



**From:** [Agneta Albinsson](#)  
**To:** [Community Development\\_HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** PLN2015-00626  
**Date:** Monday, October 10, 2022 9:00:57 AM  
**Attachments:** [Screen Shot 2022-10-10 at 9.29.02 AM.png](#)  
[Screen Shot 2022-10-10 at 9.28.16 AM.png](#)

---

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

**EXTERNAL**

To Whom It May Concern,

We own a condo in 121 West De La Guerra, facing 113-117 W De La Guerra. Since we are in unit 14, we are heavily impacted by unit 13 in the new project.

By filling up the empty space completely with buildings, and 4 stories in addition to the amount of buildings, there is no air left. It is going to look like a ghetto! By building so many units, the affordable units are going to destroy the value of the existing condos on both sides of the infill. Not because they are affordable, but because there are too many of them.

If the new buildings were kept to two stories, there would at least be some air left. The new units are not going to have a view anyway, so why going high. Unless it is because of greed!

It is beautiful architecture, which no-one will ever see, since there is no distance left that you can appreciate from.

Look at these pictures of the infill. It is absolutely crazy! It does not look like two people can meet in the walkways. And no light is going to come into those units! Or our units for that matter!!!

Sincerely,  
Agneta Albinsson  
Mats Wahlstrom  
121 West De La Guerra, unit 14  
[aralbinsson@gmail.com](mailto:aralbinsson@gmail.com)





**From:** [Joan Davidson](#)  
**To:** [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** Written comments for the scheduled PLN2015-00626 October 12, 2022  
**Date:** Monday, October 10, 2022 7:20:07 PM  
**Attachments:** [HLC letter Revised. pages copy 2.pages](#)

---

EXTERNAL

I plan to attend the meeting as well, but request that I be added to the “Interested Party” list for any updates on this project. Joan Davidson

# Joan H. Davidson

City of Santa Barbara  
Historic Landmarks Commission  
P.O. Box 1990  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990

October 10, 2022

RE: PLN2015-00626  
113-117 W. De la Guerra St., SB, CA 93101

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in **strong opposition** to the above cited project as it is currently proposed.

The design is completely out of scale for the neighborhood as well as for the historic facade which is to be saved within the design. That historic structure is only one story, and the density, mass and bulk of the design makes “window dressing” of 113-115 De la Guerra historic WD Smith building and forever changes its setting. The single story facade is dwarfed by the three and four story development behind it.

Most of the residences in this area are two story. The new development along Chapala Street — a busy large-scale commercial thoroughfare at this point — is an exception to the rule. It is an exception that should not be duplicated in development away from Chapala Street which is considerably wider than De la Guerra Street.

Although there are a few structures with three story elements found away from Chapala, again they are exceptions, not the rule. The height, density and mass of what is proposed does not fit this residential neighborhood full of historic structures. Such development will forever change the character of the neighborhood.

I note that the developer has included many photos of “paseos” both in Santa Barbara and presumably in Spain. In none of those pictures is the paseo bordered by buildings more than three stories high and most of them, including those in Santa Barbara, are framed by two story buildings —not three and four story structures that impact available sunlight and views.

I reside at 121 W. De la Guerra which has only 16 units on a lot somewhat larger than the proposed development. A previous project proposed for 113-117 W. De la Guerra had only 9 units. That project has somehow morphed into 23 units and the necessary parking which make it out-of-scale with the neighborhood.

I respectfully request that the Commission recommend that the project be reduced in height and density in order to reduce the impacts to historic resources and the setting of the historic neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Joan H. Davidson

121 W. De la Guerra St., Unit 10, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 805 895-6291

**From:** [Judy Flanagan](#)  
**To:** [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** PLN2015-00626 at 113-117 W. De La Guerra St.  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 10:54:25 AM

---

You don't often get email from [flan2002@yahoo.com](mailto:flan2002@yahoo.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL

To the HLC Secretary:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the above development as currently proposed. Although I'm in favor of developing the lot, the current proposed building is too tall, too dense, and doesn't provide enough parking in an area that already has issues with lack of parking. Additionally, it doesn't relate to other neighborhood historical structures. I hope that the committee will consider these issues when reviewing the proposed plans for approval.

Best,  
Judy Flanagan  
121 W De la Guerra Unit 11  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

**From:** [Shella](#)  
**To:** [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: PLN2015-00626  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 11:32:18 AM  
**Attachments:** [10-11-22 - HLC Comment re PLN2015-00626.pdf](#)

---

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

**EXTERNAL**

Dear HLC Secretary,

Attached is my public comment on the noted application. Kindly include it in the Commissioner's packets at your earliest possible convenience.

