

# Sheila de la Guerra General Public Comment

**From:** page robinson <robinsonpage@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 30, 2024 9:01 PM  
**To:** sbcob  
**Cc:** Plowman, Lisa  
**Subject:** Public Comment Miramar scheduling and process & Coastal Access



**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.**

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors and Director Plowman –

We live at 97 Eucalyptus lane, directly across the street from the North Eastern portion of the proposed Miramar shopping center.

As this development falls under SB330 it is limited to five hearings.

1. Please consider reversing the most recent changes to the hearing schedule and process for review of this large and consequential project and return it in full to the Montecito Planning Commission.
2. Please cancel the recently proposed County Planning meeting on October 9th. This would not impede the due process of the developer as he must wait for the Oct 18th MPC meeting anyway. By canceling this meeting and returning jurisdiction to the MPC you are freeing up a potential future meeting to hear additional details, which is exactly what Mr. Caruso hopes to avoid with this maneuver. The public needs more protection, and every one of the five meetings.
3. Like the vast majority of our immediate neighborhood, we support affordable housing, but are deeply concerned about the impact of this complex development on our tiny beachside community.
3. To cite one example, we believe that the under parking of this multi use project threatens the general public's coastal access. Located just one block from the ocean, with a \$40 Miramar valet fee, no doubt shoppers and diners will fill the limited neighborhood spaces historically used by surfers and beachgoers.

Coastal Land Use Plan 2019

Policy 7-1 "The County shall take all necessary steps to protect and defend the public's constitutionally guaranteed rights of access to and along the shoreline."

Policy 7-10 "The County shall provide INCREASED opportunities for beach access and recreation in the Montecito planning area."

5. The Miramar's current parking and traffic analysis was conducted by the same firm whose questionable assumptions and predictions in 2016 have been proven wrong. They are currently vastly under parked during peak times.

This year's "Parking Analysis" dated June 25, 2024, includes similar questionable assumptions and data points.

The chart uses "peak time" of "Tuesday, 6pm March" for its statistics. March.

Page 5 of the report states:

**“As shown on Table 3, the Coastal Zoning Ordinance Requirement for Approved Project and proposed Project is 701 spaces. THE PARKING SUPPLY OF 480 SPACES DOES NOT SATISFY THE STANDARD CODE-REQUIRED PARKING, **THUS A PARKING MODIFICATION WILL CONTINUE TO BE REQUIRED.**”**

**By their own calculations, this plan, located one block from the Pacific Ocean, falls short 221 parking spaces. And this figure is without a peer review—something the County should conduct.**

As the Miramar proposal stands now, this parking deficit will result in a DECREASE of opportunities for beach access and recreation for the general public. We believe that by returning this to MPC and cancelling the County Planning meeting of October 9th, you will at a minimum, be helping the County take the necessary steps to protect and defend the public's Coastal Access rights.

Allowing this to rush through the approval process without as much consideration as is legally possible appears to favor the interests of the billionaire developer over those of the people. This is an opportunity for you to demonstrate good governance and do the right thing.

Thank you for your consideration,

Page Robinson  
Anthony Donovan

97 Eucalyptus Lane