

Public Comment #1

From: [Donald Sharpe](#)
To: [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)
Subject: Re: 1201 Las Alturas, Santa Barbara
Date: Monday, March 14, 2022 8:27:47 AM

You don't often get email from donaldgsharpe@gmail.com [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL

Dear HLC Members,

As a long time member of HLC, I urge you to designate 1201 Las Alturas as a City Landmark.
Thank you.

Don Sharpe

To: Santa Barbara City Historic Landmarks Commission

Date: 14 March 2022

Re: Assessor's parcel number 019-113-024 1201 Las Alturas Road
Application Number : PLN2022-00073

Thank you for informing us neighbors of the motion by McDonough Family 1996 Trust ie The McDonoughs.

We would like to be placed on the "Interested Parties" list to receive updates and voice our inputs.

We are located on High Ridge Lane Santa Barbara, would like to go on record related to the McDonough Family 1996 Family Trust application for Landmark Designation of their property.

We strongly urge the Santa Barbara city council to DENY this application. This application represents the latest iteration of the McDonoughs' attempts to assert a claim of superior rights and dominance over neighboring properties and is exclusionary by design. The McDonoughs are asking this Commission to grant them a special designation which they are not entitled to and would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood, other property owners, and public policy that promotes progress and equitable communities.

Kindly find the following inputs, but they are not limited to those listed below:

1. Property Value Drag/Reduction on Neighborhood: This designation reduces the property value of our neighborhood.

a. By limiting the ability of this old home on a large, terrific lot to not be significantly remodeled, improved, or even a new home someday, it will reduce the value of the neighboring properties. Its eventual resale will be hampered by these constraints, thus lowering the formulation of sale price for our neighborhood.

b. Plenty of other buyers resent the idea of buying a property they're forbidden to make any changes to, so landmarking can make a property hard to sell and bring down overall neighborhood values.

2. Antithesis of what our dear city Landmark status signifies: If approved, the city will set a deeply concerning precedent for new and old mishmash properties as being "historical".

a. A crash of styles and times: Upon reviewing the section of their application under Integrity Main House, it illustrates the capricious actions of the owners who have done "recent kitchen remodels" (when? As they neglect to include that), in fill of original garage, windows widened (when?, (pool added?) and more. Thus, we know updates and major changes have been made on this property in 1955, 1959, 2006 & *more recently* per their application. Note: kitchen and other remodels/updates mentioned without details (date please!). These are the kinds of things that a historic designation is

designed to prevent & at least deter. It is a bit high handed at best, if not downright hypocritical to then be demanding a Landmark Designation.

3. Historical Landscape: An affront to the true ones.

a. An Asian pagoda is not of SB historic significance. It is an eye soar that towers over its neighbors impacting our sense of serenity, privacy, and an affront to the general Santa Barbara style. If designated historical, we lose hope of it ever being removed. This I imagine other neighbors may also object to it being permanently protected. It is a towering (height?) intrusion.

b. The gravel circular entrance cited as an example of historic landscape features certainly brings the bar for a historic property landscape to an all-time low.

c. The large grass at their property requires significant water. Why protect such landscape as historic especially as such landscapes negatively impact our already overburdened water of Santa Barbara?

d. The ivy as seen on the photo plate 11 is not historic and creates habitats for rats and other vermin, which may lead to the use of modern-day poison boxes. If so, those boxes are endangering the owls & hawks that live in the nearby canyons who daily eat more vermin than any rat box poison tries to address.

e. His dilapidated fence is an eye sore and not historic! How horrible if we were stuck with it given a historic designation. It also *trespasses* on neighboring property.

Have you seen the recent property survey? It shows how his property TRESPASSES on neighbor's property, a wonderful new neighbor he is intent on running out of the neighborhood.

