



Public Comment Received for:  
Item 3: 481 W Mountain Dr  
(PLN2021-00127)

Name of Sender	Distributed prior to hearing	Distributed after the hearing
1. Leslie Gutierrez-Jones	x	
2. Cody Cammbell	x	

**From:** [Leslie Gutierrez-Jones](#)  
**To:** [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** Mountain Drive/Rancho Hacienda report  
**Date:** Sunday, August 01, 2021 4:11:55 PM

---

EXTERNAL

August 1 2021

Dear HLC members,

While there is much to be admired about the El Rancho Hacienda community and history, there is reason for frustration on the part of northerly neighbors. For more than a quarter century we received reassurances (both from the city and from hacienda residents) that accumulated nonconforming developments would eventually be brought to code, and that aesthetic and (especially) safety concerns would be addressed and corrected. During this period our own homes have faced scrupulous enforcement of building codes, ABR Hillside Design standards, covered parking requirements, accessory building limitations and the like. It is only reasonable to expect that any historical protections that may now be accorded the El Rancho Hacienda development be limited to the aspects of the property that are truly historical, and that all building, safety, and architectural code enforcements are otherwise upheld.

Of greatest concern are the extravagant number of unpermitted accessory buildings, which the Post/Hazeltine report acknowledges are not themselves of historical value. These structures add significantly to the overcrowding of a lot whose 1958 subdivision originally allowed for 7 initially very small homes on a 4.5 acre parcel: already well above the density of the surrounding neighborhood. The apparent spaciousness of the Hacienda's facades and front lawns belies the dangerous clustering of accumulated unpermitted work to the north of these homes, where fire separation distance is not maintained (see the report's figure 73 for an example). This crowding poses a danger to families whose only emergency vehicle access to their homes runs adjacent.

Over and over again, regarding these seven homes' materials, workmanship etc., the Post/Hazeltine report qualifies virtually every claim of hacienda structures having sufficient design integrity with the phrase "for its primary (south) elevation." The report's repeatedly implied dismissals of additions and alterations that are "concentrated on rear elevation" or "confined to the north and northwest" as somehow irrelevant to evaluating the parcel ("as an architectural assemblage") ignores the parcel's location within the Hillside Design area, under the purview of the Architectural Board of Review. Hillside design standards apply, and so violations of historical materials and workmanship that ARE clearly visible from neighboring homes' entrance, lawns, and living areas need to be acknowledged (and corrected) during this review process.

As a single example: the Post/Hazeltine report repeatedly describes the homes at all seven addresses as "covered in c-shaped terra cotta tiles, and rolled asphalt," a reasonable enough description for most of the hacienda homes but terribly misleading in the case of the homes at 469 and 473 Mountain Drive, where the entire, readily visible rooftop area is red tar paper, with at most a single line of tile edging (see report figure 23). The report's proposal that the many (at #473, eight) large plastic bubble skylights (already against SB Single Family

Residence Design Guidelines) be replaced during rehabilitation with "less visually intrusive flat skylights" (p.113) is most welcome. But, as well, the historical authenticity of dominantly Spanish-style tile roofing should absolutely be required for approval of this designation and for adherence to the city's Hillside Design standards.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Leslie Gutiérrez-Jones  
563 Mountain Drive

## Public Comment #2

**From:** [Cody Cammbell](#)  
**To:** [Community Development HLCsecretary](#)  
**Subject:** HLC Agenda, 8/4/21, Item #3, 481 W. Mountain Drive  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 03, 2021 1:37:32 PM

---

EXTERNAL

To Whom It May Concern:

Shown below is a copy of my communication to the HLC prior to the April 28, 2021 meeting. The issues outlined in that letter continue to be of concern to me.

To: [HLCSecretary@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:HLCSecretary@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

RE: Historic Landmarks Commission Agenda, April 28, 2021  
Item 5 and 6: Miscellaneous Action Item/New Item:Concept Review

To Whom It May Concern:

I am the resident at 559 Mountain Drive. I have a common property line along a portion of the north end of the El Rancho Hacienda property.

My main issue is that the original and recorded property line is maintained and that there is never any question in the future about the location of the property line. I bring this up because, at the present time a fence exists parallel to the berm alongside the private access road that gives access to 563, 559 (my property) and 557 Mountain Drive. This road is maintained by and is the responsibility of those three addresses. A good portion of it goes through my property east-west. There is a fence that was installed as a joint project by 559 and 563 around the time that the McMillans purchased their house (I don't know the house address but it is part of El Rancho Hacienda). That fence, as well as the other fences along the south side of the access road are north of the El Rancho Hacienda (ERH) property line. In other words, land presently being used by homes in El Rancho Hacienda are actually part of my property for which I am allowing temporary use; however, under no circumstances have I agreed to a permanent transfer or alteration of the property line. If, in the future, anyone who owns the 559 Mountain Drive property wants or needs to make full use of the property up to the property line, it is important that there will be no attempt by any resident in the ERH to delay or halt such use.

As a long term Santa Barbara resident and a proponent of preservation of historical sites, I object to an attempt to make a collection of independently owned homes exempt from Santa Barbara building or civil codes. My concern stems from the fact that the property directly to the north of mine, previously owned by the Jorgensen family, was designated as a historic resource. When the present owners improved that property, updating and expanding it, I - as a direct neighbor - was not given any prior notice nor did I have the opportunity to hear or comment about it in a public setting - not even to request a more friendly start time. It was only when construction began from that historically designated property did I become aware that changes were being made to that home.



Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Sincerely,

(Ms)Cody Cammbell

--

Cody [Cammbell](#)