

***PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT***

***PROPOSED FINAL  
SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
REPORT***

***08EIR-00000-00003/SCH#2007121158***

***and Addendum to***

***NEGATIVE DECLARATION (00-ND-003)***

***for the***

***Miramar Beach Resort and***

***Bungalows Project***

***07RVP-00000-00008, 07CUP-00000-00045,***

***07CUP-00000-00046, 07CUP-00000-00047,***

***08CUP-00000-00005***

***July 3, 2008***

## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	ES-1
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Adequacy of a Subsequent EIR .....	3
1.2 Public Participation and Review Process.....	3
2.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	5
2.1 Project Applicant .....	5
2.2 Project Location .....	5
2.3 Project Objectives .....	6
2.4 Project Description .....	7
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING .....	33
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	32
4.1 Historic Resources .....	32
4.2 Other Issue Areas.....	52
5.0 OTHER CEQA CONCERNS .....	52
5.1 Growth Inducement .....	52
5.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	52
6.0 CONSISTENCY WITH ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES .....	52
7.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....	53
7.1 No Project (Approved Schrager Plan) .....	53
7.2 Alternative 1 - Replacement of Historically Significant Features on Existing Cottages and “Out Buildings” and Repair of the Poolside Rooms.....	54
7.3 Alternative 2 - Relocation of Historically Significant Structures.....	54
7.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	56
8.0 REFERENCES.....	59
9.0 PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONTACTED .....	59
10.0 LIST OF PREPARERS.....	60
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
A	15164 Addendum for the Miramar Beach Resort and Bungalows Project
B	Negative Declaration for the Approved Schrager Plan (Schrager ND) (00-ND-003)
C	<u>Public Comments on the Public Draft SEIR and Responses to Public Comments</u>
D	Applicant’s Responses to Public Comments
E	Vicinity Map
F	Site Plans

**TABLES**

Table 2-1	Project Statistics – Structural Development.....	110
Table 2-2	Project Statistics – Site Walls.....	14
Table 2-3	Height Modifications Required for Buildings Requiring More than 10 Feet of Fill.....	15
Table 2-4	Comparison of the Proposed Caruso Plan with the Approved Schragger Plan.....	28
Table 4-1	Existing Historic Structures at the time of approval of the Schragger Plan.....	41
Table 4-2	PPA’s Evaluation of Historical Significance of the Miramar.....	42
Table 4-3	Current Existing Historic Structure .....	48
Table 4-4	Historically Significant Buildings or Features Proposed for Demolition under the Schragger Plan.....	51

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Caruso BSC Miramar LLC requests 1) approval of a Revision to a previously approved Development Plan and associated Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) granted for the renovation of the Miramar Hotel project (hereby referred to as the Schragger Plan or the approved plan), and 2) a new CUP for repairs to an existing seawall. The original approved plan (Schragger Plan) for the renovation of the Miramar was approved in June 2000 and entitlements include a Final Development Plan (Case No. 99-DP-001), a CUP (00-CP-032) required for construction in a Transportation Corridor zone (within a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad), and a CUP (99-CP-002) for construction of four employee dwellings and a minor CUP for construction of a 10-foot sound wall within the front yard setback. The same CUPs are being requested for the Caruso plan. Mitigated Negative Declaration 00-ND-003 was prepared for the approved Schragger Plan and adopted in May 2000 after two well attended public hearings. Because substantial work was completed pursuant to the Schragger Plan, meaning that it is a vested approval, the fully built out Schragger Plan constitutes the baseline for the CEQA analysis of the proposed Caruso project. Subsequently, amendments to the original approval were approved in July of 2000 and July 2002. The first revision reduced some building square footage and removed the employee dwelling units and the second set of amendments allowed for a phased buildout of the project.

Pursuant to Section 15160 of the CEQA Guidelines “This article describes a number of examples of variations in EIRs as the documents are tailored to different situations and intended uses. These variations are not exclusive. Lead agencies may use other variations consistent with the guidelines to meet the need of other circumstances. All EIRs must meet the content requirements discussed in Article 9 beginning with Section 15120.” This document is a Subsequent EIR focused on the only identified significant unavoidable adverse impact, historic resources, which would result from the proposed revisions. This EIR focuses on historic resources, section 4.1, the content requirements of Article 9 of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as a discussion of all other issue areas. Because the other issue areas meet the criteria of CEQA Guidelines section 15164, Addendum to a Negative Declaration (e.g., aesthetics/visual resources, noise, water resources), these areas are discussed in the attached Addendum contained in Appendix A. The impacts to historic resources are anticipated to increase from a Class II under the Schragger plan, significant but mitigable, to a Class I, significant and unmitigable impact, under the Revised Miramar plan. The document is a variation of a Subsequent EIR, CEQA Guidelines section 15162; the format has been slightly changed because only one significant adverse impact was identified.

The original approved Schragger Plan (approved under Case Nos. 99-DP-001, 00-CP-32, and 99-CP-002) consisted of the following components:

- Construction of a new banquet hall over subterranean parking, and an attached new parking structure with three tennis courts on its roof;
- Construction of a new lobby at South Jameson Lane and a central promenade that would extend continuously from the lobby southward through the site to the beach;
- Construction of a new restaurant;
- Construction of a new beach bar;
- Construction of a new spa building and treatment rooms to incorporate the existing Beach & Tennis Club and salon;
- Removal of one of the existing Oceanfront guestroom buildings south of the new promenade;

- Construction of eight new guestrooms along South Jameson Lane;
- Conversion of four of the existing Garden Rooms to four employee housing units and hotel support;
- Interior remodels of the existing cottages/guestrooms;
- Removal of 4.73 acres of asphalt throughout the site; and
- Construction of a sound barrier/hedgerow along South Jameson Lane.
- Two new swimming pools and four new fountains would replace the two existing pools. Landscaping efforts would include the removal and relocation of numerous trees and new plantings of both native and non-native species throughout the site.
- The renovated Miramar Hotel would have had 213 guestrooms, plus four employee dwelling units.
- Demolition, grading, construction, and landscaping were estimated to require approximately 15 months to complete, with up to 125 workers onsite at any one time.

The proposed Caruso Plan consists of the following components (see Table 2-4 contained in the Subsequent EIR that provides a comparison of the Caruso Plan versus the Schragger Plan):

- Construction of a new ballroom over subterranean parking. Portions of the parking garage would be covered by an event lawn, with a new motor court and access ramp to underground parking;
- Construction of a new lobby and administration building on South Jameson Lane;
- Construction of three new restaurants, one on the second floor above the lobby, one near the pool, and the third as a new beach bar/snack house;
- Creation of a central lawn area in front of the main building lobby and main building guestrooms;
- Creation of additional open space by vacating the north-south segment of Miramar Avenue, and connecting the site via internal meandering paths resulting in additional new landscape areas throughout the site;
- Construction of a new spa and fitness building and treatment rooms for use by guests of the hotel and members of the public and one new building for exclusive use by the Beach and Tennis Club members;
- Increased beach club membership from 140 to 300;
- Construction of two new tennis courts for use by hotel guests and beach club members;
- Removal of all the existing guestroom buildings;
- Construction of 204<sup>1</sup> new guestrooms located in 24 buildings and cottages throughout the site;
- A restored beach boardwalk;
- Sixty-eight new public parking spaces along Eucalyptus and South Jameson Lane to improve public beach access to existing public access points;
- New public access route along the fire lane on the Miramar property and along the private road between the proposed Main Building and Ballroom;
- Construction of a 10-foot sound barrier along South Jameson Lane west of the main entrance drive;
- Construction of two new swimming pools to replace the two pools that previously existed on the site;

---

<sup>1</sup> The CEQA analysis of the proposed project is based on a worst case of 209 rooms.

- Landscaping plan would include the removal and relocation of numerous trees and new planting of both native and non-native species throughout the site;
- Four on-site employee housing units;
- Increased number, duration, and attendance of beach events (e.g., weddings) from 12 beach events per year, for a maximum of 50 people for 30 minutes to 30 beach events per year, for a maximum of 100 people for 60 minutes; and
- A request for modifications to the height, parking, and setback requirements of the County's Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

In Negative Declaration 00-ND-03, the Schragger Plan was determined to have the following potential significant (Class II) environmental impacts on the issue areas other than historic:

Short-term:    **Air Quality** and **Noise** from construction-related activities.

Long-term:    **Aesthetic/Visual Resources** (obstruction of views, night lighting); **Cultural Resources** (potential damage to unknown cultural resources); **Fire Protection** (fire access); **Geological Processes** (erosion, unstable earth conditions); **Noise** (train and highway noise); **Transportation/Circulation** (construction traffic hazards, parking); and, **Water Resources** (flooding).

In addition, the Schragger Plan would have contributed to significant cumulative impacts in the following issue areas: Aesthetic/Visual Resources, Air Quality (ozone precursor emissions), Biological Resources, Cultural Resources and Transportation/Circulation.

Impact levels for these issue areas (e.g. Class II, Class III impacts etc.), are anticipated to remain the same under the proposed project as under the Schragger Plan, as discussed in the Addendum contained in Appendix A of the SEIR.

In terms of historic resources, all of the existing cottages (except for Matilija), the remaining out buildings (housekeeping building, maintenance building etc.), the Poolside Rooms, neon roof sign, neon pole sign, and sandstone caps are locally historically significant; the Poolside Rooms are eligible for Santa Barbara County Historic Landmark status as well as eligible to be included on the California Register of Historic Resources and National Register for Historic Places. Under the proposed project, all of these existing historically significant buildings or features (i.e., cottages, other storage and maintenance buildings “out buildings”, Poolside Rooms), would be demolished and currently, there are no plans to display the “Miramar” neon sign, neon pole sign, or sandstone caps. A Structural Conditions Report was recently prepared for the cottages and out buildings on the Miramar property by Holmes Culley (March 19, 2007), which determined that these buildings would either be structurally completely unsalvageable due to extensive water damage, weathering, and other forms of decay, or would need to have their exteriors completely replaced due to termite and severe mold issues. Based on the Holmes Culley report, repair of these historically significant buildings onsite would not be feasible without completely destroying the character-defining features that determine their historical significance (i.e., shingles, clapboard, skirting boards rafter tails, gable vents, and any remaining multi-paned windows). The Poolside Rooms were studied by Holmes Culley in a subsequent report dated April 15, 2008. Conclusions of this report were “The Poolside Units [...] have the highest potential for re-use because the exterior walls consist of metal lath and stucco; the stucco offers a low seismic resistance. Due to the dry rot found, an increased amount of work would be required to rebuild the structure. Also, a future investigation of the existing concrete foundations

would be required.”

New mitigation measure HIST-1 would ensure that each historical structure will be completely documented following HABS/HAER procedures and standards, however, under the proposed project, demolition of all of the existing historically significant structures would be a permanent loss to the historic resource and therefore, would be considered a Class I, significant and unmitigable project-specific impact. The loss of these historically significant structures would also be a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on historic resources in the community.

Regarding the “Miramar” neon roof sign, neon pole sign, and sandstone caps, implementation of the mitigation measures contained in 00-ND-003 for the treatment of these features are still feasible and shall be implemented for the proposed project. Therefore, impacts on these historically significant resources would remain Class II, significant but mitigable.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Caruso BSC Miramar LLC requests approval of a Revision to a previously approved Development Plan and associated Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) granted for the renovation of the Miramar Hotel project (hereby referred to as the Schragger Plan or the approved plan), as well as a new CUP for repairs to an existing seawall. The original approved plan for the renovation of the Miramar was approved in June 2000 and includes a Final Development Plan (Case No. 99-DP-001), a CUP (00-CP-032) required for construction in a Transportation Corridor zone (within a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad), and a CUP (99-CP-002) for construction of four employee dwellings and for construction of a 10-foot sound wall within the front yard setback. Negative Declaration 00-ND-003 was prepared for the approved Schragger Plan and adopted in May 2000.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires analysis of environmental impacts which could occur as a result of project development. For the proposed revisions to the approved project, an Addendum to the previously adopted negative declaration (00-ND-003) for the approved plan can be prepared if the following applicable provisions of Section 15164 CEQA Guidelines can be met:

*(b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.*

and

*(e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.*

An addendum has been prepared to reflect technical changes and additions from the approved Schragger Plan to the proposed Caruso Plan (proposed project); and where none of the applicable conditions of Section 15162 calling for a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred, as indicated by the County determination provided below. Specifically, under Section 15162(a), Subsequent EIRs, of the CEQA Guidelines states:

*(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for the project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*

*(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*

*(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or*

*Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*

- (3) *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*
- (A) *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;*
  - (B) *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*
  - (C) *Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or*
  - (D) *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.*

There are no substantial changes or changed circumstances under which the proposed project is to be undertaken. No new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects under the approved 00-ND-003 have been found with the proposed project, as analyzed in the Addendum to the ND (Appendix A). Further, there is no new information that the proposed project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the approved 00-ND-003, with the exception of impacts to Historical Resources, the subject of this Subsequent EIR, 08-EIR-00003.

