Lenzi, Chelsea

From: sbcob
Subject: FW: CASA DORINDA Master Plan / APPEAL

From: Brian McDermott <brian.global@me.com>
Date: February 15, 2016 at 4:56:28 PM PST
To: Carbajal Salud <supervisorcarbajal@sbcbos1.org>
Cc: <sbcob@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>, Ayars Kirsten <kayars@cox.net>
Subject: CASA DORINDA Master Plan / APPEAL

Dear Supervisor Carbajal,
I am writing to you and your four colleagues on the Board of Supervisors regarding the appeal by Casa Dorinda to overturn the request of the Montecito Planning Commission to demand an EIR for the bridge replacement for the existing old (South) bridge that has been deemed damaged by past flood waters and in need of replacement.

I am having a struggle to understand how it can be, that after more than 3 years of testimony by experts related to all aspects of the bridge replacement, the Montecito Planning Commission would demand an EIR for the bridge and its surroundings.

The experts that contributed to the conclusion of the necessity and the location for the bridge replacement deemed the following:

1. Civil Engineer deemed the old (South) bridge to be deficient and in need of replacement.

2. The Montecito Fire District deemed the bridge to be damaged and in need of a replacement that would have to be at least 20 feet wide to fire code standards.

3. Flood Control wants a new bridge to replace and remove the old bridge and the new bridge to be designed that will not raise the flood levels on Montecito Creek.

4. Transportation Engineers deemed that the safest and most logical location for the entrance/exit driveway and bridge should be at the existing four-way intersection of Hot Springs Road, Olive Mill Road and the entrance & exit of Casa Dorinda.

5. Casa Dorinda Operations deems that the existing exit bridge needs to remain during construction of the replacement for safe access for residents, staff and emergency services.

6. Historians deemed that the (South) bridge can be replaced without a significant environmental impact if the stone facade of the old bridge be re-used in a structure of similar design that meets the requirements of the above requirements, and the (North) bridge and channel remains.

7. Biologist deemed that the proposed new bridge location enable habitat restoration and continuous enlargement of the open space area surrounding the existing (South) exit bridge.

8. The Arborist deemed that the proposed location contains the fewest trees to be removed for bridge construction than any other alternatives.

So, given that an EIR would result in a ONE YEAR delay costing an additional $500,000.00, and given the conclusions listed above, is there going to be an outcome from the EIR that is so much better than the existing Casa plan ?
Surely the conclusion of the appeal will involve an element of fairness.

I thank you for all the work you do for our wonderful County.
Respectfully,
Gisele & Brian McDermott
Montecito

Lenzi, Chelsea

From: sbcob
Subject: FW: Appeal Feb.16th

From: Polly Griscom <mommom10@hotmail.com>
Date: February 15, 2016 at 4:11:16 PM PST
To: "SupervisorCarbajal@sbcbos1.org" <supervisorcarbajal@sbcbos1.org>
Subject: Appeal Feb.16th

I am writing to you to express my frustration with three members of the MPC who are asking for additional study of the proposed bride plans for Casa Dorinda. Having attended several meetings and heard the irrelevant questions they have asked, I believe there is an element of personal obstruction going on. This project has passed every test and conforms to the CA. Environmental Quality Act. The one thing that could kill it is to request an unnecessary EIR. I can not understand how three laymen, without experience in this area, are able to hold such sway over this project. I would think the professionals who have enthusiastically approved it, would have more of a say. The system for plan review is clearly flawed if individuals are permitted to wield this power for reasons known only to them.

I beg you to appeal their unfair and prejudiced decision.

Polly Griscom, Casa Dorinda resident