4. Previous Work Permits: Were all the required permits obtained for their remodels, adding walls, enlarging windows (more heat escape), adding new structures?

a. Has the city inspected the property for compliance?

b. His pergola & terribly maintained fence certainly must not be complying as it intrudes on neighbors' property. *This should be REMOVED and in compliance with current city rules.*

5. Wasteful management of resources: Old homes built at various times with older materials do not offer the energy and fire protection that new technologies and building methods offer today. The safer our neighbor's home and property, the better it is for our precious neighborhood.

a. Thus, this designation will deter, if not, stop energy & sustainability improvements.

b. We lose the opportunity for new more efficient opportunities that will better reflect improvements in creating high fire resistance in resident landscape, permeability, water conservation, energy efficiency, radon mitigation – indoor air quality, etc

i. Keep in mind this property likely has very high radon. Large remodels and even new builds (so often done – thanks in part to the city) often address all these issues far better than a mishmash old property.

ii. Santa Barbara is also known & praised for its award-winning homes that are blending SB Style while incorporating best practices. Thus ultimately, improving our city's coffers (higher tax), water tables, reducing fire risks for neighbors and thus looking after our fire fighters & first responders and so forth.

6. Sustainability – per the Santa Barbara city guidelines: “Good design can help ensure that meeting the needs of the current generation does not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This is the “sustainability” concept. It is important that neighborhoods *change* in a way that promotes the long-term economic, environmental and social sustainability of the City. ... well-designed homes are often more sustainable because they tend to:

- require fewer natural resources in construction
- consume less electricity and natural gas... “

Thus, such a designation deeply impacts all of us and our future generations; By giving this large property a special designation that again prevents the application of new safer, more efficient design & materials, we hurt all of us today and tomorrow.

Thus, it means a larger climate footprint.

In our city's own Single Family Residence Design Guidelines updated 17 June 2011 “City of Santa Barbara General Plan, “Santa Barbara has, as its primary... [goal], the provision of a particularly desirable living environment. ...• promote long-term sustainability” utilizing energy efficiently (1.3.1 and 1.3.2)

7. Intent: Such a designation may make it more difficult for any adjoining neighbors to ever remodel, renovate or build new on their property. Why are they doing this, if not to make that so?!

It is especially important to note that the McDonoughs have been litigious with neighbors even stating their aim to run our new neighbors out of town! They have spread rumors with so many false narratives and fake data points, that they invite being accused of *slander* in a court of law.

I can speak more to this at the meeting on the 16th, if said council would like specifics.

City of Santa Barbara in its aim to encourage the “Neighborly” aspect of our community, should be acutely aware of the Intent behind this application.

8. Permeability – Per SB City guidelines, new projects must maximize permeable areas. Again, a designation prevents these improvements. It also again may negatively impact the ability of our neighbors to do new projects if the McDonoughs can then claim it somehow impedes their historic

landmark home vistas or any other such claim, they may be able to site (true or not) to prevent others in making improvements, new builds etc

We know for a fact that they are doing everything they can to stop improvements in our neighborhood.

9. Higher Demands on City/Neighbors: In addition to the points listed above, some historic designations often mean that the current owner pays LESS tax. A significant tax decrease or lack of increase in keeping with the neighborhood, means this wealthy over \$10million property with their large wealth gets another pass and special treatment. Our city needs our tax dollars. It then puts a higher impact on all others who do NOT have such a historic designation to make up for those tax losses. This is not only unfair, it borders on wealthy white man privilege. We do not want to be seen as a city enforcing archaic actions that hurt our most vulnerable as well as the everyday hard working good people of our city.

10. Neighborhoods do grow, evolve and transform. We should embrace this. Thankfully, our city – you and your colleagues, have very specific strong rules for encouraging healthy, smart growth in keeping with our precious city & the changing demands of our high fire risk, drought impacted city.

11. Santa Barbara Council integrity: Given the high standards of the Santa Barbara City Council in guiding new construction and our abundance of true SB historic properties, designating this mishmash of a property as a Landmark property would reflect badly on the city, diminishing the legacy and good work of the Council.

12. Use of Landmark Designation Process as a weapon/Bullying Behaviour: It reflects owners continuing efforts to be the rulers of our neighborhood.

They are utilizing this in their continuing efforts to thwart neighbors in building new beautiful, more efficient structures. This is evident in their litigious behavior to neighbors and strong opposition to any improvements.