Pursuant to Section 15160 of the CEQA Guidelines “This article describes a number of examples of variations in EIRs as the documents are tailored to different situations and intended uses. These variations are not exclusive. Lead agencies may use other variations consistent with the guidelines to meet the need of other circumstances. All EIRs must meet the content requirements discussed in Article 9 beginning with Section 15120.” This document is a Subsequent EIR focused on the only identified significant adverse impact, historic resources, which would result from the proposed revisions. This EIR focuses on historic resources, section 4.1, the content requirements of Article 9 of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as a discussion of all other issue areas. Because the other issue areas meet the criteria of CEQA Guidelines section 15164, Addendum to a Negative Declaration (e.g., aesthetics/visual resources, noise, water resources), these areas are discussed in the attached Addendum contained in Appendix A. The impacts to historic resources are anticipated to increase from a Class II under the Schragger plan, significant but mitigable, to a Class I, significant and unmitigable impact, under the Revised Miramar plan. The document is a variation of a Subsequent EIR, CEQA Guidelines section 15162; the format has been slightly changed because only one significant adverse impact was identified.

This environmental document, which includes the Addendum, is intended to inform the public and decisionmakers of the significant environmental effects of the Miramar Beach Resort and

Bungalows project and to identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects. The document satisfies all the contents requirements of Article 9 of the CEQA Guidelines, including the identification of alternatives to the project that could reduce environmental impacts on historic resources. While CEQA requires that major consideration be given to avoiding environmental impacts, the lead agency and other responsible agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including economic and social goals, in determining whether and in what manner a project should be approved.

## **1.1 ADEQUACY OF A SUBSEQUENT EIR**

In terms of adequacy, CEQA Section 15151 states:

*An EIR should be prepared with sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.*

This SEIR has been prepared in accordance with the environmental review requirements established by CEQA statutes and Guidelines, and in accordance with the County of Santa Barbara CEQA Guidelines, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1990, as amended in 2005.

## **1.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND REVIEW PROCESS**

A Notice of Preparation was released on December 28, 2007 which initiated the 30-day scoping period on the SEIR ending on January 28, 2008. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on January 14, 2008 and the project was brought before the Montecito Planning Commission for conceptual review on January 16, 2008. A total of 77 comment letters were received during the scoping period for the project; a total of 15 members of the public expressed their support for the project without further comment and a total of 56 members of the public, organizations, or law firms expressed their concerns about one or more of the following issues:

- The scope of the environmental document with respect to the assumed baseline condition of the approved plan and the preparation of an addendum/SEIR;
- Potential impacts on public views of the ocean and of the mountains;
- Compatibility with the residential character of the neighborhood in terms of height, size, bulk, and scale;
- Potential impacts from night lighting;
- Consistency with County policies requiring maintaining a “cottage type” tradition at the Miramar;
- Long-term impacts on air quality due to increased traffic associated with the project;
- Potential impacts on existing archaeological resources;
- Potential impacts on nesting birds, monarchs, individual trees, and on the riparian corridor of Oak Creek;
- Potential impacts on emergency access during a fire;
- Adequate safety precautions for pedestrians crossing the railroad;

- Liquefaction potential;
- Impacts on sand supply and beach erosion due to repairs to an existing seawall and short-term construction impacts on the beach;
- Impact on historic buildings and requests that they be replaced or restored rather than demolished;
- Increased trips associated with the proposed project and impacts on area circulation and public parking for beach access;
- Short-term construction impacts on noise and traffic;
- Use of amplified noise;
- Noise impacts associated with increased number of events;
- Noise associated with back-of-house areas used for truck deliveries;
- Noise reflection off the 10-foot soundwall and buildings along South Jameson;
- Solid waste production;
- Adequate sewer capacity and infrastructure;
- Potential increases in flood levels associated with filling in the floodplain on the Miramar property;
- Use of water from a new well and potential impacts on neighboring wells;
- Potential for groundwater depletion and contamination with nitrates; and
- Adequate treatment of storm water runoff and control of the increase in volume and velocity of runoff.

The above issues have been discussed in the public draft SEIR, including the attached Addendum. The public draft SEIR was circulated for public comment between April 1, 2008 and May 15, 2008. A total of 100 comments were received. All comments and responses to public comments are provided in Appendix C of this document. The applicant also prepared responses to public comments. These are included as Appendix D of this document. All changes made to this SEIR and the attached Addendum in response to comments are shown in strike out and underline.

All background documents for this project, including the special studies prepared for the project, are on file and available for review at Planning and Development, 123 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, CA. Background documents are also available for review online as cited below. In addition, the Negative Declaration for the approved Schrage Plan is contained in Appendix B of this document and is also available online at <http://sbcountyplanning.org/projects/07DVP-00017/index.cfm>. This document and the historic reports prepared for the project are also available online.

## 2.0 REQUEST/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 PROJECT APPLICANT

Caruso BSC Miramar LLC.  
 101 The Grove Drive  
 Los Angeles, CA 90036

### 2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

A vicinity map for the proposed project is contained in Appendix D. The nearest cross street to the project is San Ysidro Road.

<b>Miramar Beach Resort and Bungalows Site Information</b>	
Montecito Community Plan Designation	Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial (hotel grounds) and Transportation Corridor (UPRR)
Ordinance / Zone Districts	Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Article II) / C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial; REC, Recreation (20' of 60' easement); TC, Transportation Corridor (100' - wide, centered on RR tracks) Coastal Commission Appeals Jurisdiction
Assessor Parcel Numbers	9-333-10, 9-371-03, 9-371-04, 9-372-01 and 9-010-002 (UPRR)
Site Size	Gross: 15.99 acres w/UPRR parcel (14.66 acres without UPRR parcel); Net: 15.77 acres w/UPRR parcel (13.30 acres without UPRR parcel)
Present Use/Development	Beach resort hotel
Surrounding Uses/Zoning	<u>North</u> : South Jameson Lane, U.S. Highway 101 and residential/TC and 20-R-1 zoning <u>South</u> : Residential, Pacific Ocean/REC, TC, DR-12, and 7-R-1 zoning <u>East</u> : Residential/DR 4.6 and 1-E-1 zoning <u>West</u> : Residential, All Saints by the Sea (church)/15-R-1 zoning
Access	U.S. Highway 101, South Jameson Lane, Eucalyptus Lane, Miramar Ave.
Public Services	<u>Water Supply</u> : Montecito Water District and one proposed new private well (supplemental supply for irrigation only) <u>Sewage</u> : Montecito Sanitary District <u>Fire</u> : Montecito Fire Protection District <u>Other</u> : Montecito Union and Santa Barbara High School Districts

## 2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Caruso BSC Miramar LLC's objectives for the proposed project are as follows:

- 1) Design a project that echos the mystique of a by-gone era with an updated, contemporary edge for a world-class, family friendly resort;
- 2) Provide visitors with a beautifully landscaped, even-grade site to enhance the walking and strolling experience; allowing visitors to stroll through the property from verdant gardens to open spaces for ocean gazing to the convivial atmosphere of the main pool and beach front areas; pathways have been designed and carefully placed to appropriately accommodate hotel guests as well as take into consideration golf cart access to the Main Building, the Oceanfront and Suite Buildings as well as the Lanai Buildings, Cottages and Bungalows throughout.
- 3) Design elegant and stately architecture that complements the surrounding environment and enhances the visitor experience by providing a distinctive resort character and flow; this includes larger rooms for enhanced comfort, cohesive site design of bungalows, cottage clusters and other buildings so that relationships of buildings to each other allow for spaces with feelings of intimacy and exclusivity;
- 4) Provide visitors with first-rate, modern amenities, such as spa facilities, tennis, retail and dining experiences that are consonant with resorts of superlative caliber;
- 5) Create site uniformity, singular identity and a sweepingly expansive, relaxed atmosphere by abandoning Miramar Ave and elegantly landscaping the area;
- 6) Design a project consistent with policies outlined in the Montecito Community Plan that preserve a feeling of Miramar's historic era and the charm and elegance of the community;
- 7) Create a distinct experience and all-inclusive destination resort that caters to the needs of discriminating visitors;
- 8) Increase the amount of distinctive retail and specialty shops that cater to visitors' discerning tastes and serve the needs of the local community;
- 9) Increase the stock of unique dining experiences, banquet and conference facilities/venues for local community events;
- 10) Restore and increase membership and recreational amenities to members of the local beach and tennis club;
- 11) Increase public access to the beach over what was provided in the Schragger plan;
- 12) Increase public parking for the beach above what currently exists or was proposed under the Schragger plan;
- 13) Provide affordable housing for 4 employees; and

- 14) Incorporate drought-tolerant landscaping and state-of-the-art irrigation techniques which ensure the least amount of water usage.

## **2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Caruso BSC Miramar LLC requests approval of a Revision to a previously approved Development Plan and associated Conditional Use Permits granted for the renovation of the Miramar Hotel project (hereby referred to as the Schragger Plan). The original approved plan for the renovation of Miramar was approved in June 2000 and includes a Final Development Plan (Case No. 99-DP-001), a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) (00-CP-032) required for construction in a Transportation Corridor zone (within a parcel owned by the Union Pacific Railroad), and a CUP (99-CP-002) for construction of four employee dwellings and for construction of a 10-foot sound wall within the front yard setback.

The original approved Schragger Plan was subsequently modified twice by amendments; the first involved the removal of the employee units and alterations to some building square footages which was approved in July 2000 (Case Nos. 99-DP-001 AM01 and 99-CP-002 AM01; Case No. 00-CP-032 was not amended), and the second involved phasing of the project which was approved in July 2002 (Case Nos. 02AMD-00000-00007 [for the development plan], 02CUP-00000-00030 [for construction of the 10-foot soundwall], and 02AMD-00000-00008 [for construction in the Transportation Corridor zone]).

The proposed Final Development Plan revision (Case No. 07RVP-00000-00009) and revisions to the CUPs for construction within a Transportation Corridor (Case No. 07CUP-00000-00045) and for construction of a 10-foot sound wall (07CUP-00000-00046) (hereby referred to as the Caruso Plan) would supercede the current approved permits. Because employee dwellings are proposed to be added back into the project description, the proposed project would also require a revision (Case No. 07CUP-00000-00047) to the original approved CUP 99-CP-002 for the employee dwellings. Finally, a new CUP is required for repairs to an existing seawall (Case No. 08CUP-00000-00005) which were not required under the Schragger Plan. Site plans for the project are contained Appendix E.

The subject property is reported at 15.99 gross acres (15.77 net acres) and comprises ten lots of legal record totaling 696,470 square feet (SF) of gross area and 686,977 SF of net area, including one parcel owned in fee by the Union Pacific Railroad but over which Caruso BSC Miramar LLC has an easement to allow certain uses. Caruso BSC Miramar LLC owns another adjacent parcel to the southwest of the proposed new hotel (APN 009-344-008), however this parcel is not a part of the Development Plan. Caruso BSC Miramar LLC is applying to merge the legal lots of record owned by Caruso BSC Miramar LLC for the proposed project.

The original approved Schrager Plan (approved under Case Nos. 99-DP-001, 00-CP-32, and 99-CP-002) consisted of the following components:

- Construction of a new banquet hall over subterranean parking, and an attached new parking structure with three tennis courts on its roof;
- Construction of a new lobby at South Jameson Lane and a central promenade that would extend continuously from the lobby southward through the site to the beach;
- Construction of a new restaurant;
- Construction of a new beach bar;
- Construction of a new spa building and treatment rooms to incorporate the existing Beach & Tennis Club and salon;
- Removal of one of the existing Oceanfront guestroom buildings south of the new promenade;
- Construction of eight new guestrooms along South Jameson Lane;
- Conversion of four of the existing Garden Rooms to four employee housing units and hotel support;
- Interior remodels of the existing cottages/guestrooms;
- Removal of 4.73 acres of asphalt throughout the site; and
- Construction of a sound barrier/hedgerow along South Jameson Lane.
- Two new swimming pools and four new fountains would replace the two existing pools. Landscaping efforts would include the removal and relocation of numerous trees and new plantings of both native and non-native species throughout the site.
- The renovated Miramar Hotel would have had 213 guestrooms, plus four employee dwelling units.
- Demolition, grading, construction, and landscaping were estimated to require approximately 15 months to complete, with up to 125 workers onsite at any one time.