Thank you,

Shella Comin-DuMong

Shella Comin-DuMong  
121 W. De La Guerra St., Unit 8  
Santa Barbara CA 93101  
805-452-3195

October 11, 2022

City of SB Historic Landmarks Commission  
HLC Secretary  
PO Box 1990  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990

**VIA EMAIL:** HLCSecretary@santabarbaraca.gov

RE: **STRONGLY OPPOSE** - PLN2015-00626 as Currently Proposed  
113-117 West De La Guerra Street SB CA 93101

Dear Commissioners:

I write this letter to register that I, as an adjacent neighbor, Santa Barbara native, and member of the workforce, **STRONGLY OPPOSE** the above project as it is currently proposed.

The mass, scale, size, concentration, height, and density are not only out of scale, but are out of character with the street and neighborhood as well as the historic elements and ways that our families have lived, worked, recreated, and conducted our lives in our neighborhood.

The physical and social impact of such a development to the immediately adjacent neighbors as well as the street and neighborhood at large will be overwhelmingly negative and cannot be overstated or ignored. The development as proposed will forever destroy the quality of life, privacy, quiet enjoyment, view corridors, history and historical charm of our remaining historical homes and much smaller scale developments. De La Guerra is a side street not a major thoroughfare.

While your Commission deals primarily with historic landmark elements, there are other areas of concern and which I am including in this communication.

1. Exact nature and use of the proposed residential units is unclear – the application only says “mixed-use”. What will this development be? Will it be a 100% for-sale condo development? Will it be affordable rental housing for the workforce (if so which income category/ies)? Will the residences solely be rentals? Are there plans for it to become an AirBNB vacation rental development, or hotel, or no-contact short term rentals? Will there be an HOA? Will it be some combination of the foregoing or something altogether different? With the currently proposed density, close proximity to existing homes and residences, lack of privacy, historic character change of the neighborhood itself, it truly matters what the developer’s intentions and long term plans are because once it’s built we neighbors are impacted forever.

2. Another concern I have relates to the City’s seeming inability to enforce ordinances and codes after-the-fact. I speak to this issue because the current property owner as well as the City have a history of

not really protecting neighbors' health and safety from negative impacts of even his current tenants (Elsie's second-hand smoke and noise.) This means that we can't really count on unenforceable assurances of future care and concern and must rely on City planning before construction to ENSURE safeguards by building in basic quality of life and health protections for ALL proposed close-proximity infill developments, including this one. For example, robust sound shielding of mechanical, HVAC, and garage/parking noise, and protection from second-hand smoke drift from mixed-use commercial and residential etc.

In the event you're not aware, there is a case of ongoing complaints to the City of mechanical and other noise violations of the Public Market (Chapala and Victoria) which is still unaddressed by those at the City with the responsibility to enforce ordinances and codes. The noise impacts many elderly low-income seniors residing at The Edgerly Santa Barbara development across Chapala Street. The resident complaints are not taken seriously and not acted upon. This leaves me with understandable concerns about enforcement of violations (now as well as in the future) and so I bring this to your attention because not addressing it with such a massive, dense, invasive, and close development holds great potential to negatively impact neighbors and quality of life and the long term. I realize that as more and more infill developments happen, the concerns I mention now become more and more important to address because ordinances and codes are intended to protect residents and enhance quality of life.

3. Another item of concern is that this development's application includes density bonus units (smaller units under the theory of "affordable by design") when we (and you and the City) know full well that historically and almost exclusively those units built to date are not actually affordable to regular working Santa Barbarans. It's just a way to get more units and therefore profits. This is concerning to me because the applicants are going for maximum public concessions on density, scale, height, parking, driveway access, etc. without disclosing the actual affordability or income categories the citizenry would purportedly receive in exchange for you and other City Commissions approving and granting those concessions. Currently, the City's published income categories are:

<i>Income Category</i>	<i>% of Median</i>	<i>Household Size</i>					
		1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6 Persons
<i>Household Size Adjustment</i>		0.7	0.8	0.9	1	1.08	1.16
Median	100%	\$ 70,070	\$ 80,080	\$ 90,090	\$ 100,100	\$ 108,108	\$ 116,116
Very Low	50%	\$ 48,900	\$ 55,900	\$ 62,900	\$ 69,850	\$ 75,450	\$ 81,050
Low	80%	\$ 78,350	\$ 89,550	\$ 100,750	\$ 111,900	\$ 120,900	\$ 129,850
Moderate	120%	\$ 84,084	\$ 96,096	\$ 108,108	\$ 120,120	\$ 129,730	\$ 139,339
Middle	160%	\$ 112,112	\$ 128,128	\$ 144,144	\$ 160,160	\$ 172,973	\$ 185,786
Upper-Middle	200%	\$ 140,140	\$ 160,160	\$ 180,180	\$ 200,200	\$ 216,216	\$ 232,232

