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Dear SFD Board,

Re: 691 N Hope Ave (Lots 4, 5 and 6) Development

As residents of the Hope/San Roque neighborhood, we are concerned about the subject development proposed for the lot on the west side of Hope Avenue, Parcel # 057-113-007.

We understand that SFDB will review the designs for lot 6 on March 14, and the designs for lots 4 and 5 on March 28.

We have the following concerns about the designs for lots 4, 5 and 6:

- The overall designs of the structures proposed does not seem appropriate for the neighborhood. The houses’ architectural design and large sizes are objectionable when compared with existing homes in the immediate area. The new houses will significantly infringe on the privacy of existing homes on Connie Way.
- The ingress/egress aspect of the access road is very close to the Monte Vista Elementary School crossing of Hope Avenue. This presents significant risks associated with students using the crossing. Drivers’ visibility up and down Hope Avenue is not adequate to ensure safety.
- An aspect of Santa Barbara that makes it a special place to live is the cohesiveness of our various neighborhoods. Neighbors look out for one another. This proposed development, in its current form, appears to violate this aspect by imposing deleterious effects on neighbors including traffic and parking congestion, noise pollution for the duration of the construction, deterioration of neighbors’ views by large structures, and a glaring difference in architecture.

For these reasons, we sincerely request that the Single Family Design Board reject the proposed development and seek a proposal that more reflects the important neighborhood needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Terry and Joyce Fernandez
3733 Calle Cita, Santa Barbara, CA 93105
Dear SFDB Secretary,
I am a home-owner at 3803 Connie Way, Santa Barbara, CA 93110.

For the upcoming meeting I would like to request that:
(1) RRM is required to install full (level A) story poles (per SFDB general guidelines section 3.6.4) and
(2) To conduct an on-site visit with homeowners in the neighborhood after the story poles are installed.

I have two primary concerns about the proposed development at 691 Hope St., Santa Barbara, 93110. The first is the 2-story building plan and modern style buildings. The second is the safety of the children who cross in front of this drive daily.

The last time RMM drew a plan, it wasn't until the story poles went up that we fully realized the enormity and invasiveness of this project. The Connie Way and Pemm Place neighbors are extremely disappointed with the continued push for a 2-story building plan. It isn't respectful of homeowners who live in the neighborhood now. Two-story buildings directly affect the views and privacy of the single level home residents on both sides of Connie Way. More attention needs to be placed on existing homeowners' needs.

I'm confident that there is a way to design single level homes that stylistically complement the existing neighborhood architecture. The modern style of what RMM is proposing is very different than the ranch style homes in the neighborhood. An elegant example of new homes that implemented respect and awareness for existing neighborhood homes is on Hope St. and Rose Lane. They are new and "fit in" with the existing neighborhood.

Secondly, there needs to be more thought put into where the driveway for these homes is located. Perhaps the driveway at Pemm Place and 691 Hope St. can be combined, away from people's homes. Then, installation of an automatic gate or other safety precaution for both driveways, that would lessen the chances for an unnecessary accident involving a child or pedestrian.

I own and direct an after-school care program for Monte Vista students, in grades kindergarten through 6th grade. I have been in business since 2013 and have seen first-hand the danger the Pemm Place driveway creates for children walking on the sidewalk or riding bikes in the bike path. High traffic times are when children are walking and riding their bikes to and from school 7:30 a.m.-8:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m. The same proactive plan should be implemented for the Pemm driveway. Monday through Friday, I pick children up from school, twice a day. That's 5,760+ crossings, over the last 8 years! Please listen and act on the children's behalf.
Here is a link that addresses Child Pedestrian Injury: A Review of Behavioral Risks and Preventive Strategies that may help [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3467946/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3467946/).

This is an urgent matter that needs consideration as the development moves forward. I therefore ask you and the County and City of Santa Barbara to take whatever steps you can to ensure the safety of the children.