The proposed Caruso Plan consists of the following components (Table 2-4 below also provides a comparison of the Caruso Plan versus the Schrager Plan):

- Construction of a new ballroom over subterranean parking. Portions of the parking garage would be covered by an event lawn, with a new motor court and access ramp to underground parking;
- Construction of a new lobby and administration building on South Jameson Lane;
- Construction of three new restaurants, one on the second floor above the lobby, one near the pool, and the third as a new beach bar/snack house;
- Creation of a central lawn area in front of the main building lobby and main building guestrooms;
- Creation of additional open space by vacating the north-south segment of Miramar Avenue, and connecting the site via internal meandering paths resulting in additional new landscape areas throughout the site;
- Construction of a new spa and fitness building and treatment rooms for use by guest of the hotel and members of the public and one new building for exclusive use by the Beach and Tennis Club members;
- Increased beach club membership from 140 to 300;
- Construction of two new tennis courts for use by hotel guests and beach club members;
- Removal of all the existing guestroom buildings;

- Construction of a maximum of 204 new guestrooms located in 24 buildings and cottages throughout the site;
- A restored beach boardwalk;
- Sixty-eight new public parking spaces along Eucalyptus and South Jameson to improve public beach access to existing public access points;
- New public access route along the fire lane on the Miramar property and along the private road between the proposed Main Building and Ballroom;
- Construction of a 10-foot sound barrier along South Jameson Lane west of the main entrance drive;
- Construction of two new swimming pools to replace the two pools that previously existed on the site;
- Landscaping plan would include the removal and relocation of numerous trees, including nine oaks, and new planting of both native and non-native species throughout the site;
- Four affordable on-site hotel employee housing units;
- Increased number, duration, and attendance of beach events (e.g., weddings) from 12 beach events per year, for a maximum of 50 people for 30 minutes to 30 beach events per year, for a maximum of 100 people for 60 minutes; and
- A request for modifications to the height, parking, and setback requirements of the County's Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

Below is a summary of the proposed structural development, site improvements, and proposed operation of the new beach resort and bungalows.

## **PROPOSED STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT**

The proposed project would involve the demolition of all existing structures on the property and the addition of 401,205 gross SF (169,937 net SF) of structural development, excluding paved areas. Table 1 below summarizes the square footages of the proposed new buildings along with their maximum height (as measured from existing grade).

Pursuant to Section 35-203 of Article II of the County Code, Coastal Zoning Ordinance, in the Montecito Community Plan Overlay District, the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for projects in the C-V, Resort/Visitor Serving Commercial zone is 0.25. The proposed project would result in 169,937 SF of net floor area for an FAR of 0.2474 (see Table 2-1 below).

**Table 2-1  
Project Statistics – Structural Development**

<b>Building Name</b>	<b>Building No. on Plans</b>	<b>No. of Stories</b>	<b>Max. Height above Existing Grade (ft.)</b>	<b>No. of Guest-rooms</b>	<b>Gross Interior Area (SF)</b>	<b>Net Floor Area (used for FAR) (SF)</b>	<b>Gross Exterior Area (SF)</b>	<b>Total Site Coverage (SF)</b>
Ballroom	5	2	41'	0	24,702	13,331	5,278	25,280
Main Building	1	2 <sup>2</sup>	49'	28	216,923	37,759	15,623	76,804
Pool Bar/Restaurant	7	1	27.3'	0	878	667	0	2,342
Spa	31	2	26.2'	0	15,575	10,313	0	10,546
Beach and Tennis Club	6	2	38'	0	2,222	1,482	326	1,238
Retail – R1	24	1	19'	0	1,003	704	0	1,003
Retail – R2	25	1	18.6'	0	959	711	0	959
Retail – R3	26	1	16.1'	0	930	676	0	930
Retail – R4	27	1	16.0'	0	1,669	1,170	0	1,669
Retail – R5	28	1	18.5'	0	924	641	0	924
Lanai 9 – L9	44	2	31.5'	49	35,151	24,478	7,642	22,912
Lanai 1 – L1	11	2	31.5'	6	5,528	3,614	1,059	3,497
Lanai 2 – L2	9	2	33.5'	14	11,020	8,598	2,777	7,261
Lanai 3 – L3	43	2	28.5'	24	19,884	14,023	4,246	12,719
Cottage 1 – C1	22	1	16.6'	4	2,385	2,184	679	3,632
Cottage 1 – C1	23	1	19.0'	4	2,385	2,184	679	3,632
Cottage 3 – C3	32	1	17.5'	6	4,533	3,684	1,284	5,817
Cottage 3 – C3	34	1	17.5'	6	4,533	3,684	1,284	5,817
Cottage 3 – C3	40	1	17.8'	6	4,533	3,684	1,284	5,817
Cottage 3 – C3 Alt	41	1	17.3'	6	4,533	3,684	1,284	5,817
Cottage 4 – C4	36	1	19'	4	3,152	2,901	552	3,704
Cottage 4 – C4	37	1	17.5'	4	3,152	2,901	552	3,704
Bungalow 1 – B1	33	1	17.1'	1	929	811	249	1,178
Bungalow 1 – B1	35	1	18.6'	1	929	811	249	1,178
Bungalow 2 – B2	15	1	18'	2	1,431	1,265	367	1,798
Bungalow 2 – B2	16	1	18.5'	2	1,431	1,265	367	1,798
Bungalow 2 – B2	18	1	17'	2	1,431	1,265	367	1,798
Bungalow 2 – B2	19	1	17'	2	1,431	1,265	367	1,798
Bungalow 2 – B2	20	1	17'	2	1,431	1,265	367	1,798
Governor's Suite – G1	17	1	17.5'	2	1,674	1,506	335	2,009
Oceanfront West – O1	2	2	24.0'	10	6,712	4,250	1,326	4,411
Oceanfront East - O2	3	2	24.0'	16	14,433	10,433	3,272	9,216
Oceanfront Presidential - O3	4	2	24.0'	1	2,965	2,728	500	1,830
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>204*</b>	<b>401,205</b>	<b>169,937</b>	<b>52,315</b>	<b>234,836</b>

Notes: Based on plans submitted on May 19, 2008.

\* The impact analysis was conducted for a maximum of 209 rooms.

### Proposed Architectural Style

The proposed California Coastal architectural style for the project is described as casual elegance and a residential scale. The buildings are described as understated and have a preponderance of one-

<sup>2</sup> The main building is a two story building with two underground stories of parking.

story eave lines.

The guest arrival is to the Main Building with a porte cochere and a see-through lobby that overlooks a courtyard with the ballroom beyond. All guest parking except for a limited number of spaces in the front motor court and at the oceanfront buildings, has been moved underground to allow the landscaping to reflect the refined residential nature of this building.

Throughout the project there are generous open spaces and a variety of experiences and building types that reinforce the outdoor temperate lifestyle encouraged by the design. Guestrooms are located in one-story cottages and two-story lanais, oceanfront and poolside buildings with panoramic window lines, expansive patios and balconies. Awnings and drapes and landscaped trellises add detail and shade to the outdoor environment.

The color and materials palette are generally white and light. Wood clapboard and shingle siding, painted brick, plaster, wood shutters, eaves, trims, columns and windows are occasionally offset by natural stone accents.

### **Ballroom/Employee Dwellings**

The ballroom would primarily be used for special events of various sizes. It would be for use both by beach resort and bungalow guests and the community. Vehicles would arrive at the ballroom via the existing private road. There would be a forecourt at the ballroom with valet parking, and cars would be parked in the underground parking through a separate entrance directly across the road from the forecourt. One would also be able to access the ballroom from the main building by either going down stairs or an elevator and crossing the private road on foot. The ballroom could either accommodate one large event, or with slide walls could be subdivided to accommodate up to three different events.

There are large hallways outside of the ballroom to provide adequate circulation of either one large event or three concurrent events. The ballroom building also houses a banquet kitchen that would be used primarily for special events. This is separate from the primary kitchen in the Main Building. There would be large doors opening out to a large lawn south of the building that would allow the ballroom facility to accommodate up to 600 people.

The ballroom building also houses the four affordable employee housing units on the north side of the building facing South Jameson Lane. The affordable employee housing units would be rented to moderate income (120% AMI) full-time employee renter. Income eligibility for affordable rental units would be determined by the County or its designee.

### **Main Building/Restaurant/Two-level Parking Garage**

The main building in the Caruso plan includes the lobby/check-in area, a second floor three-meal restaurant, administrative offices, three meeting rooms, back of house (BOH) areas, and guestrooms all built on top of a two-level subterranean parking garage. The main building is oriented around an interior courtyard situated on top of the parking deck. Guestrooms, the lobby, and the restaurant face the main lawn area where the main pool is located. The new restaurant above the lobby would be a more formal venue for dining with a portion of the seating located in an unenclosed deck area.

### **Pool Bar/Restaurant and Beach Bar/Snack House**

The second restaurant would be located near the main pool and would be more casual in nature and designed to have seating in an unenclosed patio area. The new beach bar would be located on the west end of the Oceanfront Building East (O2); it would have patio seating only and include food storage and preparation areas. The beach bar has been designed with low roof forms to create architectural diversity with respect to the oceanfront units and to allow for ocean views through the Miramar site. The views from the beach into the property and from the property to the beach would be enhanced by the large opening that would be created between the oceanfront buildings where the beach bar would be located. The opening would be 35 feet wide at its narrowest point, and would average a width of 40 feet.

The total indoor and outdoor seating in the two restaurants and the beach bar/snack house is proposed to match the 258 seats previously approved in the Schragger Plan and also matches the seat count in the formerly operating hotel.

### **Spa**

A new spa facility would be constructed in the north section of the site along South Jameson Lane. The spa would include new treatment rooms, men's and women's locker rooms, fitness facilities, and relaxation gardens in a one and a half level structure oriented around a courtyard.

The building would be located in the northwest corner of the site in close proximity to a second pool (spa pool) on the property. In addition to guest use, there would be allowance for 15 non-guest uses per day consistent with the uses approved in the Schragger Plan.

### **Beach and Tennis Club**

The proposed project includes a two-story clubhouse for the Beach and Tennis Club. The clubhouse would be for the use of Beach and Tennis Club members only and would include lockers, a sauna and steam rooms, and a lounge area. Adjacent to the clubhouse would be two new tennis courts. These would be available for use by the club members and beach resort and bungalow guests. The courts would be enclosed by netting instead of fences to allow for views across the courts. If necessary, the courts could also be used for overflow parking for large events. The Caruso plan includes a request for an increase to 300 members based upon high community demand. The parking for the club would be valet and handled in the same forecourt used for the ballroom.

### **Five New Retail Buildings**

Adjacent to the main building would be a cluster of small cottage style retail boutiques featuring convenience type products and services to the hotel guest. This incidental retail use would be geared to satisfy the needs of the hotel guests but could also be a resource to the neighborhood in the immediate vicinity of the hotel for browsing, services and gift item purchases. Examples of possible retail uses include apparel, beach recreation (i.e., beach towels, hats, beach chairs, boogie boards, etc.), magazines and newspapers, candy, sunglasses, specialty food sales (i.e., bakery goods, ice cream, coffee), jewelry, art, gifts, visitor information, gourmet grocery items, and wine, among others. Uses would not include open alcohol sales, fast food meals, dry cleaners, post office, parcel services, or a bank.

### **New Guestrooms**

Under the Schrage Plan, 213 guestrooms were approved, whereas under the Caruso Plan, 204 guestrooms are proposed. Seven types of guestroom buildings are proposed under the Caruso plan: Lanai buildings, Cottages, Bungalows, Oceanfront buildings, one Governor Suite, one Presidential Oceanfront unit, and guestrooms attached to the Main Building (as summarized in Table 1 above). The Lanai buildings, Oceanfront buildings, Presidential Oceanfront unit, and guestrooms attached to the Main Building would be two-story buildings while the others would be one-story buildings.

**Sound Barrier**

A sound barrier is proposed along South Jameson Lane west of the main entrance drive to reduce noise from the freeway in exterior spaces. Along South Jameson Lane, this sound barrier would consist of an approximate 10-foot high (as measured from the South Jameson Lane grade) sound wall with landscaping on both sides to make the wall visually appealing as well as architectural features that would enhance the visual appearance of the wall.