The federal government consider affordable rent to be 30% of gross household monthly income. Using the City's own income categories, for one person sized household, the monthly rent would need to be:

(see table on next page)

Income Category	Gross Monthly Income Equivalent	30% Affordability Limit
Extremely Low Income (30% AMI)*	\$1,751.75	\$525.53
Very Low (50% AMI)	4,075.00	1,222.50
Low Income (80% AMI)	6,529.17	1,958.75
Median Income (100% AMI)	5,839.17	1,751.75
Moderate Income (120% AMI)	7,007.00	2,102.10
Middle Income (160% AMI)	9,342.67	2,802.80
Upper-middle Income (200% AMI)	11,678.33	3,503.50
<i>*note that I added the extremely low income category</i>		

Given the above affordability tables and calculations, my question is this: In exchange for the proposed density, height, parking, and other concessions, how many affordable units are proposed to be built and what income category/ies will “affordable and ADU units” be targeting, if any. And, what mechanism is being used to ensure now and in the future that the affordability of ADU units is being enforced? Lastly, given that the current Section 8 payment standards are within the above affordability limits for studio, 1-br and 2-br sized units, is there any way to ensure that voucher holders can occupy any affordable rental units produced within the final development?

4. One more concern I have is the orientation of the units. The applicants have gone to great length to find, and provide you, pictures of the cutest and most charming European town street scenes. However, I note that the orientation of units is outward above and beyond the adjacent properties resulting in maximum negative impact, invasion of privacy, noise, and other impacts to existing adjacent properties & neighbors. We neighbors’ see little to none of the European charm, only vast walls that block the light, eliminate existing view corridors of sky, mountains, skyline, is not compatible with the existing neighborhood, and has invasive patios adjacent to our only outdoor space of solace and refuge. De La Guerra Street isn’t Chapala, and the development should not equal the size, height, scale, density and bulk of buildings on that main thoroughfare. The proposed development should instead be shorter, smaller, less dense, and the units oriented inward toward itself and its charming street scenes thereby fitting in better while preserving privacy for the units themselves as well as adjacent neighbors.

Thank you for hearing and addressing some or all of my concerns. I look forward to participating in future meetings on the size, scope, mass, density, orientation and nature of the proposed project.

Sincerely,



Shella Comin-DuMong

*Michael P. Stamat*

---

October 10, 2022

Santa Barbara City  
Historic Landmarks Commission

Regarding: 113-117 West De La Guerra Street

To whom it may concern:

As a resident of West De La Guerra Street, I want to inform you that I am opposed to the proposed development due to:

1. The size is too big;
2. The density is too extreme;
3. The height is too tall;
4. It is incompatible with the history and nature of our little side street, the W. De La Guerra neighborhood;
5. The traffic and parking and impacts will be very negative and will become impossible;
6. The amount of people going in and out of a substandard driveway will be disruptive and dangerous to our neighborhood's residents, walkers, children, and animals; and
7. It looks like the neighbors will be harmed in terms of quality of life and losing light and privacy.

I urge you to take more time to consider all the issues surrounding this development proposal and be very, very thoughtful about how to find balance between preserving our neighborhood, its identity, its history, and allowing for thoughtful and compatible development on our little street.

Thank you,



Michael P. Stamat  
805-218-9392

**From:** [Kelly Bartlett, M.Ed., CRC](#)  
**To:** [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)  
**Cc:** [Bartlett Voc Sys](#)  
**Subject:** APN: 037-082-027 for review 10/12/2022  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 3:49:56 PM  
**Attachments:** [City of Santa BarbaraHLC 10.11.22 letter.docx](#)

---

EXTERNAL

Please find attached my letter of concern regarding the proposed project at

**113-117 W DE LA GUERRA ST**

I would have preferred to appear in person on 10/12/22 before the HLC, but my work is preventing my attendance.

Thank you.