Are you aware that they have signs outside their home against the other neighbors?! How is this historic?! How would you feel if a neighbor put up signs saying ANTI/NO and your company name?! His actions are a slow poison and have had disastrous impacts on many.

This request is just another tool they are trying to wield in their aggressive phobic, unneighborly behavior towards people different than themselves. He is hassling so many of us. Did you know even before moving in, he sued the new neighbors adjoining his property to the South. He doesn't even reach out to them. By the way, his property is encroaching on the property of the neighbors he has been bullying and harassing. He demands tree removals on their property yet paints his property and landscape as historical. If he is a friend of the old trees, why did he sue the neighbors to remove some? He could have asked, but that misses the point of the duplicitous nature of their historical designation

while demanding long term trees to be removed. Empowering a neighborhood bully is exactly what the city will be doing if they grant this Landmark designation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Deeply concerned Neighbors

Public Comment #3

From: [Mary Louise Days](#)
To: [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)
Cc: [Mary Louise Days](#)
Subject: Proposed Designation of 1201 Las Alturas Road
Date: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 3:55:09 PM

EXTERNAL

To the City of Santa Barbara Historic Landmarks Commission:

I support the designation of the significant historic resources at 1201 Las Alturas Road in the Riviera neighborhood as a City Landmark. This is an important property. The main house was designed by Carleton Winslow, Sr., a major local architect of the early 20th century. There are several residential buildings Mr. Winslow designed in Santa Barbara, and the significant ones should be designated.

Mary Louise Days, Historian

Public Comment #4

From: [nikki lombardi](mailto:nikki_lombardi@yahoo.com)
To: Community_Development_HLCsecretary
Subject: 1201 Las Alturas Rd , Application number PLN2022-00073
Date: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 9:20:45 PM

[You don't often get email from nikki_lombardi@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

EXTERNAL

Re: Historic Landmark Application for 1201 Las Alturas Rd
Application number PLN2022-00073

We are in opposition of the designation of 1201 Las Alturas Rd as a historic landmark. We are concerned for multiple reasons:

1. As stated in the resolution recommending the status, it states "the property has maintained a high level of historical integrity at its location....conveys its original appearance". It is also stated in the resolution that the property has, at minimum, 4 structures of different architectural styles and eras, These two statements seem to be contradicting each other. None of the items detailed in the resolution are of cohesive style; a 1919 Spanish-Colonial Revival main house, a Mid-Century studio from 1959, a Japanese pagoda, sandstone features of different styles/types. The resolution's list does not mention other characteristics of the property which continue the lack of cohesion including the guest house from 1969.

2. We are concerned about the intentions of the McDonough's seeking status.

A. Per the applicants email to us, dated March 12, 2022, when I asked why they are seeking landmark status, this was their reply: "Emmett and I have lived here for almost 27 years and really love it. We have worked to maintain and preserve it. We hope to stay for many more years. But, at some point, this house will have new owners. Many houses in Santa Barbara these days are being bought to be torn down and replaced by something bigger and more contemporary. We don't want that to happen here." Their reason doesn't seem like they are wanting to preserve the house, rather are interested in barring any changes in the future to their property or adjacent properties; even after they are no longer the owner.

B. They have been litigious with a neighbor which seems to have spawned this request for historical status.

Thank you, Laramie and Nikki Greene
1301 Las Alturas Rd (adjacent neighbors)

PLEASE BE ADVISED

The following public comment was not received in time to process. Distribution to the Historic Landmarks Commission occurred after the meeting.

Public Comment #5

From: [Nancy Solway](#)
To: [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)
Subject: House on Las Alturus requesting historic status
Date: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 1:33:42 PM

[You don't often get email from nancy.solway@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

EXTERNAL

We live on High Ridge Lane and vehemently oppose designation of historic status to our neighbor on Las Alturus. We enthusiastically endorse the planned redevelopment and oppose the McDonoughs efforts to derail the project.
Respectively
Nancy and Harvey Solway

Sent from my iPhone

From: windnsea1@gmail.com
To: Community_Development_HLCsecretary
Cc: NHernandex@SantaBarbaraCA.gov
Subject: FW: 1201 Las Alturas Road Application Number : PLN2022-00073
Date: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 3:41:09 PM
Attachments: [Historic Landmark Commission.docx](#)
Importance: High

Some people who received this message don't often get email from windnsea1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL

Dear HLC Commission:

We appreciate Commissioner Ed Lenvik & Mr. Justin Manuel comments.

