

March 28, 2012

Board of Supervisors  
Santa Barbara County  
123 E. Anapamu Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Re: Park Hill Estates v2

Dear Supervisors:

In 1970, my father, Mr. Louis Zeluck, together with his partners, purchased this 14.87 parcel at Via Los Santos. He envisioned a project along the lines of what Mr. Jeff Nelson and Oak Creek Company have designed and that is before you today. The fact that it has taken 42 years to arrive at the point we are today is a testament to patience, endurance, and confidence that this property is best suited developed into private, luxury class homes, and not remain as perpetual open space. My father never lived to see his plans realized, but the reins have been taken now by Oak Creek Company, and they have designed an energy-efficient, highly attractive 16 home development that I am very sure my father would have been enthusiastic about and which would have met with his endorsement.

As my mother, Mrs. Charlotte Zeluck both understood and intended, the development of Park Hill Estates v2 is a matter of considerable importance both for me and my immediate and extended family, as our future economic security is tied inextricably with its success. Estate and personal debts cannot be satisfied, medical internships cannot be paid for, retirements cannot be planned for or enjoyed until this project is approved and the land sold.

I am not certain what future opportunities I will have to voice my points, so I felt it was necessary to explain my perspective at length here. I would have wished to be at the Planning Commission hearing of January 25<sup>th</sup>, to defend the land and the excellent project that Mr. Nelson and Oak Creek Company have designed, but I had fallen ill about two weeks before the hearing and have just recently recovered my health.

I will make an effort to be present whenever Park Hill Estates is on the agenda, time and finances permitting. Since I believe the Commissioners construed my absence at the January 25<sup>th</sup> hearing as a lack of interest or concern, please understand that my inability to attend any hearing concerning Park Hill Estates is due to work commitments or health issues which require that I must stay in San Francisco.

In the course of this letter I will explain my concerns that efforts are being made by the adjoining property owners, both publicly and privately, to delay this well planned project to failure, a fear that I have been forced to acknowledge in light of what occurred at the January 25<sup>th</sup> hearing. I ask that the Planning Commissioners' "no decision" be set aside and I will provide justification to do so in the course of this letter.

This project deserved approval on January 25<sup>th</sup> and deserves approval now. Commissioners Brown, Cooney and Valencia approved a 12 unit project on this site in 2007. Unfortunately the real estate crash occurred soon thereafter and the property did not sell at that time. The difference today is that native grasses have grown on the property, for which an excellent mitigation plan has been arranged at UCSB, and there are four more homes planned for.

To further extend the vetting process is **unnecessary, wasteful and counter-productive**, given the years of effort, hundreds of man-hours, and considerable expense that have gone into this project by the Department of Planning and Development in cooperation and coordination with Mr. Jeff Nelson. P&D has concluded that this land and this project are appropriate as a mitigated negative declaration. In my respectful opinion,

the Commissioner's hearing of January 25<sup>th</sup> was not a forum that could have resulted in anything approaching fairness.<sup>1</sup>

It certainly appears the Santa Barbara County Department of Planning and Development's planning process was adhered to very closely in the creation of both the draft MND and the Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no stage in process review was skipped or rushed through, and every aspect was the subject of intense scrutiny and analysis. I closely followed the Santa Barbara County Department of Planning and Development's online progress entries throughout the two and a half years of research that this project was under study, and which eventually culminated in the classification of the project as an MND.

Park Hill Estates, an infill development, is subject to P & D's 80 page Mitigated Negative Declaration document, as well as subject to the Board of Architectural Review's high standards.

In the course of my research on infill development in the Greater Santa Barbara area to give me some background on the salient points, I have discovered that future infill development is promoted in many diverse growth plans. And I would believe that most real environmentalists will agree that infill development is strongly preferred to further development of agricultural lands and outlying undeveloped areas.