Thank you for your consideration,
Michele Martin
805-448-6289

--

*Michele Martin*
*Poppins Family Services, Director*
[www.poppinsfamilyservices.com](http://www.poppinsfamilyservices.com)
805-448-6289
To Whom It May Concern:

I am the property owner and resident at 3822 Connie Way and respectfully request that the Single Family Design Board (“SFDB”) reject the proposed individual property designs based on the submitted drawings. I am NOT opposed to development at 691 Hope Ave. What I AM opposed to and request your review and oversight on are the size and style of the proposed structures.

First of all the proposed structures are too large for the parcels, would not be opposed to structures single story and less than 2500 sq ft.

Due to the slope of the property the 2 story designs infringe on the privacy of homes surrounding these structures and obstruct the mountain views affecting many adjacent properties. The neighbors would have no problem if these proposed homes were single story and the design was more in keeping with the surrounding community. 6 contemporary architectural style do not blend well with the neighborhood. The new development does not allow for any street parking for guests or the number of cars that may be owned by the property owner based on home size. This will therefore cause congestion to neighboring streets and Monte Vista School.

1. Per SFDB general guidelines section 3.6.4 and install full (level A) story poles
2. Onsite visit by the Board after the story poles are installed.
3. Keep structures less that 2500 sq ft
4. Single story homes only
5. Architectural design reworked based on surrounding homes. 1 contemporary design, not 6

Respectfully,

Nancy Swanson
Dear Santa Barbara Single Family Design Board,

3/14/2022

We are writing to ask that the Board deny approval for the lot 6 design at 691 N. Hope Avenue.

To date, there have been five SFDB meetings about this development, including the current proposed design for lot 6. While this may be a “new” application, this design is the same recycled one that RRM presented to the board in May and July 2021 (Figure 1). Resubmitting this design under a new application appears like an attempt to circumvent the Board’s previous recommendations (Appendix 1), and ignore the community’s persistent concerns about neighborhood compatibility and privacy. These concerns have been repeatedly voiced verbally and in writing to the Single Family Design Board, RRM and the Yaos, and they remain the following:

1. **Compatibility with Surrounding Neighborhood:** The design for lot 6 is still wholly incompatible with the existing surrounding neighborhood. The SFDB defined our neighborhood in previous meetings as those 29 homes on Connie Way, Rolling Brook Lane, Pemm Place and North Hope (Figure 2). Based on information in the Santa Barbara Tax Assessor’s database, the mean size of the homes in this area is 1,691 sq. ft., the mean FAR is 46.5% and 90% are single story (Table 1). All of the existing homes are built in either a rancher, craftsman or Spanish architectural style.

RRM’s design for lot 6 proposes a home that is much taller, larger, modern and occupies more of the lot compared to the existing neighborhood. Specifically, the proposed home on lot 6 is +2,362 sq ft larger, +8’ 9” taller than the average homes in the neighborhood (Table 2). It is also modern and two stories, which is unlike anything else in our community. For these reasons, this home will stick out like a sore thumb from the existing homes on Connie Way, Pemm Place, Rolling Brook and Hope Ave. This home will also be clearly visible from both private and public view sheds and forever change the character of our modest neighborhood. Overall, this design remains wholly incompatible with the existing community and should be rejected.

2. **Privacy:** The neighbors have spent hours meeting with RRM and the Yaos to voice our concerns and ask for changes to the proposed development at 691 N Hope in July 2021. This design for lot 6 still does not adequately preserve the privacy of the adjacent properties since it is two stories and ~9 feet taller than homes with which it shares lot lines. These heights create a direct line of sight from the proposed homes’ second stories into the adjacent neighbors’ yards and bedrooms. This line of sight directly and negatively impacts the right to privacy of those neighbors. The recent Tree farm development (Figure 3) provides an analogous example, illustrating the loss of privacy the Connie Way Neighbors can expect from this design. All 2 story elements should be removed.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, the community is looking to the SFDB to reject this proposed design for lot 6, which will set the precedent for the other forthcoming designs at 691 North Hope. The SFDB is set to review the designs for lots 4 and 5 on March 28. Since the beginning of this process, the community’s privacy and compatibility concerns have not been meaningfully addressed.