Myself and another neighbor hand was raised post the further discussion but we were not given a chance to give input or ask questions again, thus:

Kindly advise:

1. How can the public comments/letters/emails submitted be read into the record? (mine attached again for ease of reference)
 - a. Is it fair that the presenters receive so much time and screen sharing of powerpoints/images without offering the same to neighbors? (as well as so much extra time for preparation?)
 - b. Is there motion to process that could be considered to offer equal speaking time to neighbors or opposition?
 - c. Can you provide concrete refence as to what such designation equates to including impact and rights on them to impact trees, development etc in neighborhood esp adjoining or vista properties.
 - i. When was the this Cuatro Vistas name created? It is new to us.
2. What can be done for a motion to be considered related to Notification Process?
 - a. Can we be notified by email as well as mail?
 - b. Kindly consider extending neighborhood notification to extend beyond 10 days (imagine being away, dealing with a medical illness, etc) and suggest minimum 30 days and ideally 60 days Certainly, the people doing this designation have been working on it for an extended time and a neighborly thing do to is to advise

with much more notice.

- c. Is there a reason for the rush? 10 days put an onus on neighbors
- d. Additionally, such a designation impacts more than 300 feet of neighbors. What can be done to extend the surrounding notifications to a much larger area, as such designation often impacts property values? Real estate organizations may give you some insight on how far to extend the neighbors notice given that many landmark homes lose resale value due to the constraints on landmarks, and thus drives down nearby values.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/adammillsap/2019/12/23/historic-designations-are-ruining-cities/?sh=2c8298e057af>) among other studies.

3. Please address our questions included in the letter which include but are not limited to:

- a. Shouldn't something be done to address the 1201 property (dilapidated fence and pagoda) encroaching on 1191 Las Alturas BEFORE giving them any special landmark status?
 - i. Won't landmark status give an advantage to the 1201 property to continue to encroach?
 - ii. Won't landmark status make it more difficult to address the dilapidated fence?
- b. Does landmark status impact their tax rate? (reduce it?) Do they have entitlement to special mortgage or/and special monies from city, state or federal for house work, as I have read in some of my research?
- c. Did you know the ocean views you are now seeing are new as the 1201 Las Alturas owners sued the new owners of 1191 Las Alturas, before even meeting them to remove trees?! Trees that had been on site for decades. It is ironic that they are pointing to their trees as being special when they just sued neighbors (before even asking) regarding trees which frankly it seems they had no standing. The tree removed was bordering 1191 Las Alturas and our home 1200 High Ridge Lane and now we have LESS privacy.
- d. When were the recent kitchen and other remodels done? Those are mentioned but not dated. Once designation happens those extensive changes would not be allowed correct? So why

grandfather in something that would not be allowed if they had long ago asked for special status?

- e. Merit: How is a hodgepodge of buildings, renovations etc be deemed SB Historic Landmark? We love some of the city downtown historic elements and landmark properties. Please note that recommending this 1201 Las Alturas property lowers the bar and special status of our existing designations. It opens a floodgate and sets a dangerous precedent that could diminish not add to our beautiful city.

4. As noted from the meeting today, two reasons stated to either grant or make it “easy” on 1201 included:

- a. An original owner was a developer in SBA. Isn't this ironic? Please note the 1201 owners put in writing they are doing this to prevent people building new homes in the neighborhood. (See public comments by another neighbor & backed by an email sent by 1201 McDonoughs)
- b. Regarding surveys and elevation costs as being onerous on the McDonoughs reason for possibly waiving that requirement, is missing a few key facts:

- i. The property in the upper riviera is valued at around \$10million. (https://www.zillow.com/homedetails/1201-Las-Alturas-Rd-Santa-Barbara-CA-93103/15884022_zpid/) The owners are more than comfortable with their large family trust

- ii. Given they have done surveys just recently that shows they are actually encroaching on neighbors, at least to the South of them at 1191 Las Alturas, and that they have not provided that information to the council is a loud, large RED flag.