On the topic of infill I quote from a number of those plans here:

"The plan proposes that firm urban-rural boundaries be established which will have the effect of redirecting growth from an outward expansion to infilling. In this sense, the plan will result in more compact urban development, thereby assuring the long-term protection of surrounding agricultural lands and recreational resources." "To prevent further urban encroachment onto agricultural lands and encourage infilling within urban areas, urban/rural boundaries are delineated on the land use plan maps for the Carpinteria Valley, Summerland, and Goleta planning areas." - Santa Barbara County Coastal Use Land Plan, (June 2009), page 19

"Goal: Housing development is limited to infill projects and non-contiguous (leap frog) development is discouraged." - A Comprehensive Vision for the Eastern Goleta Valley" prepared by the Goleta Vision Committee, (June 2006), page 17

"The Plan prioritizes neighborhood development in strategic locations near commercial and employment destinations, schools, parks, and multi-modal transportation facilities. These locations direct development patterns to infill development in urban areas while preserving the function, forms, and characteristics of existing suburban neighborhoods and rural lands. Based on the community's goals for sustainability, these patterns are preferred over continuing suburban sprawl into the rural, agricultural and coastal lands of Eastern Goleta Valley." - Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan, Residential Land Uses, (February 1, 2012), Page 41

"Urbanization: In order for the County to sustain a healthy economy in the urbanized areas and to allow for growth within its resources and within its ability to pay for necessary services, the County shall encourage infill, prevent scattered urban development, and encourage a balance between housing and jobs." - Santa Barbara County Conservation Element, (republished August 2010), page 67

"Residential development in the foothills to date has been substantially below the buildout projections used in the GCP EIR. The development of 16 residential units on the 14.87-acre project site is generally

---

<sup>1</sup> The neighbors were permitted to engage in unrestrained fear-mongering (including the screening of a home made 'scare' video), haranguing and threats; I observed that certain of the Commissioners asked leading questions of experts, appeared at times to become befuddled and forgetful, allowed themselves to pander to constituents' demands, and reversed conclusions due to peer pressure.

consistent with the buildout projections for the area based on the current zoning (1-E-1) and parcel size, as it would result in just over one more unit than would otherwise be allowed under base density and zoning. As such, the cumulative analysis contained in the GCP EIR is applicable to the proposed project.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 49

“...the site is zoned and designated for residential development and is surrounded by residential development which is indicative of its status as an infill development site. An approved subdivision on this property from 2007 reflects the fact that this site is intended for residential development. Additionally, the visual resources present on-site resulting from the current lack of development are not unique to the site as other pockets of similar visual characteristics exist elsewhere in the community. These include several properties east of San Antonio Creek Road in between the project site and Highway 154 which are currently vacant and/or contain significant open, vegetated spaces. In addition, while less visible, the 12-acre open space parcel located within the La Romana Subdivision north of the project site also contains valuable scenic visual resources available to the public. Further, the large undeveloped properties zoned Agriculture and Mountainous north of the project site serve as a critical visual backdrop to the neighborhood, contributing to the open and scenic character of the area.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 11

Egress in times of emergency was an issue that was spoken of regarding Park Hill Estates, and it's an important issue, agreed. The draft MND and the proposed final MND both hone in on egress in times of emergency:

“In the event of an emergency evacuation, the addition of up to 36 vehicles (assuming two vehicles per residence) utilizing the roadways would not be expected to significantly alter the existing evacuation capacities of the area roadways given the multiple alternatives for evacuating and the fact that 36 vehicles would represent a small fraction of the surrounding community's vehicle use.” - Mitigated Negative Declaration, (June 17, 2011), page 44

“Two new private roads connecting with Via Los Santos and San Antonio Creek Road would accomplish site ingress/egress. The existing road system leading to the project site is operating below its capacity at an acceptable LOS and the increased traffic generated by both project construction and by resident ADTs would not significantly impact the traffic volumes. The new access road entering from the south would merge with the new east-west oriented access road that ends in a cul-de-sac. Emergency access to the project site would occur by the existing roadways and the newly constructed access roads and would meet County Fire Department standards. The addition of 160 ADTs and 16 PHTs would not significantly diminish the capacity of area roadways in an emergency evacuation scenario.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 66

“The increase in population resulting from residential development of the proposed parcels would not create the need for any additional increase in fire fighting resources for the area. The site is within the five-minute Fire Department response time. Although firefighting resources need not be expanded, the Fire Department requires new fire hydrants be installed to serve the residential development. The hydrants must flow at 750 gallons per minute at a 20-psi residual pressure, the standard Fire Department requirement for residential development. It is the Fire Department's understanding that the water pressure and GPM flow capabilities of the existing water infrastructure can meet the Fire Department's requirements for fire protection (Glenn Fidler, Santa Barbara County Fire Department, personal communication, April 15, 2011).” - Mitigated Negative Declaration, (June 17, 2011), page 44:

And here is further comment on egress from the draft MND and the Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration:

“The proposed roads providing access into the project site have been designed to meet County Fire Department standards. These un-gated roadways are essentially a loop road connecting Via Los Santos and San Antonio Creek Road. The roadway design would provide an additional means of evacuating vehicles from the larger project area. This might be especially helpful if it were necessary to evacuate the area when

there is also a large gathering at nearby B'nai B'rith or the Church of Christ, thereby increasing the number of vehicles needing to exit the area and access San Antonio Creek Road. - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 48

“Impacts are considered less than significant due to the multiple means of access into and out of the site, including for emergency evacuation purposes, and due to the fact that water pressure and flow are expected to be adequate to meet minimum hydrant requirements.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 48

“The Goleta Community Plan EIR concluded that cumulative fire impacts associated with foothill build out are considered significant and unavoidable (Class I) due to constraints associated with providing adequate fire protection for continued foothill development. However, the Board’s certification of 91-EIR-13 included a Statement of Overriding Considerations that resulted in adoption of fire protection polices and development standards for the Goleta Community Plan (GCP). Under this proposal, the project would be consistent with the GCP policies and standards in providing two routes of emergency access, all existing and new roads would meet Fire Department criteria, and adequate water flows and pressure for fire protection would be available. As such, the project’s contribution to these significant cumulative impacts would be mitigated and would not be cumulatively considerable.” - Mitigated Negative Declaration (June 17, 2011), page 45:

Supervisor Wolf, Mr. Nelson informed me that Mr. Danny Vickers, current president of the San Antonio Creek Homeowner’s association and the individual who is leading the opposition to Park Hill Estates v2, said that he had witnessed flames 200 ft high as the tinder dry grass ignited in one incident on the property. I am not an expert on fire safety, granted, but I do have common sense, and common sense tells me that fire safe homes instead of the open grassland that currently exists will pose a greatly reduced fire risk to the neighborhood, a factor which is obviously in the best interest of the adjoining property owners including Mr. Vickers (although Mr. Vickers is reportedly selling his home and moving to a newly built home). Homes with interior sprinkler systems, fire extinguishers, and much else to combat ignition, do not ignite easily as does an open dry field.<sup>2</sup>

Planners learned many things from the Painted Cave fire, and that knowledge was applied to upgrade fire safety codes so that a reoccurrence would be unlikely. For example, I know from firsthand experience that shake roofs were disallowed and landscaping requirements changed because of lessons learned from the Painted Cave fire. I have just recently learned that the Santa Barbara City Fire Department offers free voluntary inspections to property owners, which according to the News-Press “are designed to ensure homes are defensible during a wildfire.” (Editorial of Terry Tyler, March 19, 2012)

I ask what will be accomplished by further analysis of fire issues if the expert who understands the area in terms of fire fighting requirements better than any other person stated without qualification that Park Hill Estates v2 is in strict compliance with existing fire code? The Fire Marshal explained very clearly and without equivocation that Park Hill Estates v2 complies with current fire codes - even without the Tuckers’ road egress route. [Mr. Nelson informs me that Commissioner Cecelia Brown said essentially this when voting to approve Park Hill Estates v1 in 2007].

To say that there was a considerable analysis of plant biology by Ms. Mooney, the County’s biologist, would be quite an understatement. There has been an abundant analysis of the plant biology at Park Hill Estates when one reads through the Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, to a point where once again common sense strongly suggests further analysis to be redundant and a waste of County resources.

Mr. Magney, the biologist the neighbors hired to throw the County biologist’s research and conclusions in a negative light, appeared uninformed, pedantic, and hairsplitting. His most serious charge was that Ms.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Oak Creek Company, in addition to the one existing fire hydrant along Pennell Road now, will install four new fire hydrants in connection with the new water lines throughout the project.