If this design moves forward, we respectfully request that the SFDB require RRM to install full (level A) story poles (per SFDB general guidelines section 3.6.4) for all single and two story components of.
the home. The existing story poles do not meet the specifications required by full (level A). Once these full story poles are installed, we would like to request that the SFDB members conduct an on-site visit before making any decisions, so they can see how out of place the bulk, height and style of this design is compared to the surrounding community. Any development should be truly compatible with, and add value to, every aspect of the existing neighborhood, and the SFDB has done tremendous work in other nearby, similar developments on Hope Ave. The community hopes that you will do the same for our neighborhood. Thank you for your time, consideration and efforts.

Sincerely,
Bryan and Nicki Costa
3814 Connie Way

Figure 1. RRM ignored the SFDB’s direction to consider including materials that are more consistent with the neighborhood and consider looking at 3814 Connie Way as archetypes (Appendix 1). The home styles and materials in the lot 6 proposal remained unchanged between RRM’s designs since May 2021.

*RRM design for lot 6 (May 2021, July 2021)*

*RRM design for lot 6 (March 2022)*

Figure 2. Map showing homes (highlighted in yellow) included in our neighborhood analysis. The mean size of these homes is 1,691 sq. ft., mean FAR is 46.5%, 90% are 1 story and 0% are modern.
Table 1. Summary of neighborhood (29 homes) surrounding 691 North Hope Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean home size</td>
<td>1,691 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean FAR</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 story homes</td>
<td>3/29 = 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean home heights</td>
<td>15’ 6”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style (Rancher)</td>
<td>23/29 = 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style (Spanish)</td>
<td>4/29 = 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style (Craftsman)</td>
<td>2/29 = 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style (Modern)</td>
<td>0/29 = 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison of proposed home on lot 6 to the existing neighborhood. The proposed home is much larger, taller and modern, making it wholly incompatible with the existing neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed home on Lot 6</th>
<th>March 2022</th>
<th>Compared to neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4,053 sq ft</td>
<td>+2,362 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>+37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Stories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90% are 1story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>24’3”</td>
<td>+8’ 9”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>0% are modern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Photographs of Tree Farm Development on Tree Farm Lane, Goleta. The Tree Farm was built in 2017-2018 next to homes built in the 1960s. The 2 story Tree Farm homes (identified with yellow arrows below) tower over the existing, 1 story homes severely impacting the adjacent neighbors’ right to privacy.
**Appendix 1. SFDB Motions and Recommendations for 691 North Hope Ave Proposed Development.**
RRM addressed 4 of the 27 recommendations made by the SFDB since November 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SFDB Motion/Action</th>
<th>SFDB Recommendations</th>
<th>Status of Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
<td>Continue indefinitely to Planning Commission with comments: James/Ferrell, 6/0/0. (Richards absent.) Motion carried.</td>
<td>1. The applicant’s demonstration of the plan is appreciated. &lt;br&gt;2. The Board has concerns about the runoff created by the different influences on the site. &lt;br&gt;3. Provide a site section showing how the grading of the lot will be related to the surrounding properties. &lt;br&gt;4. The public safety concern is apparent with neighbors showing concern about the storm water runoff. Consider retention or detention of water on the site. &lt;br&gt;5. Show the progress of the project in terms of coordination with different agencies regarding flood control. &lt;br&gt;6. Applicant to return with a Google map photograph of the surrounding area without the filter. &lt;br&gt;7. The idea of having two adjacent streets next to each other is concerning, and Transportation Staff should address the public safety concerns regarding traffic near Monte Vista School.</td>
<td>-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/2020</td>
<td>Continue indefinitely with comments: Ferrell/Ziegler, 6/0/0. (James absent.) Motion carried.</td>