**Boardwalk and Seawall Repairs**

An existing timber and concrete seawall retains the soil supporting most of the existing oceanfront units (the existing oceanfront units are not supported by deep foundations). Under the proposed project, the new oceanfront units would be supported on deep foundations (approximately 128 driven piles) to comply with requirements in the Coastal High Hazard Zone, however, compacted soil would be placed beneath the foundations between the piles to further protect the structure from collapsing in the event of lateral earth movement during an earthquake. The existing seawall would be retained to support the soil beneath the piles. Many of the timber piles supporting the existing seawall are damaged and may need to be replaced under the proposed project (with new driven piles); construction of this element of the project is anticipated to last 13 days (eight piles driven per day). In addition, new shotcrete would be installed on the face of the seawall to further strengthen it from wave forces.

The existing easternmost oceanfront unit is not protected by the seawall, but rather by a timber bulkhead located further seaward than the seawall. No repairs are proposed for the bulkhead.

A 2x10 foot plank timber boardwalk is framed off the face of the seawall, approximately 9.8 feet above existing grade (sand). The boardwalk is supported by timber piles, 10x12 foot beams, and 2x14 foot joists. In addition, a stairway leads to the beach off the boardwalk. Due to extensive wood rot, the deck of the boardwalk would be replaced under the proposed project, however, the existing piles and the existing beach stairway would be retained.

There is no anticipated need for construction equipment to be parked on the beach, though hoses, cables, etc. may go down onto the beach (i.e., shotcrete application to the seawall).

**Additional Fences and Walls**

Table 2-2 summarizes the proposed site walls and their heights under the Caruso plan.

**Table 2-2  
Project Statistics – Site Walls**

Wall Location	Maximum Height of Wall
---------------	------------------------

	(above existing grade) (ft.)
Between the spa and South Jameson (Section A on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	5.5'
In the northwest corner of the property by the spa (Section H on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	4.6'
Along the western property line between All Saints by the Sea (Section B on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	3.8'
Along the southwestern property line between All Saints by the Sea (Section C on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	2.1'
Between Lanai L2 and the residential parcel owned by Miramar to the west (Section D on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	3.9'
Series of three stepped walls in the far southeast corner of the property near the tennis courts (Section F on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	1.6', 5.5', & 6.5' for a total of 13.6'
Along service road along entire eastern boundary of the property (Section G on Sheet C-2, the preliminary grading and drainage plan)	6.7'
Retaining wall between the easternmost guestrooms on the Main Building and the entrance road	6.5'
Retaining wall between the Oceanfront units and the new fire access road and railroad tracks to the north	8'

## **Modifications**

Section 35-174.8 of Article II, Coastal Zoning Ordinance, for Development Plans, stipulates that the decision-maker of a Development Plan (e.g., Montecito Planning Commission) “may modify the building height limit, distance between buildings, setback, yard, parking, building coverage, or screening requirements specified in the applicable zone district when the decision-maker finds that the project justifies such modifications.” The applicant proposes modifications to height limits, setbacks, and parking requirements.

## **Height Modifications**

The height limit in the C-V zone is 35 feet above existing grade, or 38 feet with 4 in 12 roof pitches.

Section 35-127(A)(1)(a)(3) of Article II, Coastal Zoning Ordinance also allows exceptions to the height limit by 8 feet for a maximum total of 10% of the roof area or 400 square feet, whichever is less. All proposed new buildings would meet these height restrictions, except for the Main Building where the maximum height is proposed at 49 feet. Therefore, a modification to the height limit is requested for this building. A height modification was not requested under the Schrage Plan.

Section 35-204(1) of the Montecito Overlay in Article II, the County’s Coastal Zoning Ordinance states:

*1. New structures shall be limited to an average height of 16 feet above finished grade where site preparation results in a maximum fill of 10 feet or greater in height. This height limitation shall apply except as provided for in Section 35-127, Height.*

Under the Caruso Plan, the finished floors of the Beach and Tennis Club and the pool bar would be raised at least 10 feet above existing grade. Table 2-3 shows the difference between the finished floors and existing grade at reference points corresponding with the ridgelines of each of these buildings (see Sheet A0.20 of the plans also). Table 2-3 also shows the proposed building height above the finished floor, and indicates where this height exceeds the 16 foot limit. A modification to the height limit would be required for the Beach and Tennis Club but not for the pool bar. This type of modification was not required for the Schragger Plan.

**Table 2-3  
Height Modifications Required for Buildings Requiring More than 10 Feet of Fill**

<b>Building</b>	<b>Existing Grade (EG) (feet above mean sea level)</b>	<b>Finished Floor (FF) (feet above mean sea level)</b>	<b>FF – EG (feet above mean sea level)</b>	<b>Bldg. Height Above FF (feet above mean sea level)</b>	<b>Height above the 16' Limit</b>
<b>Beach and Tennis Club</b>					
A	17.5	28.5	+11	+22.5	+6.5
B	16.5	28.5	+12	+26	+10
<b>Pool Bar</b>					
A	21	32.5	+11.5	+12	-4
B	20.5	32.5	+12	+15.3	-0.7

**Setback Modifications**

At Miramar, there is a required 20-foot setback from the right-of-way line and a 50-foot setback from the centerline of South Jameson Lane, Eucalyptus Lane, and Miramar Avenue. In addition, there is a 50-foot setback from the entire western and eastern property line due to adjacent residential zoned properties. Finally, there is a 20-foot setback from the northern edge of the Union Pacific Railroad easement (a rear yard setback) and a 10-foot setback from the southern edge of the Union Pacific Railroad easement (a front yard setback for an interior lot).

As under the Schragger Plan, several proposed buildings would encroach into the required setbacks. Specifically, all of the guestrooms along the western property line would encroach 40 feet into the required 50-foot setback to the adjacent residential zoned properties (for a setback of approximately 10 feet from the western property line); patios for Cottages C3/C3 would be 8 feet from the western property line. In addition, the two C4 cottages, two B2 cottages, and the Governor’s Suite (G1) would be located on the right-of-way line and well within the 50-foot setback from the centerline of Miramar Avenue. Finally, the Spa building, Lanai L9 buildings, Main Building, Ballroom, and oceanfront guestrooms all would slightly encroach into setbacks as well. Therefore, a modification to the setback requirements would be required for most of the buildings (see Table 2-4 below as well for more details on encroachment into setbacks).

**Table 2-4  
Setback Modifications Required for the Caruso Plan**

<b><u>Location of Encroachment</u></b>	<b><u>Building Encroachment</u></b>	<b><u>Building Encroachment into Setback Area</u></b>
<u>Northern property line adjacent to S. Jameson</u>	<u>Ballroom, Main Building, Guestrooms, Spa</u>	<u>Approximately 10' into the setback area</u>
<u>Western property line adjacent to Eucalyptus Lane and the Church property</u>	<u>Spa &amp; Guestrooms</u>	<u>Between 32' &amp; 40' into the 50' setback</u>
<u>Southern property line adjacent to the</u>	<u>Guestrooms</u>	<u>Approximately 20' into the setback</u>

<u>east-west portion on Miramar Ave.</u>		<u>area &amp; on the ROW line</u>
<u>South-western portion of the hotel, which is south of Miramar Ave and north of the railroad track, adjacent to the properties at 50, 56, and 60 Miramar Avenue</u>	<u>Guestrooms</u>	<u>Approximately 20' into the setback area</u>

**Parking Modifications**

Please see below for further discussion about the parking proposed for the project. The County’s parking standards contained in Article II, Coastal Zoning Ordinance, require a total of 671 parking spaces onsite to accommodate the proposed project. However, only a total of 551 parking spaces would be provided, for a total of 120 spaces fewer than ordinance requirements. Therefore, a modification to the parking requirements would be required. Under the Schrage Plan, the project would have been 183 spaces short of ordinance requirements, and a modification was granted for that project.

**SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

**Grading, Drainage, and Utilities**

Grading for the project entails excavation of the underground parking under the Main Building and Ballroom and re-contouring of the site. In order to bring the eastern portion of the site above the floodplain, the grades on the eastern portion of the site need to be raised and the grades on the western portion are to be slightly lowered, moderately flattening the site. Fill within the Oak Creek floodplain would constitute a total loss of approximately 7.6 acre feet of storm water ponding volume upstream of the railroad. A total of approximately 36,300 cubic yards (cy) of cut and approximately 46,100 cy of fill would be required for the project, which factors in the amount of overexcavation and compaction required. As a result, a total of 10,000 cy of import would be required for the project.

The proposed haul period for the import of 10,000 cy of fill is proposed as follows:

Import volume	10,000 cy
Truck capacity	10 cy
Truck trips per hour	6 to 10
Duration of import	100 to 170 hours/12 to 21 days

Note: It is assumed that import of fill would occur sporadically during early stages of the project

The previously operating Miramar hotel contained about 2.028 acres of asphalt parking and pathway areas within the hotel site and the approved Schrage Plan involved a total of 2.028 acres of paving (including the north-south segment of Miramar Avenue). The proposed project involves 5.79 acres of paving. Drainage for the property would be designed following the County-approved drainage study prepared for the proposed project.

All existing on-site storm, sanitary and water systems would be removed or properly abandoned and new systems installed per current codes. Existing water service in the to-be-vacated northern portion of Miramar Avenue, which serves a portion of the adjacent community, would be maintained in place until a new system is activated as part of the project. Sanitary service would be

provided by Montecito Sanitary District service lines adjacent to the southwest corner of the property and at the eastern end of Miramar Avenue. The Montecito Sanitary District is currently updating this sewer system, including service lines that would serve the project. In conjunction with these upgrades, the project would include installation of a sewer lift station with an emergency overflow basin. The sewer lift station and overflow basin would be located in the northeastern portion of the property, and the wells for the pump station would be located approximately four to five feet below the sanitary sewer line. All existing overhead electrical lines would be relocated underground.

The applicant proposes the use of two 100 brake horse power (bhp) boilers, two 3,000 million British thermal units (MMBTu) boilers, and a 500 kilowatt (kW) emergency generator.

The project would utilize water from the Montecito Water District for both potable and irrigation purposes. No private well water use is proposed.

### **Vehicular Access to the Hotel**

The site would be accessed primarily at two points along South Jameson Lane – the main entrance road to the lobby and the private road that would provide access to the ballroom, the Beach and Tennis Club, the oceanfront rooms, and continued access for the three private homes to the immediate east of the beach resort. There would also be a third access point at the far east end of the property for service vehicles only.

The private road would be improved from its current condition. The private road's elevation would be raised to make it consistent with the new surrounding topography and to elevate it out of the current flood plain (currently, parts of the private road sit more than five feet below the 100-year flood plain). The road would be built in compliance with all required engineering standards and requirements of the Montecito Fire Protection District. The roadway edge would be attractively landscaped.

### **Pools and Pool Cabanas**

There would be two pools on the property, a smaller pool in the northeast corner of the property near the lanai buildings, and the main pool south of the lobby building. The smaller pool is envisioned as less populated and quiet while the main pool would be the focus of the resort's outdoor activities. Lawn area, large seating areas, the outdoor poolside restaurant, and pool cabanas would surround the main pool. The cabanas would be temporary open-air shade structures for rental use by the hotel guests.

### **Landscaping, Gardens, and Pathways**

Approximately 5.33 acres of the Miramar Beach Resort and Bungalows site would be devoted to landscaping. Many of the existing, mature landscape materials, including many varieties of majestic trees such as sycamores, eucalyptus, Camphor trees, and Canary Island Palms, would remain on the property. It is a goal of the project to save as many trees as possible, relocating as possible and replenishing the property with new trees as well. The remainder of the plant palette would consist of a combination of drought tolerant and non-drought tolerant shrub and ground cover species.

The entrance into the property would be landscaped with a variety of mature trees, providing a

planting buffer along the entire frontage of South Jameson Lane. This would set the tone for Miramar, bringing it once again, back to its destination resort setting, established nearly 100 years ago. In conjunction with the hotel's architecture, landscape improvements along South Jameson Lane would also help attenuate noise from Highway 101. The entrance drive off of South Jameson Lane, would be planted with a combination of non-drought tolerant and drought tolerant plant materials. The motor court would be appropriately landscaped with decorative paving materials, potted plants, and colorful, flowering shrubs and hedges.

The experience at Miramar Beach Resort and Bungalows would primarily be a walking and strolling experience. Therefore, pathways would be added and carefully placed to appropriately accommodate hotel guests as well as take into consideration cart access to the main building, the oceanfront buildings as well as the lanai buildings, cottages and bungalows throughout. Decomposed granite pathways are envisioned for pedestrian use while other materials would be used for golf cart access. The pathways have been laid out to avoid disturbing any trees, but to also accommodate fire and maintenance access.