- iii. As noted in some astute commission comments today, the information and data points are too limited and may only offer one perspective leaving out KEY issues from

the mix mash of elements, grading, elevation, surveys, original site plans etc.

iv. Money does not appear to be an issue for them. They have been clear in telling us they want to drive out any neighbors who want to do new building. They indeed have just done that!!

v. They have and continue to spend significant amounts on legal fees against neighbors. In fact, this is why I am even nervous in speaking up, but I should not be bullied. We should not let this continue. There are many of us in the neighborhood who are deeply concerned about their litigious ways and will use such a designation as another tool, even a weapon, to prevent any neighborhood advancements (which often improve our values, our climate, our fire prevention, our water tables...) at best and at worst are using it as a pulpit to revert to discriminatory real estate practices.

5. **Again, We strongly urge the Santa Barbara city council to DENY this application. This application represents the latest iteration of the McDonoughs' attempts to assert a claim of superior rights and dominance over neighboring properties and is exclusionary by design. The McDonoughs are asking this Commission to grant them a special designation which they are not entitled to and would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood, other property owners, and public policy that promotes progress and equitable communities.**

Thank you kindly for your care and attention to this matter. If you would like to view the imposing pagoda or impact of the tree loss on us, I would be happy to arrange a visit to our property on High Ridge lane (south and south east of McDonoughs plot). We do deeply appreciate all that you do and have done to care for the beautiful truly historic properties. Please note that more is not necessarily good, when it fails many of

the benchmarks that would make it a historic designation. Indeed neighbor valid input is another key factor.

Kindly advise via email next hearings.

Regards

N Martin

From: windnsea1@gmail.com

Date: March 14, 2022 at 10:44:38 PM PDT

To: HLCSecretary@santabarbaraca.gov

Cc: NHernandex@santabarbaraca.gov

Subject: 1201 Las Alturas Road Application Number : PLN2022-00073

Greetings Ms Nicole Hernandez & Santa Barbara City Historic Landmarks Commission:

Re: Assessor's parcel number 019-113-024 1201 Las Alturas Road
Application Number : PLN2022-00073

Thank you for informing us neighbors of the motion by McDonough Family 1996 Trust ie The McDonoughs. We only just recently received the Notice to Neighbor and WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU.

We are located on High Ridge Lane Santa Barbara, would like to go on record related to the McDonough Family 1996 Family Trust application for Landmark Designation of their property.

We strongly urge the Santa Barbara city council to DENY such application.

This application represents the latest iteration of the McDonoughs' attempts to assert a claim of superior rights and dominance over neighboring properties and is exclusionary by design. The McDonoughs are asking this Commission to grant them a special designation which they are not entitled to and would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood, other property owners, and public policy that promotes progress and equitable communities.

Kindly find the following inputs, but not limited to in the attached word document. Kindly confirm receipt and it being a part of the hearing on 16 March 2022 in consideration of the LDP of their property.

Please be advised that we would like to be kept apprised of this process

and to attend the Zoom meeting on 16 March 2022 at 130pm. Kindly advise zoom directions and link

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Thanks and Regards

To: Santa Barbara City Historic Landmarks Commission

Date: 14 March 2022

Re: Assessor's parcel number 019-113-024 1201 Las Alturas Road
Application Number : PLN2022-00073

Thank you for informing us neighbors of the motion by McDonough Family 1996 Trust ie The McDonoughs.

We would like to be placed on the "Interested Parties" list to receive updates and voice our inputs.

We are located on High Ridge Lane Santa Barbara, would like to go on record related to the McDonough Family 1996 Family Trust application for Landmark Designation of their property.

