



The voice of our community

**2010 Officers:**

President  
William Palladini  
1<sup>st</sup> Vice President  
Elisa Atwill  
2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President  
Monica Brock Petersen  
Secretary  
Gene Sinsler  
Treasurer

**Directors:**

Evan Aptaker  
Elisa Atwill  
Darlene Bierig  
Tom Bollay  
J.W. Colin  
Michael Cook  
Mindy Denson  
David Kent  
Richard Nordlund  
William Palladini  
Monica Brock Petersen  
Tom Schleck  
Robertson Short  
Gene Sinsler  
Peter van Duinwyk  
Jean von Wittenburg  
Louis Weider

**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

**Land Use Committee Meeting**

**July 6, 2010 – 4:00 PM**

**\*\*\*1455 East Valley Road\*\*\***

**Unapproved Minutes**

**Present:** Nordlund, Baxter, Short, Petersen, Bierig, Thielscher, Bollay, Kent

**Absent:** Bridley, Johnson

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Approval of Minutes June 1, 2010**

**III. Public Comment for Items not on Agenda**

**IV. Conference Agenda**

**A. San Ysidro Pathway Project .....SB County Public Works**

Scott McGolphin, Director of Public Works summarized process to date and noted that in response to the input from previous meetings, the plan has evolved. 70% of path is now over 30” from the curb and is an average of 32” back. County would install the landscaping and it will be maintained by a contractor hired by the County.

Susan van Atta, Project Landscape Architect – Design sets the crossings back from San Ysidro by at least 32”. Path is now 3 1/2’ wide. Proper installation of decomposed granite will ensure that it is durable. Want to stay with DG because of the rural look compatible with the community. Average 32” setback from curb. Have incorporated more succulents in the plan based on community input.

Bierig summarized history of community work on encroachments and safe routes to schools. Land Use Committee has provided input on design and maintenance issues since the beginning of this year. This plan has come a long way and is greatly improved over the initial versions because Public Work’s has been responding to the Land Use Committee’s and community’s input. Since Public Works has said this is their last visit to our committee; we should be in a position to make a recommendation to our Board about the plan before us; this committee is charged by our Board with both working on the design and then making a recommendation. Our focus today should be on the current design and whether or not it is compatible with our Community Plan and our Board’s pathway design policy. We will have 3 minutes of public comment per speaker’s slip and then ask the County if they would like to clarify anything before turning it over to the Land Use Committee for questions and comments.

Jodi Fishman-Osti – Path is needed to provide a safe walking option for school children. Design is compatible and complimentary to character of the community. She requests the committee’s support in moving the project forward.

Craig Boehr – Concerned about maintenance of the path. Park Department is contracting out for maintenance. Measure A funds would be used. Questions whether this is an appropriate use of funds.

Robert Meghreblian – Would like less of a city look to the pathway.

Miklos Dora – 93 year old Miramar Ave resident walks to the Upper Village. Finds the current path to be comfortable and not dangerous. Opposes the expenditure of funds on this.

Harry Lintukorpi – Has been involved since 2007 in efforts to get a safer path. Current situation is not safe for children. Any traffic solutions to reduce the number of cars will be an improvement. Path will help.

Judy Ishkanian – Thanks County for efforts. Concerned we didn't know all that was involved when we supported the grant. Does not support the pathway as proposed.

Kellem de Forest – Concerned about compatibility with historic character of the community.

Jurgen Boehr – Design does not consider tree canopy. He lost camphor trees after construction of the bike lane.

Molly Rosecrance – Does not believe project is warranted. Expressed concern that kids on bikes will use a decomposed granite path thereby making it more dangerous for pedestrians than current path. Kids who want to walk can walk on existing path.

Linda Johnson – Thanked MA and County for efforts. Thinks adapted design is compatible with the community. Pathway will enhance safety for everyone. Hopes the MA will support the pathway.

Leslie Hovey – Does not like the project or want it imposed on the community.

Carolee Krieger – Concerned that the project will set a negative precedent. Does not believe it is compatible with community character.

Pamela Boehr – Project is a pig; you can try and disguise it by calling it anything you want, but it is still a pig.

Maryanne Brillhart – Project will diminish value of properties along San Ysidro because of loss of individual look of each property. The most visually offensive area (in front of MUS) isn't being addressed.

Todd Boehr – Project supporters lack understanding of the importance of the community character.

Candace Buergey – Project does not seem compatible with the community. It would be better to run a shuttle to reduce number of cars on the road.