Mooney, the County biologist, did not use the right methods in analyzing the plants varieties on site. A response to Mr. Magney's charge is to be found in the final MND, which I quote here:

"A comment letter submitted on the Draft MND suggested that the methods used in the biological resources section in assessing the vegetation on-site were not adequate, that sampling plot sizes may not have been appropriate, and that random sampling was not used. The methods used in the characterization of vegetation in the MND (Rapid Assessment methodology in combination with the Watershed Environmental line transect methods) are more intensive than many other recent P&D grassland analyses due, in part, to advances in vegetation science in recent years. While these methods are not as scientifically rigorous as those for academic research projects, the surveying and sampling conducted for this project was wholly consistent with all other grassland analyses performed for other projects reviewed by P&D and is sufficient for the purposes of CEQA. In addition, it is important to note that Rapid Assessment sampling is by its very nature a plotless technique (i.e., there is no set size for plots), and it is frequently used in grassland classification (see Sawyer, Keeler-Wolf and Evens, 2009). It is agreed that more intensive academic level sampling would be desirable, but this cannot always be accomplished efficiently; nor is it necessarily an appropriate level of analysis for CEQA review. In this analysis, one combined Rapid Assessment/Releve plot was recorded (Plot AG-1). Its size was 30 x 30 ft. (900 sq.ft.), a size typically used for grassland analysis. Lastly, while random sampling is a standard technique for most studies, it is rarely appropriate for vegetation mapping and analysis because vegetation is not randomly distributed. It is generally associated with soils, slopes, and many other variables that one must take in to account when placing study plots within a stand (personal communication, Todd Keeler-Wolf, March 29, 2010)." - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 32

From the biological researches at the property has evolved a very strong grassland mitigation agreement between Mr. Nelson and the UCSB Department for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration, which make it possible to study, preserve and grow large stands of native grasslands at the University and under the auspices of CCBER:

The comment of Planning on this subject is as follows:

"...the applicant has proposed to incorporate an off-site element that includes collaboration with UCSB Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Ecological Restoration (CCBER) on restoring the 3.07 acres of impacts at a 2:1 ratio on a 6-acre area on the Ellwood/Deveraux open space adjacent to Coal Oil Point Reserve." -Mitigated Negative Declaration (June 17, 2011), Page 32

"This draft plan would be revised pursuant to Mitigation BIO-Sp2 below, and impacts to purple needle grass native grasslands would be reduced to less than significant. Off-site mitigation is considered to be a viable option in this case for the following reasons: (1) there is a minimum of 500-600 ft. of existing development surrounding the project site separating it from the adjacent natural habitats of San Antonio Creek and Maria Ygnacio Creek; (2) onsite avoidance and/or restoration options would result in isolated, low-functioning grassland areas; and (3) feasible off-site restoration has been proposed."- Mitigated Negative Declaration, (June 17, 2011), page 32

That on campus CCBER is enthusiastic in welcoming the Park Hill Estates v2 grassland mitigation plan on University land comes as no surprise to me. For more information about this please contact Lisa Stratton, Director of Ecosystem Management, Cheadle Center for Biodiversity and Restoration, [stratton@ccber.ucsb.edu](mailto:stratton@ccber.ucsb.edu), 893-4158. I am an alumnus of UCSB, College of Creative Studies (1973), and that this enhanced mitigation plan would wind up benefitting UCSB is very personally gratifying, since the University is a school with a high level of academic achievement in a unique setting, both of which I enjoyed for two years.

The neighbors reported seeing raptors and other birds nesting at the site. P&D's response to this:

"Public testimony on the Draft MND suggested that the site was used by various raptors and other bird species. However, no evidence of nesting or roosting by raptors or sensitive bird species was apparent

during the most recent site surveys conducted by the County staff biologist, which occurred during the nesting season (April 2011). Furthermore, there are few trees on the site that would provide suitable habitat for nesting or roosting. Trees that are present in the project are along the property boundaries, and as such, are already disturbed by existing residential development and uses.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 36

