

I believe my appeal should be considered based on the following:

My right to public comment was hindered by the clerk at the Cultural Heritage Committee. They refused to allow me to show my power point presentation (in pdf form). I was told that such presentations had to be submitted by noon the day of a meeting. Neither the city's website nor the language on the meeting agenda indicated this deadline. Failure to show the CHC images of buildings on Santa Barbara (to demonstrate spacing, coverage, setbacks etc.) as well as relevant language from relevant section of the Railroad District plan seriously impacted my ability to provide the committees information to make a sound recommendation.

The Cultural Heritage Committee's process to form their recommendation was inadequate and inappropriate, which in turn hampered the ability of the Director to make an informed decision. The CHC failed to consider key elements of the Railroad District Plan, did little to no deliberation regarding the pattern of development on the west side of Santa Barbara (including height, coverage, setbacks etc.) including references to such in the city's historical preservation guidelines. The applicant was absent from the CHC meeting and rather than continue the item so the applicant / their agent could answer questions, the CHC continued deliberations. These deliberations were further encouraged by the chairman's confidence in the project's architect (whom he has a 40+ year working relationship with which was not shared). The chairman confirmed the project's zoning, but not aspects of the historic preservation guidelines under the committee's purview. The chair mentioned a discussion with the applicant's architect which potentially should have been held publicly and in front of the CHC.

I understand from planning staff that the planning department has noted a north and south side of Santa Barbara Street with a delineation of Upham Street dividing this part of the Railroad District into two patterns of development. It was shared with me that each area is subject to different standards for height, coverage, setbacks and so on. I do not see this delineation referenced in the Railroad District Plan, however, if indeed this is the case I would note that on the west side of Santa Barbara between it's intersection with Broad and up to Upham – the predominant building type is commercial, the predominant height is single story and the pattern exhibited by massing and spacing is significantly different than the proposed project. In addition, commercial properties in this area which have developed with a residential component, the highest elevations are on the east side of the development adjacent to Santa Barbara and there are wide setbacks to the low density development to the west (on Chorro Street). Mimicking this type of development adjacent to Master List historical resources would be more appropriate and consistent with the area.

I believe that placing three story multifamily residential units (with a partially undergrounded 1<sup>st</sup> story) at the minimum setbacks from low density Master List Historical resources does in fact negatively impact these resources. According to the City's Context Statement, such resources are significant not only because of the building themselves but because of the story they tell and how they contribute to the community. The proposed development is neither consistent with the established pattern nor in accordance with the Historical Preservation ordinance and guidelines.