



The voice of our community

8

January 17, 2012



2012 Officers:

Richard Nordlund
President
Robertson Short
1st Vice President
Dave Kent
2nd Vice President
Monica Brock Petersen
Secretary
Tom Kern
Treasurer

Directors:

Evan Aptaker
Tom Bollay
J.W. Colin
Michael Cook
Mindy Denson
Cindy Feinberg
Dorinne Johnson
David Kent
Tom Kern
Richard Nordlund
Monica Brock Petersen
Tom Schleck
Robertson Short
Gene Sinsler
Ted Urschel
Peter van Duinwyk
Jean von Wittenburg

Honorary Directors:

Ralph Baxter
Sally Kinsell
Robert V. Meghreblian
Naomi Schwartz
Richard Thielscher
Joan Wells

Executive Director:

Victoria Greene

Office Coordinator:

Carol Celic

Office:

1469 E. Valley Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

P.O. Box 5278
Santa Barbara, CA 93150
Tel: (805) 969-2026
Fax (805) 969-4043

info@montecitoassociation.org
www.montecitoassociation.org

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

Re: Bagdasarian/Karman Appeal of the Montecito Planning
Commission's Denial of Land Use Permit for Site Alterations,
Walls and Bridges in Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area, Item
#8, Board of Supervisors Agenda of January 17, 2012

Dear Supervisors:

The Montecito Association provided the attached comments to your Board last September when this item was originally scheduled for hearing. Despite our ongoing interest in this project, we learned only upon review of the Board Report on Thursday that the project has been revised and that P&D has changed the recommendation on this important appeal. Neither P&D nor the applicant provided the Association with any information regarding the proposed changes.

As we have not had the opportunity to review the revisions to the project and continue to believe that permitting structures within the creek is contrary to long established Comprehensive Plan policies, we ask that you continue the project and bring it to the MA and community for review and input.

Further, we believe that it is an inappropriate use of public funds (\$32,000!) to review project revisions in the context of an appeal, thus failing to recover costs. In cases such as this an applicant should be required to resubmit their permit application if they wish to have a project alternative considered by staff and decision makers. Tax payers should not bear these expenses, especially in a case that arises from a blatant zoning violation.

Sincerely,

Richard Nordlund, President

cc: Julie Harris, P&D