<td>1. Keeping the six homes in the development consistent in design is acceptable, but the design needs further study. &lt;br&gt;2. The neighborhood is defined as Hope Avenue, Connie Way, and Pemm Place. The neighborhood consists of pitched roofs and smaller ranch style homes. &lt;br&gt;3. The FAR shall be brought down to the 85% guideline, and provide more space between the proposed homes. &lt;br&gt;4. Provide a more developed landscape plan with more park-like plantings that are drought tolerant. &lt;br&gt;5. Show any lighting. &lt;br&gt;6. Consider hiding the proposed solar panels. &lt;br&gt;7. Show the bioswale and water retention methods. &lt;br&gt;8. Provide more information in order to understand any potential privacy issues between adjacent neighbors. &lt;br&gt;9. Applicant shall lower the building height to be under 25 feet.</td>
<td>-Complete-Complete-Incomplete-Complete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5/24/2021   | Continue indefinitely to the Full Board with comments: Colasse/Ziegler, 5/0/1. (Moticha opposed.) Motion carried. | 1. The Board appreciates the efforts of the applicant to introduce neutral colors, sloped roofs, and wood siding to the project in an effort to be more compatible with the neighborhood, as well as the minor reductions in size that were presented. <br>2. The Board still finds that the project is incompatible, from a floor-to-lot area ratio (FAR) standpoint, with the immediately surrounding neighborhood as defined in the November 23, 2020 SFDB meeting minutes as Hope Avenue, Connie Way, and Pemm Place. <br>3. The projects shall be reduced in size to meet 85 percent guideline FAR. <br>4. The applicants shall consider materials that are more consistent with the neighborhood. <br>5. The applicants shall consider looking at 3814 Connie Way, the project at La Cumbre Road and Pueblo, or the Willowglen and Grove neighborhoods as possible archetypes for consideration. <br>6. The applicants shall address the privacy questions and concerns between the neighboring existing homes and the proposed development. <br>7. The applicant shall further clarify the privacy issues as requested during the November 23, 2020 SFDB meeting, which was, “Provide more information in order to understand any potential privacy issues between adjacent neighbors.” <br>8. The applicants shall address the conflict between the gravel basins and the planting plans. | -Complete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-Incomplete-
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The sandstone material is not compatible with the neighborhood, in the way it is being used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The Board anticipates that they will be requesting story poles for each lot with a two-story element as part of their project approval in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Board would like story-poles for the proposed project in order for neighbors to better understand what the true impact will be to the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The neighbors need to receive the information from City as requested through the Public Records request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The applicant shall remove sheet A0-3 from the applicant’s package because it does not reflect the direction that the Board has given on multiple occasions where the Board has identified the area bounded by Connie Way, Pemm Place, and Hope Avenue as the primary neighborhood of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The applicant shall return with a lighting plan for the project at large, which should include light fixtures, both for the site, as well as the buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Board still feels that the project is incompatible in terms of material use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Additional efforts shall to be made by the applicant to address the privacy issue between the existing neighbors and the proposed parcels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Board believes that sandstone on the walls of the proposed residences is not compatible with the neighborhood, as this is not the manner in which the sandstone would be used in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7/6/2021  Continue to four weeks to Full Board with comments: Colasse/Miller, 4/0/0. (Klein absent.) Motion carried.
I would like to convey my concerns regarding the proposed development of 691 Hope Ave and hope the board considers these issues before making any decisions.

Over the past 3 years, the board has listened to the concerns of the surrounding neighbors, reviewed various, although largely unchanged proposals and provided the owners over 691 Hope Ave and their developers feedback which has consistently been ignored.