### **Signs and Lighting**

A new sign would be installed on South Jameson Avenue at the main entrance to the Main Building. The new fire access lane through the property (see "Public Access to the Beach and Public Use of the Site" below), would be marked with directional signs to Miramar Avenue which can be used to access the beach at the end of Eucalyptus Lane, and clearly marking the path as public access. Public beach access signs will also be located along the private road between the Main Building and Ballroom directing people to the beach through the beach bar area. Finally, signs would also be installed on the exterior of the property directing people to public beach access points at the end of Eucalyptus Lane and the end of Posilipo Lane.

The tennis courts would have lighting, unlike the Schragger Plan, however, the lighting would be low and angled downward to avoid any impact on surrounding rooms and nearby residences.

Consistent with the Schragger Plan, lighting is proposed on the boardwalk and the beach bar, but no lighting is proposed for the beach or sandy area. Lighting along the boardwalk would not be directed onto the sand in front of the resort or on the water. Likewise, lighting at the beach bar would be kept to a minimum and would cease at 10 p.m. each evening.

### **Fire Access Plan**

A Fire Access Plan has been prepared for the proposed project, and incorporated into the site plans for the project, that outlines fire access lanes throughout the property and fire access points to the roof top of each building on the property.

### **Solid Waste Management Plan**

The applicant proposes to reduce the solid waste volume generated by operation of the proposed project by 50 percent. In order to achieve this diversion rate, the following measures would be implemented:

#### General Solid Waste

1. A County-designated hauler would provide individual bins within centralized enclosure/s on the property for trash and commingled recycling. Commingled recycling containers would be utilized for depositing materials such as aluminum, plastic, glass, newspapers, junk mail, bimetal cans, magazines, cereal boxes, and cardboard. Trash and recyclables would be picked up at appropriate time intervals determined by the designated waste hauler.
2. Interior spaces of each project area would be provided with storage for smaller recyclable materials such as office paper, cardboard, newspaper, glass and plastic bottles, aluminum and bimetal cans.
3. The designated waste hauler would provide the designated trash/recycling enclosures with commingled recycling containers for materials such as aluminum, plastic, glass, newspapers, junk mail, metal cans, magazines, cereal boxes, and cardboard. Recyclables would be picked up at appropriate time intervals determined by the designated waste hauler.

### Gardening Waste

1. The overall project landscape design would consider the following yard waste minimization methods:
  - Trees would be selected for the appropriate size and scale to reduce pruning waste over the long-term.
  - Slow growing, drought tolerant plants would be included in the landscape plan. Drought tolerant plants require less pruning and generate less long-term pruning waste, require less water, and require less fertilizer than plants with higher water and fertilizer needs.
2. The initial landscape contractor and the subsequent landscaping maintenance crew hired by the Property Manager would be responsible for all garden waste management duties for the project area. Both contractor and maintenance crew would be informed through written and verbal information sources regarding this waste plan.
3. Woody waste would be chipped and used as mulch and/or composted on-site, to the maximum extent feasible.
4. All gardening wastes not composted/utilized as mulch on-site shall be hauled offsite by the maintenance crew.

### Hazardous Waste

1. The Community Environmental Council (CEC) is a resource for information on non-toxic alternatives. Guests/visitors would be made aware that they may contact the CEC at (805) 963-0583 for additional information on non-toxic or less toxic products.
2. The CEC and University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) maintain a permanent facility for the collection of hazardous waste generated by residents and small businesses in the area. The owner would be made aware of this service, which includes the recycling/disposal of solvents, oils, and other chemicals, located at the UCSB Household Hazardous Waste Facility.

During construction, the applicant would employ a combination of local recycling services to reduce demolition and construction waste by 98.5 percent. Recycling of construction materials is provided locally by a number of waste collection companies, such as MarBorg Industries and BFI; Granite Construction, Lash Construction, and Santa Barbara Sand and Topsoil also offer construction waste recycling. For construction, a Solid Waste Management Plan shall be developed and implemented for each phase of construction. The Plan shall identify:

1. Estimated weight, by material type, to be discarded during construction.
2. Estimated weight, by material type, to be recycled or reused during construction.
3. Estimated number of separate bins required for recycling construction materials and cleared brush during grading and construction activities. All demolition and/or excess construction materials shall be separated on-site, as feasible, for reuse/recycling or proper disposal (e.g., separate bins for concrete and asphalt, wood, metal, drywall, and brush) and to take advantage of decreased prices for recycling these materials.
4. Prior to demolition/construction, the contractor would arrange for construction recycling service with a waste collection provider/s. Roll-off bins for the collection of recoverable construction materials would be located onsite. Materials earmarked for recycling include: wood, concrete, drywall, metal, cardboard, asphalt, soil, and land clearing debris (greenwaste). Sorting of general construction debris and materials would be done on-and off-site in coordination with recycling/waste collection provider.
5. The contractor would be referred to the following sources for recycled content, or reusable construction products:
  - Calmax – California Materials Exchange (916) 255-2369 – a program that facilitates the reuse and recycling of business’ excess products, materials, and discards through a bi-monthly publication listing such materials free of charge;
  - California Integrated Waste Management Board (800) 553-2962 – a State agency that provides information about recycling and waste reduction.
  - Hayward Lumber (805) 692-2113 – a local construction materials vendor that provides a wide range of recycled-content products and sustainably harvested lumber.
6. Contractor shall monitor recycling efforts and collect receipts for roll-off bins and/or construction waste recycling. All subcontractors would be informed of the recycling plan, including which materials are to be source-separated and placed in proper bins (see materials earmarked above).
7. These construction waste-recycling measures would be incorporated into the construction specifications for the contractor.
8. Development of a Source Reduction Element (SRE) describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste before it is created. For example, the SRE may include a description of value-engineering building techniques employed to keep excess cutoffs to a minimum (including increased spacing of joists and studs, in-line framing, reduced header sizes, and modular roof designs).

## **Construction Details**

Demolition, grading, construction and landscaping are estimated to require approximately 18 to 22 months to complete, with several activities likely to be occurring onsite simultaneously. It is estimated that there would be up to 250 construction workers on site at any one time. Construction vehicles and equipment would be parking within the hotel site during the renovation effort; no construction-related parking would be allowed along Eucalyptus Lane, or on the east-west portion of Miramar Avenue during the construction/renovation period.

Pile driving would occur in two areas on the project site: beneath the Main Building and beneath the oceanfront units. Pile driving activities associated with the Main Building are anticipated to last for approximately three months. Pile driving activities associated with the oceanfront units is anticipated to be performed in one phase lasting 13 days, eight hours per day (total of 128 piles with a driving capability of approximately 10 piles per day).

The proposed haul routes are as follows:

### **To Miramar from US 101**

#### **Proposed Northbound Truck Route**

1. Travel northbound on US 101.
2. Exit San Ysidro off-ramp.
3. Turn left (south) at top of the off-ramp onto San Ysidro Road.
4. Turn left (east) onto South Jameson Lane.
5. Entrances to Miramar site are located on left (south side of South Jameson Lane) as follows:
  - a. Entrance onto site via vacated Miramar Avenue.
  - b. Entrance onto site via private road (between Main Building and Ballroom).

#### **Proposed Southbound Truck Route**

1. Travel southbound on US 101
2. Exit San Ysidro off-ramp.
3. Advance straight at top of off-ramp onto Jameson Lane.
4. Entrances to Miramar site are located on left (south side of South Jameson Lane) as follows:
  - a. Entrance onto site via vacated Miramar Avenue.
  - b. Entrance onto site via private road (between Main Building and Ballroom).

### **From Miramar to US 101**

#### **Proposed Northbound Truck Route**

1. Exit the site via vacated Miramar Avenue or private road by turning left (west) onto South Jameson Lane.
2. Turn right (north) onto San Ysidro Road.
3. Cross the US 101 bridge.
4. At the stop sign, turn left (west) onto the northbound on-ramp.

#### **Proposed Southbound Truck Route**

1. Exit the site via vacated Miramar Avenue or private road.
2. Turn right (east) onto South Jameson Lane.
3. Head straight to southbound on-ramp to US 101.

## **PROPOSED OPERATION OF THE HOTEL**

### **Number of Guestrooms (or “Keys”)**

The Caruso BSC Miramar LLC renovation project proposes 209 keys and 4 affordable employee residences. There are 24 guestroom buildings and of those buildings, 18 have six keys or less, while 6 have more than six keys.

### **Events**

Under the proposed project, a number of events may be held at the hotel and the total maximum attendees at one event or several events occurring simultaneously shall not exceed 600 people, individually or collectively. Normal events (“normal events”) would have an attendee limit of 500 persons and would utilize the 6,655 square foot ballroom, 1,812 square feet of three meeting rooms, the outside, or beach area (subject to additional limitations below), or any combination thereof. It is anticipated that the same number of normal events would occur as under the approved Schragger Plan (4.7 events per day on average per year).

Special events could combine normal events with outdoor access and accommodate a combined maximum of 600 people (“special events”). Such special events would be limited to a maximum of 12 times a year. Special events would count towards the normal event limit of 4.7 events per day on average.

### **Beach Events**

Beach events would include, but would not be limited to, wedding ceremonies, commitment ceremonies, cocktail parties, or other small gatherings in the hotel beach use area and would be limited to no more than 30 per year, no more than 60 minutes per event (excluding setup and breakdown times), and no more than 100 people (“beach events”). Beach events would not count against the 12 per year special events unless the beach component would bring the activity’s total attendance to between 500 and 600 people. All beach events that are not considered special events would be considered normal events and subject to the 4.7 events per day on average limitation. Beach events would be planned and scheduled in coordination with the use of the ballroom facilities and would be managed in a fashion whereby the combined use of the ballroom and beach use area would not exceed the maximum attendance of 600 for special events or maximum attendance of 500 for normal events.

### **Restaurant Use**

Capacity for the restaurants would remain the same as currently permitted. A total of 258 seats would be spread out between the two new restaurants and the beach bar/snack house.

### **Spa Use**

As under the Schragger Plan, a total of 15 non-guests per day are proposed to be able to use the spa facilities.

## **Retail Use**

The proposed hours of the retail stores would be from 7:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m.

## **Number of Employees**

There would be approximately 102 full time, part-time, seasonal, and permanent employees under the proposed plan on-site at any given time. The total number of people employed by the hotel would be 204.

## **Parking**

In the Caruso proposal, 551 parking spaces would be provided on site; 511 spaces would be provided in a two level underground parking deck and the rest in surface parking near the main entrance and behind the oceanfront buildings and along Miramar Avenue. Additionally, 68 public spaces are proposed along South Jameson Lane and Eucalyptus Lane which equates to a net increase of 2 spaces over the Schragger Plan (under the Schragger Plan and the Caruso Plan, 16 public spaces were assumed to be available on the north side of South Jameson Lane, however, the area is posted “No Parking,” therefore, these spaces are not available). All public spaces would be labeled for “Public Use” to ensure exclusive public use and deter hotel guest use.

Parking on the hotel grounds would be shared, with a single space serving several different uses at different times during the day; also referred to as conjunctive uses. Parking calculations prepared by ATE, a licensed traffic engineer, for the proposed Caruso project indicate that the 551 spaces proposed to be provided at the site would accommodate the project’s peak summertime demands when peak events with up to 600 guests are held (516 peak afternoon demand, 499 peak evening demand). Nevertheless, a modification to the parking requirement is being requested for the Caruso plan as the proposed number of spaces is short of the ordinance requirement (see Table 4 below).

Hotel parking in the Caruso plan would be provided by valet service. Overnight guests would use the hotels’ full valet service, dropping off and picking up their vehicles at the valet stand located at the hotel lobby and would be taken to their rooms by a golf cart or on foot. All guests would be informed that the street parking spaces along South Jameson Lane and the Eucalyptus Lane are public and not available for hotel guest use. Public spaces would be labeled as such to ensure public as opposed to hotel guest utilization of spaces. Guests staying in rooms adjacent to the ocean front rooms would have designated surface parking areas and would have the option of parking near their rooms if these spots are available.

Parking associated with ballroom functions would occur in the parking structure. The Miramar Parking Plan details the event scenarios (300- and 600-person events), each of which uses valet parking. Tandem parking was included in the previously approved Schragger plan and would be retained in the current plan to maximize the efficiency of the underground parking structure and remove as much surface parking as possible from the site. In the revised plan, there would be a separate valet service area that would serve both the ballroom and the Beach and Tennis Club and would be accessed from the private road. The valet service would park these cars in the underground parking lot, accessed through a separate entrance within the property. Public patrons of the restaurant, spa, beach-bar or other visitors to the site would have the option of using the lobby valet service. Hotel employees would not be charged for parking.

