THE SILVERSTEIN LAW FIRM

A Professional Corporation

215 North Marengo Avenue, 3rd Floor Pasadena, California 91101-1504

PHONE: (626) 449-4200 FAX: (626) 449-4205

ROBERT@ROBERTSILVERSTEINLAW.COM WWW.ROBERTSILVERSTEINLAW.COM

March 20, 2015

To: 2nd District County Supervisor and Board of Supervisors Chair Janet Wolf
Cc: Supervisors Salud Carbajal, Doreen Farr, Peter Adam, Steve Lavagnino

Dear Supervisor Wolf:

It is our understanding based on the published agenda for the Tuesday, March 24, 2015 set hearing request #15-00258 that the Department of Planning & Development has requested April 14, 2015 as the first choice for the Board to hear both appeals of the Montecito Planning Commission's January decision about the Miramar project.

As the Pachulski family's legal counsel on this matter, I write to request that you not schedule the Miramar appeals on that date or on April 21, 2015 because well-documented prior conflicts make it impossible for me to attend. Instead, I ask that you schedule the appeal hearings on May 5, 2015 or any later date that is convenient to both appellants.

To repeat, my firm represents the plaintiffs (including a coalition of more than 40 community groups) in the Millennium Hollywood Towers case scheduled to go to trial on April 21, 2015. We also have a court-mandated trial brief filing (and multiple related documents) on April 14, 2015 that is crucial to that case. This is a very high-profile lawsuit that has been making its way through the courts since 2013. Both the trial date and the brief filing date were set by Judge James Chalfant long before the Miramar case was even heard by the Montecito Planning Commission, much less when we appealed the decision.

We have provided P&D with court documents in support of these conflicts and are puzzled why they continue to insist on a date that is impossible for counsel for appellant Pachulskis to attend. Due process requires that the County of Santa Barbara provide all appellants the opportunity to be represented by legal counsel of their choice and given adequate time to prepare their appeals. We, working with the dates originally proposed by P&D staff, agreed to May 5, 2015 – only to see P&D suddenly change the recommendation to a date that they have been shown does not work for our side.

Thank you for your courtesy and consideration of this request.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. SILVERSTEIN FOR THE SILVERSTEIN LAW FIRM