My biggest concern has always been the increased flood risk to my property resulting from this development. Currently, all of the water coming off the property (and from the surrounding 39 acre watershed) will go to a pipe underneath my house (3830 Connie Way). This pipe is 30” and per LAFCO report, is sized for a 50 year flood event. For reference, the rainfall intensity that caused the Montecito debris flow was a 200 year flood event (0.54 inches in 5 min), and we have had three events in the last ~20 years

Due to the increasing frequency of intense rains, liability is a serious concern for the neighbors. The developers (RRM) have said "Regarding maintenance of stormwater facilities, as we’ve clarified in the past, the City will be responsible for stormwater facilities within the public right-of-way and in public easements, including the 30” storm drain connecting from Pemm Place to the south side of the property." However the LAFCO report states the opposite. Can you please confirm who is liable for the design, implementation and maintenance?

If the city is taking on the liability for an effective stormwater system, I wanted to make sure you are aware of these inadequacies before the design is approved and implemented as is. It seems like it would be much easier to update the hydrology report, and if needed upgrade the retention system now before infrastructure, paving and eventually houses are in place. In addition we would like to request the city retain an escrow account, or add myself and the other neighbors on this email as additional insured to the city's liability policy to cover potential home damage/loss resulting from future development of this site.

To investigate this flooding concern, Adam Hendel had come to the development property in September along with RRM to inspect the water drain system. While I appreciate the visit, I have not received any feedback, likely because RRM pulled the development proposal. Unfortunately, my concerns remain regarding liability and now that the proposal is back before the board, I hope the board can address the liability issue before moving forward with any decision regarding home construction.

In previous meetings that board asked RRM install story poles on the property so the board could see the how the proposed buildings will fill the property. The story poles were installed on the lots, but only for the two-story structures. After the poles were installed, RRM removed the submission for the development so I don’t know if the board has ever had an opportunity to see these poles and view them from the neighbor’s properties. I would respectfully request that RRM install full (level A) story poles for both single and second story structures and for the board to perform an onsite visit once the story poles
are up. Seeing the size of these proposed buildings on the property is much different than reviewing the
design on paper. Additionally, I respectfully request the board consider all the lots at one time rather
than home by home so that the development can be evaluated as a whole. I believe RRM pulled the full
development submission because they believe that submitting one house at a time will allow them to
get further allowances than they would otherwise. Please don’t allow them use tactics intended to work
around the concerns of the board and the neighbors. Lots 4 and 5 are before the board on 28 March.
Please consider holding off on making any decisions on lot 6 and review lots 4, 5 and 6 together.

In previous meetings, the board has repeatedly requested that RRM redesign the proposed homes to fit
the character of the neighborhood, which is more craftsman and ranch style homes rather than the
large contemporary style homes they have submitted and continue to submit. I respectfully ask the
board to continue to insist the development maintain the character of the neighborhood both in style
and size of the homes, which is the primary function of this board.

As this development does not allow for street parking in order to ensure emergency vehicle access,
Constructing these large homes will create a need to support more vehicles per house but street parking
is not permitted because of the narrow width of the road. Consequently, cars will either be parked
illegally on the street or overflow onto neighboring streets causing additional congestion. If the home
sizes are kept in line with the rest of the neighborhood, the risk of congested parking can be significantly
mitigated.

Because my home sits at the low point on Connie Way, our family is most affected by this development
as these homes would tower over our property not only taking away our privacy, but also shedding
water and potentially flooding our property and home without any concern of liability. The
neighborhood has tried to talk with the owners directly to settle our concerns, but unfortunately, they
have not been interested in constructive discussion. During one neighborhood meeting on the property,
they effectively told those in attendance after hearing the concerns, “too bad” and now continue to
push a oversized, contemporary style development. Recently my wife and I invited them to dinner to
personally discuss the proposal, they refused and claimed they were not the decision makers. Their
uncompromising tactic has created so much animosity between them and the neighborhood that they
have decided they will no longer be moving into any of the homes being constructed.

I am imploring the board to not give into the repeated attempts to ignore the board’s suggestions and
our neighborhood’s concerns. Please have the proper story poles erected and then visit the lot to see
how these buildings will overshadow and disrupt the character of the neighborhood. The primary
function of this board is to “ensure that single family residential unit projects are compatible with the
surrounding neighborhood in size and design”. The plan submitted clearly does not meet this criteria
and must be corrected before approval.