Best Always,

Kelly Bartlett, M.Ed., CRC, ABVE/D  
Certified Rehabilitation Counselor  
American Board of Vocational Experts, **Diplomate**  
Mailing: P.O. Box 22401, Santa Barbara, CA 93121  
Office: 805.895.3700 Fax: 805.456.2966  
[Email: bartvoc@cox.net](mailto:bartvoc@cox.net)  
[www.forensicvocrehab.com](http://www.forensicvocrehab.com)

This email message and all attachments transmitted may contain confidential, legally privileged and proprietary information meant solely for the use of the addressee. If you receive this email in error, any reading, copying, dissemination, distribution, or any other use of this email is prohibited. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender by email at [bartvoc@cox.net](mailto:bartvoc@cox.net), delete this communication, and destroy all copies and attachments.

**Kelly Bartlett, M.Ed., CRC, ABVE/D**

Forensic Vocational Rehabilitation

E-mail: [bartvoc@cox.net](mailto:bartvoc@cox.net)

P.O. Box 22401, Santa Barbara, CA 93121-2401

Phone (805) 895-3700 Fax (805) 456-2966

[www.forensicvocrehab.com](http://www.forensicvocrehab.com)

City of Santa Barbara  
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION  
[HLCSecretary@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:HLCSecretary@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

10/10/22

**113-117 W DE LA GUERRA ST**

Assessor's Parcel Number: 037-082-027

Zone: C-G

Application Number: PLN2015-00626

Owner: John R. Dewilde

Applicant: Ed De Vicente, DMHA Architecture

Dear City HLC Members,

I've resided in Santa Barbara since 1992 either as a renter or property owner and for the past 14 years, I've lived at 121 W De La Guerra in a condo next door to the project as listed above. My balcony in Unit 2 is to be directly adjacent to the project on their southwest side. Given the fact that not only my living space will be negatively impacted, but the immediate surrounding city blocks will suffer from the condensed and colossal nature of the proposed project. I don't object to a new development next door, but after reviewing the proposed plans, I have several concerns that I believe need to be either addressed or rectified:

1. What is the exact size of the commercial space as it's listed in the plans as both 1,163 sq ft and 1,085 sq ft?
2. Has the Commission considered other planned developments in the city blocks directly adjacent to the project, and the drastic overall density affects of **all** of them? Examples include the multiple units being planned and developed on the corner of De La Guerra and De La Vina Streets or the approved 39-Rental Units project on Chapala and Ortega Streets?
3. If there are at least seven 2-bedrooms and the possibility of potential 2-car families living in those proposed units, where are they to park a second auto, especially surrounded by only 75 minute parking? Parking in this area is already a nightmare! We have 14 residential units and 2 commercial units with 45 total parking spaces (some not available for lease).
4. It is unclear if this project has any City's affordable housing units (ownership or rental), or if the units are market rate for sale or for lease. What is the status?
5. It appears that I will lose all direct sunlight to my balcony due to the height of the project. Can the 4<sup>th</sup> story be lowered below the 48-foot restriction? Or maybe the proposed mass total building area of **36,839 sq ft** in a **16,273 sq ft** lot be reduced by "*creating (four) buildings spread throughout the space instead of one big mass, and adding walkable paseo and arcade spaces,*" such as commented by Commissioner Cass Enberg when praising a recently HLC approved Mixed-Use Project on the corner of Chapala and Ortega Streets \*(The Independent Article by Ryan P. Cruz, 9/16/22).

Thank you for all consideration and your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,



Kelly Bartlett  
email: [bartvoc@cox.net](mailto:bartvoc@cox.net)

**From:** [Cheryl beers](#)  
**To:** [Community Development.HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** Concerns re: meeting 10/12  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 12, 2022 7:38:18 AM

---

EXTERNAL

Good morning,

Unfortunately, I am traveling and unable to attend your meeting this afternoon regarding the proposed development at 630 Chapala St.

I own unit "S" at Paseo Chapala next door.

My unit has 2 terraces looking out over the location of this project.

My concerns:

1. Blocking of light.
2. Windows/terraces of the new building looking into my home.
3. Parking allowances.
4. Loss of "neighborhood" feel.

This would be the 3rd dense housing development on the south side of this short block. Reducing both the scale and size of this project would help prevent "canyonization" and help preserve the neighborhood feel.

There is currently a decent amount of street parking available on this block but allowing a project this large to go forward with inadequate off street parking will most certainly have a negative impact on this.

All 2-bedroom units must have 2 off-street parking spaces and there should be guest parking offered as well.

Simply hoping that residents will use alternative modes of transportation is aspirational at best - hence the loss of street parking in recent years as a result of approving many dense development projects with inadequate off-street parking within the downtown area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns, I look forward to a reply.

Respectfully,  
Cheryl Beers  
cbeers4320@msn.com

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)