



Public Comment Received for:

Item 1: 1384 Shoreline Drive

(PLN2021-00545)

Name of Sender	Distributed prior to hearing	Distributed after the hearing
1. John & Lisa Miller	x	
2. Francene & Jesse Lieber	x	
3. Donny Lieberman		x
4. John & Lisa Miller		x

John & Lisa Miller
1390 Shoreline Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

January 15, 2022

Re: Single Family Design Board Application PLN2021-00545 - Jaime & Deborah Perez, 1384 Shoreline Drive Demolishment and Construction of New Two-Story Residence

Hearing Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022

To: Single Family Design Board Members

We own and live at 1390 Shoreline Drive. We are the immediate next-door neighbor West of the above referenced property.

To begin with, we are long term residents of Shoreline Drive and we have owned and lived in our home for 34 years. We are long time appreciators of Shoreline Drive and Park as a uniquely cherished area for so many residents and families in Santa Barbara.

With regard to the proposed design changes to the above referenced property, we are therefore most sensitive to maintaining our privacy both in our home and on our property. We are also very sensitive to any proposed design that would change our views from our property, or that would reduce the amount of sunlight that enters our home, or would put our home or yard into shadow.

After reviewing the proposal presented by Blackbird Architects on behalf of our neighbors Jamie & Deborah Perez, the following are our thoughts and concerns that we wish to share with the board for discussion:

1. The proposed design for 1384 Shoreline Drive does have an increase in roof height (as best we can determine it is 3' higher at the eave, 6' higher at the peak on the side nearest our home; and significantly more in the center raised atrium upper level roofline section). Although this increase in roof height will reduce the amount of morning sunlight that enters into our home, as well as reduce the amount of open sky that we see from within our home when looking out of our east facing windows, we will not object to this limited increase in roof height as is proposed. We would have strong objections should the drawings be modified in any

significant way including any attempt to raise the roofline higher, or to any attempt to change the location of the upper level observation deck, which would result in it being closer to our home. We also note on the proposed design that there are no upper or additional windows on the side nearest our home and we are in harmony with this, as it maintains the existing privacy that we have and enjoy now.

2. We are concerned about the existing shared fence that is built on our shared property line, and are not clear on the proposed design as to what if anything is proposed as it relates to this shared fence. As it stands now, there is a wood fence that is built upon the property line (along the front portion of the shared property line), as well as a shared adobe wall that predates both homes (along the back portion of the shared property line). The adobe wall to the best of our knowledge has been in existence since the 1940s or earlier when the “Mesa” was primarily pasture land and thus has historic interest. Inside the shared fence-line, within our property boundaries, we also have an existing wood trellis with mature landscape plants growing upon it that provide us with privacy and beauty. We want and plan to keep the trellis as it is. It is in harmony with our home and property aesthetic. We are, however, open to discussions about replacing the shared wood fence that sits upon the property line, as long as a design can be mutually agreed upon that is in a style that is in harmony with our existing aesthetic. With regard to the shared adobe wall that also sits upon the shared property line in the back, there is also a section of the adobe wall that extends from the wall on the property line about 2 feet into our property. This section, original to the wall and built at the same time 1940s or earlier, is integral to the wall as a whole. We also have existing landscape garden plantings within this section. We want the entire existing adobe wall - both the length of the shared wall and the section within our property boundaries - to remain as it is now.

3. With regard to lighting, we are not clear about any new lighting that is part of the proposed design. We are opposed to any new lighting that would be added that would shine onto our property (motion or otherwise) or in our windows. Any other outdoor lights on the proposed design should be hooded and specified with lower wattage.

4. Finally, we are extremely concerned about the construction phase of this proposed project, as we anticipate the duration will be extensive. It is crucial that our privacy and right to quiet enjoyment of our home and property be maintained. And that the potential impact and disruption to us as a result of construction is minimized. The proposed project is on a small property with extremely close proximity to neighbors. Therefore, we ask for the following to be expressly agreed

to in writing, and attached to the Building Permit (even if, in case the permit or property changes ownership during construction, the agreement would remain):

- No contractor, subcontractor, any other 1384 Shoreline Drive property construction related parking of any kind in front of our home for any amount of time.
- No blocking our driveway for 1384 Shoreline Drive related deliveries, loading, unloading, etc. for any amount of time.
- No 1384 Shoreline Drive construction activity whatsoever outside of City permitted hours
- No loitering, smoking, eating, littering or loud noises like boom boxes, etc. on or around the 1384 Shoreline Drive construction site.