“Bio-Sp3 Raptor, Special Status Species, and Nesting Bird Protection. To avoid disturbance of nesting and special status birds including raptorial species protected by the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code, proposed project activities, including, but not limited to, vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 15). If these activities must begin within the breeding season, then pre-construction surveys shall be conducted. The nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted within the disturbance footprint and a 500-foot buffer as allowable without trespassing on private lands. The survey shall be conducted by a County-qualified biologist familiar with the identification of raptors and special status species known to occur in Santa Barbara County using typical methods. If nests are found, a buffer ranging in size from 25 to 500 feet depending upon the species, the proposed work activity, and existing disturbances associated with land uses outside of the site, shall be determined and demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. No ground disturbing activities shall occur within this buffer until the County-qualified biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed and the young have fledged the nest. Nesting birds surveys are not required for construction activities occurring between August 16 and February 1.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 40

The Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration addresses view concerns that have been raised by the neighbors:

“Neighbors living along Pennell Road have expressed concern about existing line of sight problems when leaving and returning to their homes. Public Works has confirmed that the line of sight at the Pennell Road/San Antonio Creek Road intersection is not optimum. The proposed removal of the pepper trees along the Park Hill Estates San Antonio Creek Road frontage will improve this situation for sight distance to the southwest. The other line of sight constraint is located off-site and is associated with vegetation along San Antonio Creek Road further to the northeast. The project is not proposing Pennell Road access and, therefore, would not contribute to line of sight traffic safety hazards at this intersection.” - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 66

The neighbors stated that they are worried about reduced privacy. I can't see how they can make an effective case about loss of privacy, not with 16 units on 14.87 acres. There is plenty of privacy in Park Highlands, and these homes are planned to be on lots close to an acre. How can that not be private? Mr. Nelson does not wish his project to encroach on anyone's privacy or their views, and so he has designed it to not do that.

The neighbors complained about the current dangers to both pedestrians and motorists along San Antonio Creek Road. Park Hill Estates' design calls for the removal of pepper trees that currently block lines of sight, installation of additional street lighting, and the creation of a pedestrian walkway along that part of road (as discussed in the MND) As a person who has both walked and driven that stretch of San Antonio Creek Road many times and can attest to its dangers in its current state, I feel certain that these planned changes will improve both vehicular and pedestrian safety.

The neighbors complained about the affordable unit. Their fears regarding a single affordable unit are not grounded in reality. Nearly all new projects now require a certain percentage of affordable units. The percentage of the affordable homes to total homes in Park Hill Estates 1/16<sup>th</sup>, and that is a minimally low ratio of affordable to market rate homes, to my knowledge. Mr. Nelson has relocated the affordable unit on

site to accommodate the neighbors' concerns. A well-managed, affordable rental unit will certainly attract high quality tenants.<sup>3</sup>

At both the environmental hearing of July 2011 and the Commissioners' hearing of January 2012 the neighbors' were upset that there was more construction planned for the area. At both hearings they lamented the loss of open space. Yet as far as open space is concerned there is plenty of open space in the area that is preserved in perpetuity. There is a lovely park in Tucker's Grove, just down the hill. And there are many other large open space and recreational areas within a short drive from Park Highlands.

One can find solitude and whisper quiet serenity, fishing, camping and scenic opportunities in abundance nearby, whether one travels in a northerly, southerly, easterly or westerly direction from the project site.<sup>4</sup>

Throughout the Final Proposed Mitigation Declaration it can be seen how extensively the neighbors' concerns are considered by P&D as well as the Oak Creek Company, and how completely measures have been set forth in the Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration to satisfy their concerns.

In closing, I read with interest Nora K. Wallace's interview with Supervisor Gray in the News-Press on March 15, 2012. In it Supervisor Gray talked about the lack of County funds for basic services. In this regard I would like to quote a passage from an article entitled "The Importance of New Home Building to the United States Economy" published in the New Homes Section, (November 16, 2010), by N. Jayson. It reads as follows:

"The recent economic downturn was one more glaring example of how important new homes and home building are to the United States economy, both directly and indirectly. The housing market includes the building, selling, and resale of residential homes. But in the same way an earthquake in Japan causes a tsunami in Hawaii, the ripple effects of a housing boom—or bust—have far reaching economic ramifications because the housing markets drive so many auxiliary industries."

