



From: Villalobos, David
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2024 8:07 AM
To: sbcob
Subject: FW: Miramar Hotel Mixed-Use Development Revision (1759 S. Jameson Ln): Public Access Issues (Item #V.1, Planning Commission 11/1/24)

From: Larkin McGinnes <noreply@adv.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, December 9, 2024 8:05 PM
To: Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>; Brown, Willow <wbrown@countyofsb.org>; Villalobos, David <dvillalo@countyofsb.org>
Subject: Miramar Hotel Mixed-Use Development Revision (1759 S. Jameson Ln): Public Access Issues (Item #V.1, Planning Commission 11/1/24)

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Honorable Santa Barbara County Planning Commission,

Please do not support the Miramar Redevelopment, which could impinge on public access to the coast. The project's proposed 12 new resorts shops and a café, when added to the already existing 8-9 retail shops that Miramar got through staff-level approvals, could generate car trips at rates akin to a retail strip plaza rather than the local serving retail the applicant assumes. Previous versions of the project assumed that the retail uses would be a tennis shop or place selling beach towels, boogie boards and magazines for hotel guests, not the kind of luxury uses now being considered. In addition, the Project's staffing assumptions are unreliable and at times inconsistent. For example, the Project's Parking Study assumes the cafe will only have 5 employees even though the Project's greenhouse gas study assumes that it will have 11 employees.

Underestimating the number of employees and proposed traffic to the site could mean underestimating the amount of parking required, meaning resort guests and employees may take up public parking spaces along Eucalyptus Lane and Jameson Lane—which provides increasingly rare public parking for those trying to access the beach. All of this indicates that the Project may conflict with CEQA and coastal access policies, which would mean the project would not be eligible for an AB 1804 CEQA Exemption. Please consider a project

alternative without the luxury retail component that would better preserve public access to the Coast

Larkin McGinnes

larkinmcginnes@icloud.com

1126 Laguna st

Santa Barbara , California 93101