 respondents
- Limited development - 13 respondents
- Conditions must be met first - 11 respondents
- Yes, didn't specify number - 106 respondents
- Yes, specified number (see below) - 76 respondents
- OK with Limoneira proposal - 12 respondents
- OK with large development - 9 respondents
- No clear preference - 63 respondents

Maximum units that respondents would consider acceptable*:

- 37-150 - 9 respondents
- 200-400 - 14 respondents
- 500-900 - 13 respondents
- 1000-1100 - 17 respondents
- 1200-1500 - 18 respondents
- 2000-4000 - 5 respondents

*Includes numbers suggested, numbers suggested and described as a maximum number of units, and the high end of suggested ranges.

For East Area 1, there were only 76 respondents who indicated a particular number of units that should be built, compared to 119 for Adams Canyon and 139 for Fagan Canyon. Thirty-five respondents did indicate a maximum in the range of 1000 to 1500, and 12 additional respondents explicitly stated support for the Limoneira proposal that is still being drafted. A June 2006 draft of the Specific Plan for East Area 1 allows for the development of up to 1500 units.

Over 100 respondents suggested that a mix of housing should be built. In the mixes that they described, respondents included apartments, town houses, condos, small homes, large homes, and affordable units. Apartments were a more popular option for this area than the canyons, with 57 respondents suggesting at least a limited number of apartments. However, eight respondents specified that no apartments should be built, a sentiment echoed elsewhere in the survey.

Several respondents suggested that a school or college should be built in East Area 1, with 23 suggesting a school and 10 suggesting a college. Other items that were suggested:

- Parks
- Playing fields
- Open space
- Commercial
- Industrial

Other Areas

Question 6: What other areas (if any) in or around the City of Santa Paula do you think may have potential for new housing (including areas that are already developed)?

Answers that dealt with the potential for new housing:

- There is potential - 113
- There is limited potential - 6
- There is potential in the three expansion areas - 14
- There is no potential - 46
- Don't know - 24
- Wanted the city to focus on other priorities, including improving existing city or attracting businesses - 11

Answers that dealt with expansion:

- Supported expansion - 32
- Did not support expansion - 7
- Wanted the city to focus on existing city - 7

Answers that addressed infill:

- Supported infill - 49
- Did not support infill - 9

Suggestions for particular locations:

- Housing: vacant lots within city, apartments in railroad corridor, condos/affordable housing in railroad corridor, live/work in airport hangars, second units for lots larger than 8,000 feet, large parcel on west Santa Maria St next to new storage facility, hospital hill, single-family homes at Ojai Rd and 10th St, ranchettes from Peck Rd to Briggs Rd, townhomes at Dean and Santa Paula St, build like hospital hill at South Mountain, west area to Briggs Rd and hillsides, farm worker housing wherever agriculture is not viable
- Redevelopment of dilapidated housing: east side, south of Harvard, Harvard east of 12th, apartments between Santa Barbara and Santa Paula St, low-income housing along Ojai and Harvard, older neighborhoods, outskirts of good neighborhoods
- Redevelopment including new affordable housing: vacant lots, packing houses, manufacturing, run-down housing, Harvard Blvd east of 10th, East of Harding Park, Santa Barbara St east of 12th, north side of Harvard west of Peck, area east of 10th and south of Santa Paula St, Main St entry from east, packing houses along railroad
- Revitalization, redevelopment: blighted areas, downtown, center of town, East S.P. Ojai to 12th, on 12th, east side of town, vacant commercial buildings, Harvard/Telegraph east of town, east of Santa Paula Creek, packing house E. Main, E. Harvard, S. 10th, area around mill, improve entrances
- Adaptive re-use: warehouse at Palm & Main into mixed use lofts/condos/apartments
- Commercial and industrial parks: between 126 and Santa Clara River from Haun Creek to Briggs Rd, on flat land with easy access to freeway
- Businesses, stores, restaurants: vacant lots within city, east of 10th, downtown
- Recreation: upgrade tourist attractions downtown/rail corridor/museum/airport, create water park west of Weyerhaeuser plant
- Code enforcement, property maintenance: Main St, Harvard Blvd, 10th St

Types of improvements suggested, no particular location:

- Housing: affordable housing, no subsidized housing, apartments, no apartments, range of housing, high density near downtown, adaptive re-use of buildings into live/work, high end housing, high income housing, more single-family homes, small houses, townhouses, large developments, not large housing tracts
- Businesses: service and retail, shopping, grocery, restaurants, jobs
- Schools: junior high, high school, college
- Infill: encourage infill development through zoning changes, build 3+ stories, mixed use business/residential in vacant commercial lots
- Existing city: redevelop, revitalize, clean up, improve city/neighborhoods/homes, improve streets

Areas with potential for new housing:

- Streets: East Side 10th St. between Main & Ventura St, South 10th St, South 12th St, N.W. Sheppard Road & Telegraph, Telegraph in front of storage area, West Telegraph, Harvard Blvd, near freeway
- Canyons: Fagan Canyon, upper Fagan Canyon, Balcom Canyon, between mouths of Adam and Fagan
- West: East/west around Foothill and Peck Road, west to Briggs, west to Cummings, near Weyerhaeuser plant
- East: to Fillmore, east of Hallock Dr off 126
- South: South Mountain, south of Santa Clara River
- North: east of S.P. Creek up canyon to Steckel Park, upper Ojai
- Infill: vacant lots on March St, Dean Dr, Main St, Solo [Cup Co?] building at Main and Palm, along Ojai Rd, trailer park on Harvard and Telegraph, open property facing Harvard Blvd by Teague Park, along railroad corridor