## **Public Access to the Beach and Public Use of the Hotel Site**

Under the previous ownerships, the Miramar Hotel did not welcome members of the public entering the grounds or using the beach in front of the boardwalk. The current application submittal package states that the applicant is committed to enhancing the public's interest in visiting the Miramar and it is one of the project objectives.

Public access to beaches within the vicinity of the Miramar Hotel is provided through several vertical and lateral access points. The hotel owner provides a 20-foot recorded lateral easement to the public over the hotel's full beach frontage. The southern boundary of the public lateral easement is the water's edge; as a result, the 20 foot lateral easement varies in location with the change in tide line. There is existing public vertical access from Eucalyptus Lane about 500 feet west of the Miramar stairs to the beach, as well as from Posilipo Lane, located approximately 1,500 feet to the east.

The proposed project would ensure that there would be 68 dedicated public parking spaces on Eucalyptus Lane and South Jameson Lane. Under the Schragger Plan, an additional 16 spaces along the north side of Jameson were discussed, however, this area is posted for "No Parking" and therefore these spaces cannot be counted. (As a result, the Schragger plan included a total of 66 parking spaces located along South Jameson Lane, but unlike the proposed project, the spaces were not dedicated to public use and would have been used conjunctively by the hotel.) The proposed hotel includes a commitment for the dedication of two public access easements through the site. The easements would provide access across the Miramar Hotel property along the curving pathway (which would also serve as the fire access lane) replacing the vacated portion of Miramar Avenue and connecting the public to the remaining portion of Miramar Avenue for easy access to Eucalyptus Lane. Along this fire access lane, coastal access signs would be posted clearly directing people to Miramar Avenue and ultimately to the beach area (see "Signs and Lighting" above). In addition, public access to the beach would be provided down the private road between the Main Building and Ballroom through the property and toward the beach bar area where there would be a stairway to the beach as an additional way to access the beach. Legal descriptions for the proposed easements have been provided to the County.

Maintaining the privacy of hotel guests is a priority and the hotel would reserve areas and amenities for use only by its guests and members of the Beach and Tennis Club (i.e., swimming pools, tennis courts, and the Beach and Tennis Club building), however, the public would have access to much more of the property than when it was previously operated. As a commercial, visitor-serving operation, use by the public and the associated business that it generates is viewed as an integral part of the hotel operation. All of the restaurants would be available for use by the public as well as guests. There would be up to 15 non-guest reservations per day available at the spa, and the small retail area at the front of the property would be available for public use.

The public would also be able to access the boardwalk and the beach bar/snackhouse from the beach (access to the boardwalk was prohibited by pre-Schragger owners). There would also be restrooms near the beach that would be available to the public, as well as showers available to the public adjacent to the oceanfront buildings.

### **Hotel Beach Use**

On a portion of the sandy beach section of the property ("hotel beach use area"), running along the

entire width of the Miramar Hotel beach frontage and to a line approximately 60 feet seaward of the existing boardwalk, subject to adjustment in accordance with the public access agreement<sup>3</sup>, the hotel owner would provide a number of services to its hotel guests and visitors. In the hotel beach use area, the hotel may serve limited food and beverages to hotel guests during the hours of operation of the beach bar. Food and beverage service would be available to non-guests by going to the beach bar and snack house on the boardwalk.

The hotel may place non-permanent items such as chairs, umbrellas, and other non-motorized beach-related recreation items (inflatable rafts, boogie boards, etc.) out for hotel guests within the hotel beach use area, outside of the public's lateral access area, which would be removed nightly; these non-permanent items would only be placed out in response to guest requests.

Hotel events in the hotel beach use area would include, but would not be limited to, wedding ceremonies, commitment ceremonies, cocktail parties, or other small gatherings and would be limited to no more than 30 per year, for no more than 60 minutes per event, and with no more than 100 people. During hotel events on the beach, non-permanent items such as chairs, small tents, rope barriers, and small signs may be put up immediately before the event and removed promptly afterwards. Non-amplified music would be allowed on the beach during these events, (i.e., guitars, small string trios or quartets, etc.).

During a hotel event on the beach, part of the hotel beach use area would be limited to use by the hotel. However, hotel operations would at no time infringe on the lateral public easement as described in the dedication referenced above.

The beach in front of the resort would be kept clean by hotel staff for the enjoyment of hotel guests and the public. The resort and bungalow's beach area would be kept clean throughout the day by hotel staff, and would be cleaned thoroughly each evening.

**Amplified Music** No outdoor amplification of music or voice is proposed as part of the project.

---

<sup>3</sup> Described in a dedication by William P. Gawzner and June Outhwaite dated July 21<sup>st</sup> 1975 (Recorded October 28, 1975, Book 2591, Page 617).

## COMPARISON OF PROPOSED REVISIONS WITH THE APPROVED SCHRAGER PLAN

Table 2-5 below provides a comparison of the proposed Caruso Plan with the original Schragger Plan approved in 2000 (99-DP-001, 99-CP-002, and 00-CP-032).

**Table 2-5  
Comparison of the Proposed Caruso Plan with the Approved Schragger Plan**

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Approved Plan under 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/ 00-CP-032<sup>1</sup> (Schragger Plan)</b>	<b>Proposed Caruso Plan</b>
<b>STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT (EXCLUDING PAVING) (NET FLOOR AREAS IN SQUARE FEET [SF])</b>		
Ballroom/Employee Dwellings (or Banquet Hall/Parking Structure under Schragger Plan)	13,805 SF	13,331 SF
Main Building/Restaurant (or Lobby under Schragger Plan)	6,076 SF	37,759 SF
Pool Bar/Restaurant (or Restaurant under Schragger Plan)	12,080 SF	667 SF
Beach Bar	1,033 SF	Square footage included in Oceanfront Building 02
Spa	8,334 SF	10,313 SF
Beach and Tennis Club	included in Spa	1,482 SF
Retail	896 SF (new tennis shop)	3,902 SF
Guestrooms (& employee housing in Schragger Plan)	92,583 SF	127,314 SF
Misc. Buildings	6,133 SF	None
<b>Total Net Floor Area</b>	<b>137,711 SF</b> (=140,940 SF - 3,229 SF basement area used for storage)	<b>169,937 SF</b> (31,226 SF than Schragger Plan)
<b>Total Net Lot Area</b>	<b>568,304 SF (13.05 acres)</b>	<b>686,977 SF (15.77 acres)</b>
<b>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>0.242</b>	<b>0.2474</b>
<b>Existing Net Floor Area</b>	<b>127,827 SF</b>	<b>97,382 SF</b> (diner, lobby, convention center already demolished)
<b>Net Floor Area to be Demolished</b>	<b>34,603 SF</b>	<b>97,382 SF</b> (+62,779 SF than Schragger Plan)
<b>New Net Floor Area to be Constructed (not counting renovation of existing structures)</b>	<b>46,979 SF</b>	<b>169,937 SF</b> (+123,171 SF than Schragger Plan)

Project Component	Approved Plan under 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/ 00-CP-032 <sup>1</sup> (Schrager Plan)	Proposed Caruso Plan
Height modifications requested	None	49.0' height of Main Building
Setback modifications requested	Encroachments into all setbacks except for eastern side yard setbacks West: All guestrooms encroach approximately 45' into the required 50' setback from the property line at the Church. East: All setbacks are met. North: Lanai A, the eight new cottages and the banquet hall encroach 10' into the required 50' from the centerline of South Jameson. South: The Studio, Grey, Palomita and Bamboo cottages encroach up to 15 feet into the required 20' setback from the Miramar Avenue right of way, oceanfront guestroom encroach <10' into the 10' setback from the UPRR property line.	Same as Schrager Plan <u>West:</u> All guestrooms encroach approx. 40' into the 50' setback from the property line; Spa encroaches approx. 10' into the 50' setback from the centerline of Eucalyptus <u>East:</u> All setbacks are met <u>North:</u> Main Bldg. encroaches approx. 10' into 20' setback from the right-of-way & 20' into 50' setback from the centerline of South Jameson; all other buildings encroach approx. 10' into 50' setback from centerline of South Jameson <u>South:</u> Guestrooms along east-west segment of Miramar Avenue encroach up to 20' into the 20' setback from the property line and 30' into the 50' setback from the centerline of Miramar Ave.; Oceanfront guestrooms encroach <10' into the 10' setback from the UPRR property line.
<b>PARKING</b>		
<b>Public</b>		
South side of South Jameson	44	58
North side of South Jameson	16 spaces not factored in*	16*
North-south segment of Miramar Avenue	24 spaces not factored in	0
Eucalyptus Lane	0	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b> (44 factored +38 present but not factored in = 82; 82-16 in "No Parking" zone= 66 legitimate public parking spaces)	<b>68</b> (84-16 in "No Parking" zone = 68 legitimate public parking spaces)
<b>For Hotel</b>		
Parking structure	301	511
Onsite	115	40
Overflow on tennis courts	28	28
<b>Total</b>	<b>416 + 28 overflow spaces</b>	<b>551 + 28 overflow spaces</b>

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Approved Plan under 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/ 00-CP-032<sup>1</sup> (Schrager Plan)</b>	<b>Proposed Caruso Plan</b>
<b>Spaces Required by Ordinance</b>		
<b>Hotels/Motels</b>		
1 space per guest room	213	209
1 space per 5 employees	20 (100 employees)	7 (35 employees)
<b>Restaurant</b>		
1 space per 300 SF of patron space (indoor + outdoor)	13 (3,804 SF)	6 (270 SF net indoors + 1461 SF outdoors=1,731 SF)
1 space per 2 employees	10 (20 employees)	10 (20 employees)
<b>Beach bar</b>		
1 space per 300 SF of patron space (indoor + outdoor)	3 (876 SF)	2 (108 SF net indoors + 361 SF outdoors = 469 SF)
1 space per 2 employees	3 (5 employees)	2 (3 employees)
<b>Spa facility</b>		
1 space per 300 SF of gross area	38 (11,190 SF gross)	52 (15,575 SF gross)
<b>Tennis</b>		
1.5 per court	5 (3 courts)	3 (2 courts)
<b>Assembly space (for events + library)</b>		
1 space per 30 SF of assembly space	290 (8,689 SF incl. a library)	282 (8,467 SF, no library proposed)
<b>Employee Dwellings</b>		
1 per each dwelling unit (for one-bedroom units)	4	4
<b>Restaurant in Main Building</b>		
1 space per 300 SF of patron space (indoor + outdoor)	0	16 (3,965 SF net indoors + 947 SF outdoors = 4,912 SF)
1 space per 2 employees	0	21 (42 employees)
<b>Beach and Tennis Club</b>		
1 space per 30 SF of assembly space	0	49 (1,482 SF)
<b>Retail</b>		
1 space per 500 SF of gross floor area	0 (896 SF tennis shop not counted in approved plan)	8 (3,902 SF)
<b>Total no. of req'd spaces</b>	<b>599</b>	<b>671</b>
<b>No. of spaces short of ordinance requirements</b>	<b>183 (not counting overflow parking)</b>	<b>120 (not counting overflow parking)</b>

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Approved Plan under 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/ 00-CP-032<sup>1</sup> (Schrager Plan)</b>	<b>Proposed Caruso Plan</b>
<b>SITE IMPROVEMENTS</b>		
Utilities replaced	Replace electrical lines; use of existing water well for landscape irrigation	Replace sewer, water, & electrical lines
Repairs to seawall proposed	No	Yes
Lighting	No night lighting of tennis courts or of the beach.	Night lighting of the tennis courts and night lighting of the boardwalk.
Tree removal or relocation	Removed: 1 sycamore & 189 non-natives Relocated: 3 coast live oaks and 55 non-natives Total: 4 natives & 244 non-natives	Removed: 40 non-natives Relocated: 3 sycamores, 9 oaks, & 41 non-natives Total: 12 natives & 81 non-natives
Landscaping (acres)	6.13	5.33
Paving (acres)	2.028 (1.57 acres paving + 0.458 acre of paving associated with the north-south segment of Miramar Avenue still present)	5.79 (1.78 acres asphalt + 4.01 acres of hardscape such as pathways)
Grading	10,000 cy of cut; 6,000 cy of fill; & 4,000 cy of export	36,300 cy of cut; 46,100 cy of fill; & 10,000 cy of import
Duration of construction	15 months	18 to 22 months
No. of truck trips	375 to 400 (for hauling dirt over 12 weeks) + truck trips for equipment delivery etc. during entire duration of construction	1,000 (over a haul period of 12 to 21 days) + truck trips for equipment delivery etc. during entire duration of construction
No. of construction workers	125	250
<b>OPERATION</b>		
No. of guestrooms (“keys”)	213	204
No. of employees (full time, part-time, temporary & permanent)	125	102 (approximate no. of employees on site at any given time)
No. of employee dwellings	4	4
Assembly area for events (SF)	8,672 SF	8,467 SF
No. of assembly seats (indoors and outdoors)	600	600
No. of onsite events	4.7 events per day for “normal” events of 500 people + 12 “special events” per year of 600 people + 30 weddings onsite per year of 50 to 200 people	Same as Schrager Plan, except now, beach events count towards the size limit of 500 for normal or 600 for special events