Very Respectfully,

Matt and Bess Scribner
3830 Connie Way
805 252 5089
Dear chair and members of the SFDB,

I am Elizabeth Scholtz, owner and resident of the property at 3838 Pemm Place. My family has owned and lived at this property since 1961. I am providing comments for the project at 691 N. Hope Avenue, included on your March 14, 2022, agenda.

I have three main points for comment:

1) Drainage. The flow of water from the north has been impeded at the 691 N Hope property for many years, and the concerns of the residents on Pemm Place who experience flooding with every rain have been well described in previous discussions and emails. I want to thank the Yau family for providing some mitigation of the flooding problem during this last (2021-22) rainy season. Grading and trenching and a gravel-filled hole on/across the lowest lying portion of 691 N Hope allowed much of the runoff during this season’s (at-times torrential) rain to flow above ground, across 691 N Hope, to the drainage system in place on Connie Way. I’m not aware how this affected the flooding issues on Connie Way, but it did provide some much-needed mitigation of the Pemm Place flooding issue. This very much appreciated temporary solution did not address the build-up of silt and sediment in the underground pipes beneath Pemm Place. The underground pipes and a more permanent solution to the impedance of natural water flow from the north must still remain at the forefront of any development planning.

2) Neighborhood fit. While I will welcome developers, such as the Yau’s with strong ties to the community, I feel the proposed home style is too large, does not blend well with the neighborhood and will compromise the privacy and aesthetics of the existing homes nearby. Single-story homes would certainly mitigate this issue. I urge the SFDB to 1) require RRM to install full (level A) story poles (per SFDB general guidelines section 3.6.4) and 2) to conduct an on-site visit after the full story poles are installed. I believe this will allow the Board and the neighborhood residents to better appreciate the impact and remarkable bulk of the proposed home(s).

3) Elementary School traffic. Safety of the children should be a primary concern with development of a new road adjacent to Pemm Place. Some sort of safeguards should be added to the plans; perhaps a yellow-flashing crossing warning across the Pemm and adjacent (name to be determined) road inlets to alert drivers when pedestrians are crossing in front of the driveways, and improved sightlines for drivers.

Thank you for your continued attention and consideration.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth Scholtz
3838 Pemm Place, Santa Barbara CA 93110
Hello,

As a homeowner with property directly adjacent to this new development, I'm writing to include a public comment for consideration on the SFDB March 14th agenda regarding the proposed development of "Lot 6" at 691 N. Hope Ave.

The style and size of the proposed development is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. At over 4,000 square feet, "Lot 6" is nearly twice the size of even the largest homes in the immediately surrounding neighborhood (Connie Way, Rolling Brook, Pemm, Hope Ave). The Hope neighborhood is comprised of Spanish, Rancher, and Craftsman style homes, and the modern aesthetic of the proposed development is incongruous.

In addition to the incompatible size and style of the proposal, the current plans create privacy issues for the immediately surrounding neighbors. These new homes, starting with "Lot 6" will tower over the neighbor's homes, creating direct lines of sight into yards and windows.

I join my neighbors in requesting that RRM be required to install **full (level A) story poles** (per SFDB general guidelines section 3.6.4) and that the board conduct an on-site visit after the story poles are installed. We feel this is the only way to adequately illustrate the impact the current proposal will have on our neighborhood. I've also requested that the existing partial story poles at lots 5 and 6 be removed, as they've been in place for nearly 9 months, and are in various stages of collapse and decay. The plastic flags have been torn and scattered in the wind, littering the area, and the poles themselves are rusted and collapsing. RRM has refused to remove them, and so I bring that up here.

Lastly, I would just like to point out that RRM continues to point to the "housing shortage" in their presentations, which I find insulting. In this market, a 4,000+ square foot, brand new construction home will sell for upwards of $4 million, which does nothing to alleviate the lack of affordable housing in Santa Barbara.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

- Jillian Title
3838 Connie Way