We strongly urge the Santa Barbara city council to DENY this application. This application represents the latest iteration of the McDonoughs' attempts to assert a claim of superior rights and dominance over neighboring properties and is exclusionary by design. The McDonoughs are asking this Commission to grant them a special designation which they are not entitled to and would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood, other property owners, and public policy that promotes progress and equitable communities.

Kindly find the following inputs, but they are not limited to those listed below:

1. Property Value Drag/Reduction on Neighborhood: This designation reduces the property value of our neighborhood.

a. By limiting the ability of this old home on a large, terrific lot to not be significantly remodeled, improved, or even a new home someday, it will reduce the value of the neighboring properties. Its eventual resale will be hampered by these constraints, thus lowering the formulation of sale price for our neighborhood.

b. Plenty of other buyers resent the idea of buying a property they're forbidden to make any changes to, so landmarking can make a property hard to sell and bring down overall neighborhood values.

2. Antithesis of what our dear city Landmark status signifies: If approved, the city will set a deeply concerning precedent for new and old mishmash properties as being "historical".

a. A crash of styles and times: Upon reviewing the section of their application under Integrity Main House, it illustrates the capricious actions of the owners who have done "recent kitchen remodels" (when? As they neglect to include that), in fill of original garage, windows widened (when?, (pool added?) and more. Thus, we know updates and major changes have been made on this property in 1955, 1959, 2006 & *more recently* per their application. Note: kitchen and other remodels/updates mentioned without details (date please!). These are the kinds of things that a historic designation is

designed to prevent & at least deter. It is a bit high handed at best, if not downright hypocritical to then be demanding a Landmark Designation.

3. Historical Landscape: An affront to the true ones.

a. An Asian pagoda is not of SB historic significance. It is an eye soar that towers over its neighbors impacting our sense of serenity, privacy, and an affront to the general Santa Barbara style. If designated historical, we lose hope of it ever being removed. This I imagine other neighbors may also object to it being permanently protected. It is a towering (height?) intrusion.

b. The gravel circular entrance cited as an example of historic landscape features certainly brings the bar for a historic property landscape to an all-time low.

c. The large grass at their property requires significant water. Why protect such landscape as historic especially as such landscapes negatively impact our already overburdened water of Santa Barbara?

d. The ivy as seen on the photo plate 11 is not historic and creates habitats for rats and other vermin, which may lead to the use of modern-day poison boxes. If so, those boxes are endangering the owls & hawks that live in the nearby canyons who daily eat more vermin than any rat box poison tries to address.

e. His dilapidated fence is an eye sore and not historic! How horrible if we were stuck with it given a historic designation. It also *trespasses* on neighboring property.

Have you seen the recent property survey? It shows how his property TRESPASSES on neighbor's property, a wonderful new neighbor he is intent on running out of the neighborhood.

4. Previous Work Permits: Were all the required permits obtained for their remodels, adding walls, enlarging windows (more heat escape), adding new structures?

a. Has the city inspected the property for compliance?

b. His pergola & terribly maintained fence certainly must not be complying as it intrudes on neighbors' property. *This should be REMOVED and in compliance with current city rules.*

5. Wasteful management of resources: Old homes built at various times with older materials do not offer the energy and fire protection that new technologies and building methods offer today. The safer our neighbor's home and property, the better it is for our precious neighborhood.

a. Thus, this designation will deter, if not, stop energy & sustainability improvements.

b. We lose the opportunity for new more efficient opportunities that will better reflect improvements in creating high fire resistance in resident landscape, permeability, water conservation, energy efficiency, radon mitigation – indoor air quality, etc

i. Keep in mind this property likely has very high radon. Large remodels and even new builds (so often done – thanks in part to the city) often address all these issues far better than a mishmash old property.

ii. Santa Barbara is also known & praised for its award-winning homes that are blending SB Style while incorporating best practices. Thus ultimately, improving our city's coffers (higher tax), water tables, reducing fire risks for neighbors and thus looking after our fire fighters & first responders and so forth.