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Approved Plan under 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/00-CP-032<sup>1</sup> (Schrager Plan)</b>	<b>Proposed Caruso Plan</b>
No. of beach events	12 weddings on the beach per year of 50 people for 30 minutes	30 weddings on the beach per year of 100 people for 60 minutes (beach events now count towards the size limits on normal and special events instead of being in addition to these events)
Event hours	7 am to 1 am (outdoor activities to conclude by 10:30 pm)	Same as Schrager Plan
Total no. of restaurant seats (indoors)	258	258
Total no. of restaurant seats (outdoors)	see above (no. combined for indoor & outdoor seats)	see above (no. combined for indoor & outdoor seats)
Hours of operation of restaurant	6:30 am to 11 pm (bar closes at 2 am)	Same as Schrager Plan
Hours of operation of beach bar/snack house	9:30 am to 12 am (midnight)	Same as Schrager Plan
Beach and Tennis Club membership	140	300
Spa use by non-guests	13-15 non-guests/day	15 non-guests/day
Hours of operation of spa	9 am to 9 pm	Same as Schrager Plan
Public access through Miramar to the beach	Public access to the beach required by condition of approval along a new promenade running through the center of Miramar from the lobby to the beach. No new public access easements required.	Dedicated public access easements to east-west segment of Miramar Avenue and ultimately to the beach at the end of Eucalyptus Lane to offset the abandonment of the north-south segment of Miramar Avenue, and on the private road through the property to the beach bar opening to the beach.
Public access signs	“No Trespassing” signs removed; 3 new coastal access signs installed on the boundaries of the Miramar property directing public to the beach (one outside hotel entrance, one at intersection of South Jameson and private driveway to the banquet hall, and one at the 90-degree bend in Miramar Avenue)	“No Trespassing” signs removed; new signs installed on the boundaries of the Miramar property and dedicated public access easements along the fire access lane directing the public to the beach, and along the private road through the property directing the public to the beach through the beach bar area.

Notes:

\* Both the Schrager Plan and the Caruso Plan discuss 16 parallel parking spaces on the north side South Jameson Lane, however, this area is currently posted for “No Parking,” therefore, they cannot be counted as actual available parking spaces to the public.

1. The Approved Schrager Plan (Case Nos. 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/00-CP-032) was amended twice under Case Nos. 99-DP-001 AM01/99-CP-002 AM01 (00-CP-032 unchanged) (in July 2000) and 02AMD-00000-00007/02AMD-00000-00008/02CUP-00000-00030 (in July 2002). These amendments both resulted in reductions in the project and/or changes that resulted in a negligible change in environmental impacts. Therefore, the baseline for the environmental impact analysis of the Caruso Plan is based on a comparison against the worst-case Approved Plan under the original case nos. 99-DP-001/99-CP-002/00-CP-032.

2. Floor Area Ratio = Net Floor Area/Net Lot Area

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A detailed description of the environmental setting of the site is provided in Negative Declaration 00-ND-003, and summarized below.

The project site lies within an area currently developed as a resort hotel which has been shut down since 2000, with approximately 97,382 square feet of existing structures. Surrounding uses are: residences (to the east and west), church (to the west), and transportation corridor (Highway 101 [to the north] and railroad [to the south]). Farmland at the site was converted over a period of years, beginning in the late 1880s, to the current hotel use; the site has not been farmed for many years. Sewer and water lines currently exist on the site.

The entire subject property has been previously developed and contains several native trees (including large native sycamores) and many ornamental plantings (although much of the landscaping was removed post-2000 by the past owner). The eastern property line of the Miramar Hotel site is within the former riparian corridor of Oak Creek, as indicated by the location of remnant western sycamore trees offsite to the east. A mature hedge of *Myoporum* and *Pittosporum*, both common non-native plants often grown for screening, occurs offsite against the fence that delineates the eastern property boundary. One sycamore is located at the intersection of the eastern property line with South Jameson Lane and one multi-stemmed sycamore is located within the eastern fence line south of South Jameson Lane.

A significant portion of the Miramar site is within the 100-year floodplain of Oak Creek, which is located just east of the property boundary. The southern part of the site, north of the train tracks, has been known to flood during major storm events, likely as a result of ponding water backed up behind an offsite railroad culvert. In 1995, this portion of the site flooded, depositing in some locations up to one foot of silt and some building damage occurred.

The Miramar Hotel site is a nearly flat to moderately sloping site with gradients generally to the south and southeast. Elevations range from a high of  $\pm 42$  feet above sea level near the northwest corner of the property to sea level along the southern edge of the property. Surface drainage on the parcel is generally from the northwest to the southeast with minor variations depending on the local topographic configuration. Some areas have been recontoured by past grading activities that have modified some of these drainage patterns. Average slopes on the property range from 1.75 to 5.2 percent. The entire site is underlain by Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 2 to 9 percent slope series. This soil is characterized by medium runoff and moderate erosion hazard. Permeability is moderate.

The stratigraphic profile of the Miramar site is represented by a series of relatively young (Pleistocene age) sediments composed mainly of conglomerate, sand, silt, and clay. The entire project site is underlain by unconsolidated alluvial materials to a depth of approximately 200 to 250 feet. Most of the underlying strata are composed of poorly sorted, interbedded alluvial materials dominated by gravels, cobbles, and sandy clays.

The project site overlies the southern edge of the Montecito Groundwater Basin and is served by the Montecito Water District. An existing well is located near the eastern property boundary and was used as a supplemental water source for irrigation and laundry. Past measurement of the ground water level within this water well for the Schragger Plan indicates that the top of the water

table is located approximately six feet below ground level. Because the well is located in a low-lying area on the property, the top of the water table elsewhere on the property generally is estimated to be at a greater depth (>6 ft.) below the ground surface. Historical water demand for irrigation and laundry use was estimated by the applicant to be 14 acre feet per year (AFY).

The existing Miramar Hotel structures limit views to the ocean from Highway 101. Views toward the ocean from North Jameson Lane (north of Highway 101) also are blocked by intervening topography and landscaping. There is a limited view of the ocean at the existing main driveway to the Miramar, off of South Jameson Lane. Here, the ocean can be seen by looking down the driveway between the two eastern-most Oceanfront units along the beach. This view is limited in that the two buildings through which the ocean is visible are only 20 feet apart. The Santa Ynez Mountains are visible from the railroad tracks and beach in the southern portion of the site.

Environmental documentation on file at the Archaeological Inventory, South Central Coast Archaeological Information Center, University of California, Santa Barbara indicates that two archaeological sites, CA-SBA-18 and CA-SBA-19, are located in the project area and were recorded over 70 years ago. Previous investigations have recorded CA-SBA-19 as adjacent to the western boundary of the Miramar Hotel complex and possibly intruding into the hotel area west of Miramar Avenue. CA-SBA-18 was previously noted to occur northwest of the existing hotel complex in the vicinity of Highway 101. For reasons not made clear in the literature, the boundary of CA-SBA-18 was extended at some time in the past to include the central portion of the hotel complex and to overlap the boundary of CA-SBA-19. In addition, several existing buildings onsite are considered historical resources (as discussed further in Section 4.0 below).

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

### **4.1 Historic Resources**

#### **4.1.1 Setting**

##### **4.1.1.1 Regulatory Setting**

Pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript can be deemed an “historical resource” if it (1) is listed or eligible to be listed on the California Register of Historical Resources, (2) is included in a local register of historical resources (i.e., considered a County Historic Landmark or Place of Historic Merit), or (3) is determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California based on substantial evidence and in light of the whole record, as stated specifically below:

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines states:

- (a) *For the purposes of this section, the term “historical resources” shall include the following:*
  - (1) *A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historic Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et*

*seq.*).

- (2) *A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.*
  
- (3) *Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:*
  - (A) *Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;*
  - (B) *Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;*
  - (C) *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or*
  - (D) *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*
  
- (4) *The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.*

Furthermore, as local lead CEQA agency on the proposed Miramar project, the County of Santa Barbara's Planning and Development Department has further determined what is locally defined as a "historical resource" in the County's Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (page 61) which states:

*Any structure 50 years or older is considered potentially significant and shall be subjected to the following criteria:*

*A significant resource a) possesses integrity of location, design, workmanship, material,*

*and/or setting; b) is at least fifty years old<sup>4</sup>; and c) demonstrates one or more of the following:*

- 1) Is associated with an event, movement, organization, or person that/who has made an important contribution to the community<sup>5</sup>, state, or nation;*
- 2) Was designed or built by an architect, engineer, builder, artists, or other designer who has made an important contribution to the community, state, or nation;*
- 3) Is associated with a particular architectural style or building type important to the community, state, or nation;*
- 4) Embodies elements demonstrating a) outstanding attention to design, detail, craftsmanship, or b) outstanding use of a particular structural material, surface material, or method of construction or technology;*
- 5) Is associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or social group, or to the community-at-large;*
- 6) Illustrates broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history;*
- 7) Is a feature<sup>6</sup> or a cluster of features which convey a sense of time and place that is important to the community, state, or nation;*
- 8) Is able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to the scholarly study of history, historical archaeology, ethnography, folklore, or cultural geography.*

*The level of significance for these criteria are established by rating each significance attribute of the resource (detailed below) according to the following scale:*

*E = exceptional  
3 = high; very good  
2 = good  
1 = little*

*The following guidelines shall govern the assignment of significance level ratings for each aspect:*

#### *Integrity*

*E = pristine integrity in all 5 categories  
3 = good integrity in at least 3 categories*

---

<sup>4</sup> A historic resource less than fifty years old may be considered significant if it is unique or possesses extraordinary elements of integrity, design, construction, or association.

<sup>5</sup> Community is defined as a neighborhood, town, city or district.

<sup>6</sup> A feature may be defined as a structure, building, structural element, object, tree, garden, etc.

2 = good integrity in at least 1 category  
1 = fair to poor integrity in all categories

*Integrity means that the resource retains the essential qualities of its historic character. These guidelines recognize five components of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, and workmanship.*

Integrity of location means that the resource remains at its original location.

Integrity of design, strictly applied, means that the resource accurately reflects its original plan. However, it is rare to find intact structures that have never undergone change. Thus, design integrity often infers that the components of the structure as a whole reflect design compatibility. For example, building additions that accurately incorporate design elements found in the original structure (e.g., roof pitch and covering, window placement and form, or exterior wall treatment) would not compromise integrity of design.

Integrity of setting means that buildings, structures, or features associated with a later development period have not intruded upon the surrounding area to the extent that the original context is lost. For instance, an old barn now in the midst of suburban residential development might retain integrity of setting if the immediately surrounding area still reflects a rural setting (e.g., open space, fencing, water troughs, etc.).

Integrity of materials means that the physical elements present during the historic period are still present or, if materials have been replaced, the replacement(s) have been based on the original. For instance, a Victorian style wood-frame dwelling that has been covered with stucco has lost its integrity of materials. Conversely, an adobe wall that has been reconstructed with similar adobe mud, as opposed to adobe-simulate concrete, would retain its integrity of materials.

Integrity of workmanship means that the original character of construction details is still present. These elements cannot have deteriorated or been disturbed to the extent that their value as examples of craftsmanship has been lost. For example, if the surface of a carved sandstone gate post has been seriously eroded, the feature will have lost much of its integrity of workmanship because its ability to provide information concerning older designs and techniques of stonecarving has been lost. Conversely, a steel superstructure may hide unreinforced brick walls of an old commercial building which can provide a valuable record of 19th century solid-wall brick construction techniques.

Age

E = 125 years old or older  
3 = 100 " " " "  
2 = 75 " " " "  
1 = 50 " " " "

An E designation is based on the premise that any manmade feature which survives for 125 years or more is intrinsically exceptional and therefore subject to special consideration by virtue of its age, irrespective of other ratings.

