

For: May 19, 2015 Supervisor Meeting Appeal (Case No14APL-00000-00028)

The Discrimination Issue.

The remark by the SBAR staff that the "Appellant's project treated like any other project" is both infuriating and insulting.

How many other appellants are ordered to leave the SBAR meeting without saying a single word?

How many other appellants are NOT told why their project was rejected at the meeting?

How many other appellants have to wait 3 weeks to find why their project was rejected?

How many other appellants have to wonder for 6 months if SBAR reviewed their latest design or their earlier design? This drove my blood pressure up very high for 9 months even under medication.

How many other appellants are ordered to leave without given the opportunity to present their design?

How many other appellants are told that your latest design is the same as your first design, when it is not?

How many other appellants have wonder if SBAR members can tell the difference between the garage and the kitchen?

How many other appellants have the staff not present the drawing that shows the upper and lower level in question? Yet, the staff claims the upper level is "solely" over the garage. (How many of you think the upper level is "solely" over the garage.)

How many other appellants are not given a chance to modify their first new concept design because it was not discussed at the SBAR meeting?

How many other appellants are not told that the previous approvals done by 5 of the same members of the Board do not apply to you? Decisions are made on a case by case basis.

How many other appellants have to read the minutes to their meeting concerning their project 3 weeks later, because they were not allow to attend the meeting?

If this is the way that SBAR treats other appellants, then we need find those people and get a class action lawsuit against the county, because SBAR has been violating the Ralph Brown law for years.

The original intent of the guidelines has failed miserably . This is from the 2nd sentence of the guidelines: "...these guidelines have been developed to help maintain the high quality of Eastern Goleta Valleys neighborhoods and promote neighborhood compatibility and good architectural design." Who in this room can believe that? Look at our design and realize that the members of SBAR cannot distinguish the difference between the kitchen and the garage. Look at the 442 Ribera design – this is awful – totally unbalanced. Look at 122 Santa Ana – quoting or paraphrasing Ryan Cooksey , ‘ugly is not a criteria for not approving a design.’

No these guidelines have been established for the privilege few to govern as they see fit and every one knows that in order to get your project passed that you have to get someone who knows someone on the South County Board. I have heard this time and time again. Ed, you will never get your project approved that way, find someone who knows someone on the Board.

No one should have to endure this crap that I have been put through. Think about it!! Would you like to be put through this. We were ordered to leave within 15 seconds of the start of the meeting without getting chance to say a Single Word!! Can you honestly say that the members of SBAR treats everyone and every project the same? If you ~~believe~~ that then you should be in jail.

Ed Kalasky Ph: 805-964-3070 E-mail: D2Bike@Juno.com

*endorse this
behavior*