6. Sustainability – per the Santa Barbara city guidelines: “Good design can help ensure that meeting the needs of the current generation does not compromise the ability of future generations to meet their needs. This is the “sustainability” concept. It is important that neighborhoods *change* in a way that promotes the long-term economic, environmental and social sustainability of the City. ... well-designed homes are often more sustainable because they tend to:

- require fewer natural resources in construction
- consume less electricity and natural gas... “

Thus, such a designation deeply impacts all of us and our future generations; By giving this large property a special designation that again prevents the application of new safer, more efficient design & materials, we hurt all of us today and tomorrow.

Thus, it means a larger climate footprint.

In our city's own Single Family Residence Design Guidelines updated 17 June 2011 “City of Santa Barbara General Plan, “Santa Barbara has, as its primary... [goal], the provision of a particularly desirable living environment. ...• promote long-term sustainability” utilizing energy efficiently (1.3.1 and 1.3.2)

7. Intent: Such a designation may make it more difficult for any adjoining neighbors to ever remodel, renovate or build new on their property. Why are they doing this, if not to make that so?!

It is especially important to note that the McDonoughs have been litigious with neighbors even stating their aim to run our new neighbors out of town! They have spread rumors with so many false narratives and fake data points, that they invite being accused of *slander* in a court of law.

I can speak more to this at the meeting on the 16th, if said council would like specifics.

City of Santa Barbara in its aim to encourage the “Neighborly” aspect of our community, should be acutely aware of the Intent behind this application.

8. Permeability – Per SB City guidelines, new projects must maximize permeable areas. Again, a designation prevents these improvements. It also again may negatively impact the ability of our neighbors to do new projects if the McDonoughs can then claim it somehow impedes their historic

landmark home vistas or any other such claim, they may be able to site (true or not) to prevent others in making improvements, new builds etc

We know for a fact that they are doing everything they can to stop improvements in our neighborhood.

9. Higher Demands on City/Neighbors: In addition to the points listed above, some historic designations often mean that the current owner pays LESS tax. A significant tax decrease or lack of increase in keeping with the neighborhood, means this wealthy over \$10million property with their large wealth gets another pass and special treatment. Our city needs our tax dollars. It then puts a higher impact on all others who do NOT have such a historic designation to make up for those tax losses. This is not only unfair, it borders on wealthy white man privilege. We do not want to be seen as a city enforcing archaic actions that hurt our most vulnerable as well as the everyday hard working good people of our city.

10. Neighborhoods do grow, evolve and transform. We should embrace this. Thankfully, our city – you and your colleagues, have very specific strong rules for encouraging healthy, smart growth in keeping with our precious city & the changing demands of our high fire risk, drought impacted city.

11. Santa Barbara Council integrity: Given the high standards of the Santa Barbara City Council in guiding new construction and our abundance of true SB historic properties, designating this mishmash of a property as a Landmark property would reflect badly on the city, diminishing the legacy and good work of the Council.

12. Use of Landmark Designation Process as a weapon/Bullying Behaviour: It reflects owners continuing efforts to be the rulers of our neighborhood.

They are utilizing this in their continuing efforts to thwart neighbors in building new beautiful, more efficient structures. This is evident in their litigious behavior to neighbors and strong opposition to any improvements.

Are you aware that they have signs outside their home against the other neighbors?! How is this historic?! How would you feel if a neighbor put up signs saying ANTI/NO and your company name?! His actions are a slow poison and have had disastrous impacts on many.

This request is just another tool they are trying to wield in their aggressive phobic, unneighborly behavior towards people different than themselves. He is hassling so many of us. Did you know even before moving in, he sued the new neighbors adjoining his property to the South. He doesn't even reach out to them. By the way, his property is encroaching on the property of the neighbors he has been bullying and harassing. He demands tree removals on their property yet paints his property and landscape as historical. If he is a friend of the old trees, why did he sue the neighbors to remove some? He could have asked, but that misses the point of the duplicitous nature of their historical designation

while demanding long term trees to be removed. Empowering a neighborhood bully is exactly what the city will be doing if they grant this Landmark designation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Deeply concerned Neighbors