5. Because of the property being in a Coastal Zone, has as the Coastal Commission weighed in on this particular application, as to the overall effect it would possibly have on the general spirit of Shoreline Drive and Park, which is a unique and sensitive coastal area for so many people, for so many years?

Very respectfully yours,

John and Lisa Miller

From: [Jesse Lieber](#)
To: [Community Development, SFDB Secretary](#)
Cc: [Barbara Burkhart](#); [Jesse Lieber](#); [Francene Selkirk](#)
Subject: Re:1384 Shoreline Drive, Santa Barbara Project
Date: Monday, January 17, 2022 5:21:24 PM

EXTERNAL

We are the neighbors directly impacted by the above project. We live at 1375 Santa Rita Circle and share the north boundry line 1384 Shoreline drive.

We met previously with the applicant owners regarding a tree that was blocking our view, which had been maintained by the previous owner to help us with our view all these years. We had requested to the applicants that they might consider trimming the tree but the issue remained unresolved.

At that meeting, Jaime Perez asked us how high our property was elevated over theirs. We guessed approximately 7 feet. After seeing the plans, we noticed the rear wall and plants seemed almost purpose built for their privacy but obliterates our view and the light .

Questions:

1. How high off the pool deck is the back common wall?
2. The plants that are on the North and East Side of the building, how high will they be able to grow?
3. Will they come under the Santa Barbara View Ordinance?

Thanks, Francene and Jesse Lieber

PLEASE BE ADVISED

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

From: [Donny Lieberman](#)
To: [Community Development, SFDB Secretary](#)
Subject: 1384 Shoreline Drive
Date: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 10:39:52 AM

EXTERNAL

We are Donny and Kim Lieberman and live at 1394 Shoreline Drive, two doors west of the subject project. We are in line with the comments made by John and Lisa Miller on all accounts. Our biggest concern is the disruption and noise during the construction process. Many homes along Shoreline have been remodeled during the past few years. Contractor's seem unwilling to park on the adjacent side streets and park illegally along Shoreline or take up all the spaces at the park, which should be reserved for people using the park. Also, project cleanliness should be monitored by the Owner and City. Also, we've seen many projects on our street take 2 years or more to build. Can the Owner endeavor to enforce a more reasonable timeframe for construction in their selection of the Contractor?

Thank you,

Donny Lieberman
President
Sunseri Construction, Inc.
Office: 530-891-6444
Cell: 530-828-1337
Email: dl@sunsericonstruction.com
Web: www.sunsericonstruction.com

John & Lisa Miller
1390 Shoreline Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

January 19, 2022

Re: Single Family Design Board Application PLN2021-00545 - Jaime & Deborah Perez, 1384 Shoreline Drive Demolishment and Construction of New Two-Story Residence

TO: Single Family Design Board Members

We own and live at 1390 Shoreline Drive. We are the immediate next-door neighbor West of the above referenced property.

The record will show we sent a letter to the Design Board prior to the January 18 Meeting setting forth our concerns about the above referenced proposal. The minutes will show our attendance to the Meeting and stating our concerns about the applicant's proposal.

After hearing the discussion yesterday with Board members comments and various points of view, we understand better about the proposed project. This better understanding of the greater ramifications of this proposal crystalized even more our concerns set forth in our letter of January 15. Yesterday's board's discussion brought up new aspects of the design that were not apparent to our ordinary understanding of the architectural drawings and we now realize that this proposal has a greater and more extreme impact upon our primary concerns as stated in our letter.

It is now clear to us as the result of the Board Meeting discussion and how we now understand the fundamental problem, that collects all the other problems, is that the proposed design is simply too much home for that small lot. Therefore our concerns are so great that we now oppose this home. We want to add these further comments in file in conjunction with our previous letter and in support of the board's assessment that the mass, scale and size of the house is too large as proposed and should be brought back into proper proportion.

Respectfully,

John and Lisa Miller