Bierig – Participants should not criticize public works staff for time spent attending this meeting. She invited Public Works staff to be here to facilitate a community discussion on the design of the path. Greatly appreciates the 1<sup>st</sup> District Supervisor's office (Jeremy Tittle in attendance) as well as the county staff's willingness to work on this collaboratively; they initially became involved with this project at the request of members of this community, not the other way around.

Petersen – Understands that project came along because community members wanted a pathway. Appreciates the County's willingness to participate in these meetings and be responsive to input.

Thielscher – Questioned whether maintenance funding would be available over the long-term. McGolphin responded that the funding would be programmed in the annual road maintenance budget. The source is Measure A (sales tax) funds. The landscape maintenance would be done by a private contractor.

Kent – Notes division in the community. Commends Public Works for their efforts. They’ve come up with a plan that is as good as it is going to get. Thinks it is important that the MA take a position. Question is whether the project is compatible with the community today and in the future.

Bollay – Troubled by some design elements but in support of trying to build something. This compromise is acceptable given constraints.

Short – Great division in the community over the project now but in past many pushed for this project. In favor of going through with the project; empathizes with parents at Montecito Union who are concerned about their children’s safety. Already, there is nothing semi-rural about San Ysidro given the amount of traffic and mix of uses.

Bierig – Seen improvement in the landscaped setback from the curb. The fourth generation of the plan is before us. It seems to be the best that can be done given the design constraints established by Public Works early in the process; the homeowners’ desires, designing around existing encroachments, and grant standards. Is the current design good enough becomes the question? Referred to pathway design policy adopted by the MA Board.

Thielscher – Has a lot of problems with the path. Can’t support it.

Nordlund – Acknowledged that the County has made its best effort. Noted presence of mix of institutional uses along San Ysidro. Worried that if we don’t accept this design we might end up with something worse.

Petersen – Conflicted about spending government money at this time, but project is here. Input into design has created marked improvement.

Kent – Motion: Recommend that the Montecito Association Board oppose the San Ysidro path project as currently presented and that the Association work with Montecito Union, Montecito Trails Foundation and neighbors to develop a more acceptable alternative. Motion seconded by Thielscher and passed 4-3 (Kent, Thielscher, Nordlund, Bierig in support; Petersen, Short, Bollay opposed; Bridley, Baxter and Johnson absent).

B. Consider Comments to P&D Regarding Supplemental EIR for Extension of the Montecito Growth Management Ordinance – Thielscher pleased that a 20 year extension is proposed. Committee support a letter in response to the draft SEIR with comments to reflect our interests. Bollay/Kent, unanimous.

C. Consider Comments to Santa Barbara County Historic Landmark Advisory Commission Regarding East Valley Eucalyptus Trees –Greene summarized process for designation of structures of historic merit and landmarks as well as policies of the community plan that are applicable. Evan Aptaker – believes this is one way to help protect the trees and supports it as part of that effort. Carolee Krieger would like this to move forward as an important part of the effort to protect the trees. De Forest – Trees meet 5 of 9 criteria for designation as a landmark. Application has yet to be completed or filed. After discussion, the committee agreed that it would be appropriate to consider whether to support the application once a complete application is available. Greene will reagendaize at that time.

## **V. Committee/Staff Member Reports**

### **A. Chair’s Report**

P&D Process Improvement Committee Meeting – MA was not in attendance. Committee discussed discontinuance of funding of contract for running the PIC meetings.

### **B. Committee Reports:**

Tree Subcommittee – Thielscher discussed group’s feeling that it was premature to pursue an ordinance until we learned if the County might have any resources to put to the issue. He

plans to meet with Supervisor Carbajal later in this month. Bierig asked that this approach be reconsidered and offered to discuss it further with the subcommittee.

MBAR – Bierig noted that prior to the Hosmer adobe discussion the applicant's representative asked that Palladini not participate because of his prior comments on behalf of the Association. Because he is a board member, when we take action in the future, will it disqualify him from representing the community on MBAR? Greene explained that this was an unusual circumstance where Palladini had commented on the project on behalf of the MA prior to being seated on the MBAR. This type of perceived conflict would not be expected for most projects.

**VI. Planning Commission Items – July 28, 2010**

- A. Appeal of P&D Approval of NextG Santa Rosa Site – Committee recommends that the board write a letter to the MPC in support of the appeal. MSC, unanimous.

**VII. Old Business**

- VIII. New Business** – High Road residents asked committee to comment to the County regarding proposed coastal development permit to remove a pergola that has been previously identified as a significant historic resource. Application was filed after the County stopped work on the removal. County staff has required that the owner submit additional documentation regarding historical significance. Committee concluded that it was premature to comment at this time but they may want to weigh in at a later date. (Bierig stepped down.)

- IX. Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 pm.

Next meeting August 3, 2010