"New homes, which are considered durable goods, have to be furnished with everything from appliances, light bulbs, and consumer electronics to textiles, paint, and gardening supplies. Goods that are part and parcel of new housing generate state and local sales taxes. Appliances, furniture, building materials and electronics provide a large amount of revenue from sales taxes. So when the housing market goes down, retail sales decline, sales tax revenue shrinks, and local communities and states have less money for services."

"During a real estate market decline, property taxes are also impacted, although on a delayed schedule. The amount property owner's pay in taxes is a percentage of the home's appraised value; as house values goes down, the amount of money homeowners pay in taxes decrease. A bust like the current one, can and has devastated local economies nationwide."

"More houses mean more families in the community which is good for local restaurants, shops, movie theaters and so on. So not only is there a direct economic benefit from new housing, there is an ongoing indirect benefit which is why new home construction is used as an indicator of the country's overall economic health. As the recent recession showed, a housing bust can significantly impact financial markets too. As people default on their loans, the values of the houses decrease, which reduces the value of

---

<sup>3</sup> I speak here from personal experience as having been a tenant in a rent controlled (affordable) apartment for the past 22 years. As I am, there are also many other high quality tenants who seek affordable rentals, and who are both reliable and appreciative of the opportunity to live in a lovely property in safe and scenic surroundings.

<sup>4</sup> America's Byways' San Marcos Pass Road Overview states: "The San Marcos Pass Road, Route 154, gracefully works its way from near the dreamy Santa Barbara Coastline, over the Santa Ynez Mountains, and on to Highway 101, 35 miles inland. The route takes the traveler through parts of the Los Padres National Forest, past beautiful Lake Cachuma, and on to colorful, historic valley towns. It is a gently curving two-lane highway that passes through four separate scenic environments."

Supervisors  
March 28, 2012  
- 8 -

the banks' mortgage portfolio. When that happens, banks tighten their loan parameters, making it harder for individuals and small businesses to get loans."

"The above reasons are why an increase in new construction is considered the first sign of a recovery. It is the engine that drives the financial train. More new homes typically mean more new jobs, not just in construction but in related industries too. As unemployment goes down, consumer confidence increases, which leads to more consumer spending. As business improves companies hire more workers, leading to more economic growth, higher incomes, and more disposable cash. New construction can signal the beginning of a positive spiral of prosperity."

Supervisor Wolf, what is applicable in general for the country is also applicable in particular to Eastern Goleta Valley, in my respectful opinion. If the prior paragraphs are true – and they most certainly would appear to be -- then the Park Hill Estates v2 at 4700 Via Los Santos in Goleta will contribute to improving overall economic growth and prosperity in both Goleta and in Santa Barbara County generally.

Santa Barbara County Department of Planning and Development's conclusion regarding 16 home Park Hill Estates v2 is as follows:

"There are no components of the project that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings as all impacts of the project could be feasibly mitigated. Lastly, there is no disagreement supported by facts over the significance of an effect which would warrant preparation of an EIR for this project." - Proposed Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, (October 14, 2011), page 78

I have written to you here on my own behalf as part-owner of Park Hill Estates and not at the request of or on behalf of any other person or organization. I hope that resolution of any issues concerning Park Hill Estates v2 will be speedily resolved and so allow approval of this excellent project to occur without further delay. I respectfully ask that in 2012 there will be a resolution to this matter after 42 years of ownership, so that the ongoing stress and anxiety associated with this land and project, and the dire health and financial consequences of continual delay, can finally reach a conclusion. After having been informed by P&D that a May 1<sup>st</sup> date was set for the hearing, I booked my Santa Barbara travel plans accordingly. I respectfully ask that the May 1<sup>st</sup> hearing date be reinstated so that I may be able to attend the hearing.

Thank you.

Yours Sincerely,

*Steve Zeluck*

Steven Courtney Zeluck

(415) 312-2634 (mobile)  
2750 Sutter Street, #8,  
San Francisco, California

cc: Mrs. Doreen Farr, Chair, Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
Mr. Salud Carbajal, Vice-Chair, Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
Mrs. Joni Gray, Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
Mr. Steve Lavagnino, Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
Dr. Glen Russell, Director, Santa Barbara County Planning & Development  
Mr. Jeffrey C. Nelson, Founder, Oak Creek Company