Association with an Event, Movement, Organization, or Person Important to the Community, State or Nation

- E = resource has a central or continuous association with an event. . .*
- 3 = resource has a direct association with. . .*
- 2 = resource has an indirect association with. . .*
- 1 = resource has a distant association with. . .*

*The significance of the event, movement, organization, or person must be established before this criterion is applied.*

Designer

- E = a designer who has made important contributions to the community and to the state or nation*
- 3 = a designer who has made important contributions to the community*
- 2 = an "attributed to" designer who has made important contributions to the community*
- 1 = the designer is unknown.*

*This significance attribute focuses on overall designer contributions rather than on the aesthetic merits of the design itself.*

Architectural Style or Building Type

- E = retains all the attributes associated with its style or type or is a good example of its style or type if few survive*
- 3 = retains most of the attributes associated with its style or type or is remodeled in a recognizable style that does not destroy the original style or type*
- 2 = retains few, but sufficient attributes associated with its style or type*
- 1 = undecipherable as a style or type or is one of many examples of its style or type*

*Vernacular building types and industrial architecture are equal in resource value to well-defined and studied architectural styles.*

Construction materials

- E = outstanding or very early example if few survive*
- 3 = outstanding or very early example if many survive; good example if few survive*
- 2 = good example if there are many examples of any material(s) and/or method(s) not generally in current use*
- 1 = common example of any method(s) and/or material(s)*

*Examples of outstanding construction methods or structural materials include those which successfully address challenging structural problems, or which are treated as visible elements that contribute significantly to the resource's overall design quality, or which exhibit fine craftsmanship.*

### Traditional Lifeways

- E = resource has a central association with a tradition spanning three or more generations*
- 3 = resource has a direct association with a tradition spanning three or more generations*
- 2 = resource has a direct association with a tradition spanning two generations or an indirect association with a tradition spanning two or more generations*
- 1 = resource has a distant association with a tradition spanning two or more generations*

*Traditional lifeways, as used here, pertain to cultural patterns which have attained antiquity commensurate with the age requirement to which tangible resources are held. A central association ("E" rating) implies a quality of uniqueness between the resource and the tradition.*

### Association with Broad Themes of Local, State, or National History.

- E = resource has a central association with theme(s)*
- 3 = resource has a direct association with theme(s)*
- 2 = resource has an indirect association with theme(s)*
- 1 = resource has a distant association with theme(s)*

*The theme and its significance must be established before this criterion is applied. A helpful measure of this criterion is to consider how useful the resource would be for teaching or writing about cultural history.*

### Conveys Important Sense of Time and Place

- E = an individual resource or a unified urban or rural landscape which defines a period of 100 or more years ago*
- 3 = an individual resource or a unified urban or rural landscape which defines a period of 75 or more years ago*
- 2 = an individual resource or a unified urban or rural landscape which defines a period of 50 or more years ago*
- 1 = a unified urban or rural landscape which is less than 50 years old*

*A useful measure of this criterion is to consider whether the resource(s) has/have a prominence which contributes to a historic, visual, or environmental continuity. Would a typical resident of the area notice the resource(s) and remember it/them?*

### Ability to Yield Important Information

*This attribute of significance is not quantifiable. Generally, when this criterion is invoked, it is an indication that the resource under study requires further examination by a professional from a related discipline. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon the historical specialist to consider what qualities of the resource or the project area might enable it to yield information that is important to another scholarly discipline.*

*For instance, the presence of building foundations or of a well, privy, trash pit, drain, sump, or cistern indicates that the project area may possess historic archaeological research potential. Similarly, is there archival evidence (maps, written documents, etc.) that the project area was occupied before or during some transitional period, either naturally occurring (e.g., fire, flood, drought, or earthquake) or culturally induced (e.g., highway or city street construction, the laying of water or sewer mains, or new building construction)? As a corollary, is there evidence that these earlier features may have survived to the present as subsurface resources?*

*In a different vein, is there evidence, gained through archival research, site inspection, or consultation with community groups or individuals, that the project area has a tangible or intangible quality of tradition that is important to an identifiable cultural group? For instance, there might be evidence that Italian immigrant stonemasons had cut stone from a sandstone outcropping occurring in the project area or that the area might be the site of a legendary event. If so, even if the data are sufficient, to determine a significance level under C-5, it would be appropriate to discuss additional research potential here.*

*If a cultural resource is determined not to be "important", both the resource and the effect on it shall be noted in the project file Initial Study or EIR but need not be considered further in the CEQA process. The project applicant is responsible for the complete funding of Phase 2 investigations. Phase 2 investigations are not limited by cost; however, costs are limited to providing services defined in scopes of work which are developed by DER.*

#### **4.1.1.2 Historical Resources at the Miramar**

Table 4-1 below lists all of the structures existing on the Miramar property at the time of approval of the Schragger Plan and indicates their current status (i.e., existing or demolished). For the Schragger Plan, Preservation Planning Associates (PPA) prepared a historic resources report for the project in 1999, which was peer reviewed by San Buenaventura Research Associates and amended several times in 1999 and 2000. Following the County’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, PPA determined that many of the buildings on the Miramar property, that were 50 years or older at the time of PPA’s report, are historical resources (see Table 4-1). The Oceanfront Rooms, Lanai Rooms, and Poolside Rooms were not studied completely by PPA following the County’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* because they were not 50 years old or older at the time of the study and PPA determined that they were not “unique or possess extraordinary elements of integrity, design, construction, or association” to warrant full investigation of their historical significance using the County’s thresholds.

**Table 4-1  
Existing Historic Structures at the time of approval of the Schragger Plan**

<b>Structure name</b>	<b>Year constructed<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Structure/ feature considered historically significant under Schragger Plan?</b>	<b>Current status</b>
<b>Cottages</b>			
Matilija	Pre. 1904	No	Existing
Sea Foam	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Cherokee	Pre-1904	Yes	Existing

Honeysuckle	Pre-1904	Yes	Existing
Rose	Pre-1904	Yes	Existing
Aralia	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Marguerita	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Oaks	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Arroyo	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Fairview	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Littlefield	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Pinecroft	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Ivy	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Sea Wave	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Sycamore	1900s	Yes	Existing
Sunnyside	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Bamboo	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Palomita	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Serena	1900s	Yes	Existing
Fuchsia	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Studio	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Doll House	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Las Tunas	1946	Yes	Existing
La Paz	1946	Yes	Existing
Los Pinos	1946	Yes	Existing
La Cumbre	1946	Yes	Existing
Las Flores	1946	Yes	Existing
Los Positos	1946	Yes	Existing
Los Olivos	1946	Yes	Existing
Pine	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Outlook	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Ocean View	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Magnolia	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Gray	1900s	Yes	Existing
<b>Other Buildings</b>			
Maintenance Building	1924	Yes	Existing
Storage (tool shed)	1940s	Yes	Existing
Housekeeping	1904	Yes	Existing
Linen Building	1924	Yes	Existing
Poolhouse	1941	Yes	Photodocumented & Demolished
Convention Hall	1920s	No	Demolished
Main Building (aka "Dining Commons")	1940	No	Demolished
Garden Rooms	1940s-1954	No	Existing
Two Garages	1940s & 1970s	No	Existing

<b>Structure name</b>	<b>Year constructed<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Structure/ feature considered historically significant under Schragger Plan?</b>	<b>Current status</b>
Poolside Rooms	1954	Not studied in 1998 because <50 years old <sup>1</sup>	Existing
Oceanfront Rooms	1962	Not studied in 1998 because <50 years old	Existing
Lanai Rooms	1964	Not studied in 1998 because <50 years old <sup>1</sup>	Existing
<b>Features</b>			
Miramar train depot	1904, 1980	Yes	Existing
“Miramar” neon roof sign	1941	Yes	Demolished but potentially retained in storage onsite
Neon pole sign	1941	Yes	Demolished but potentially retained in storage onsite
Sandstone caps with “Miramar” inscribed	ca. 1926 or earlier	Yes	Demolished but potentially retained in storage onsite
Kidney-shaped swimming pool	1941	Yes	Photodocumented & Demolished
Pullman car (2 of 2 “railroad cars”)	1974	Not studied in 1998 because <50 years old	Demolished
Diner (1 of 2 “railroad cars”)	1980	Not studied in 1998 because <50 years old	Demolished

Note:

<sup>1</sup>Slated for alteration or demolition under the Schragger Plan.

<sup>2</sup>Source: PPA 1999 as amended

### **Preservation Planning Associate’s (PPA) Analysis**

Table 4-2 summarizes PPA’s evaluation of the Miramar’s historical significance following the County’s criteria in Section 4.1.1.1 above.

**Table 4-2  
PPA’s Evaluation of Historical Significance of the Miramar**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Integrity	3
Age	2
Association	Excellent
Designer	1
Architectural Style or Building Type	3
Construction Materials	2
Traditional Lifeways	N/A
Associated with Broad Themes of Local, State, or National History	3
Conveys Important Sense of Time and Place	3
Ability to Yield Important Information	N/A

N/A Not analyzed by PPA.

PPA gave the Miramar Hotel a rating of 3 for integrity concluding that:

“The Miramar Hotel retains integrity of location, materials, and workmanship. The resort is in its original location. The majority of cottages retain integrity of materials; although they have been modified over the years, they retain the physical elements, such as shape, roof line, shingles, clapboard, and skirting boards that indicate their early twentieth century origins. The cottages also retain integrity of workmanship; their construction details, such as skirting boards, rafter tails, gable vents, and multi-paned windows remain.

The Miramar does not retain integrity of setting or design. Its original setting, with cottages arranged informally and surrounded by lawns, flowers and shrubs, has been destroyed in several areas by the 1960s intrusion of motel style units at the beach and on the west side of Miramar Avenue, and by the proliferation of paved parking lots. The areas that still retain integrity of setting are the central grouping of cottages and the western-most grouping of 1946 cottages. Additionally the curved entry road and Miramar Avenue remain of the original hardscape. The cottages do not retain integrity of design; some of them have non-compatible picture or louvered windows, and all of them have modern lattice-work railings and concrete non-skid surfaces on the decks and stairs.”

For buildings studied by PPA, PPA determined that they had low significance according to designer because the designer is unknown and the buildings were likely built by a carpenter using a pattern book. In terms of architectural style or building type, PPA states that the Miramar cottages were “Craftsman-style bungalows or vernacular houses with shingles or clapboard siding, bay windows with small multi-pane transoms, boxed eaves or broad open eaves with rafter tails, porches, hipped or gable roofs, and post and pier foundations with wood skirting. Although many of the cottages have been altered with picture windows, new porches and lattice railings, as an aggregate grouping, they retain most of the attributes associated with the vernacular cottages and their remodeling does not destroy their original vernacular type.” Finally, with respect to construction materials, PPA found that the cottages are a good example of the vernacular use of wood materials.

In terms of association with an event, movement, organization, or person important to the community, state or nation, PPA concluded that the Miramar Hotel had a “central or continuous association with the hotel and resort movement in Santa Barbara and Montecito during the Americanization period (1880-1915) and the Regional Period (1915-1945),” citing that the Miramar was the first tourist resort established in Montecito, the first cottage style resort, and the first resort to be close to and oriented towards the ocean. Regarding its association with broad themes of local, state, or national history, PPA concludes that the Miramar “is associated with the theme of tourism during the Americanization period (1880-1915) and the Regional Period (1915-1945).” PPA states that “the significant time period for the Miramar is from 1887, when the resort originated, to 1948, the fifty-year cut-off date for assessing significance according to County guidelines.” Finally, PPA concluded that the Miramar, “through its retention of its original cottages and mature landscaping,” conveys an important sense of time and place, by “defining a period existing 75 years ago, and with its additional changes to keep pace with tourist tastes, it also defines a period existing 50 years ago.” Specifically, PPA states “the significant elements of the Miramar Hotel property defining the tourism ethic of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century include the cottages (with the exception of “Matilija” that

has been so altered that it no longer retains integrity), the mature landscaping, and the sandstone gateposts with “Miramar” carved on them that are now part of the landscape design in the central section of the lawn. The significant elements of the Miramar Hotel property from 1939 to 1947, defining the style of auto tourism in the 1940s, include the color scheme of blue roofs and white walls, neon “Miramar” roof sign, and the neon pole sign near the junction of Eucalyptus and South Jameson Lanes.”

In the Negative Declaration prepared for the approved Schragger Plan (00-ND-03), County staff concurred that the structures and features identified in the PPA report as historically significant, are locally historically significant pursuant to Section 15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines and pursuant to the County’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*.

It also should be noted that PPA concluded that none of the structures or features studied in 1998 were eligible to be included on the National or California Register of Historical Resources (as Caltrans also concluded in a study conducted in 1991 on the property).

### **Kaplan Chen Kaplan’s (KCK) Analysis**

In July 2007, Caruso BSC Miramar, LLC (Caruso) submitted an application for the proposed Miramar Beach Resort and Bungalows project. With this submittal, Caruso submitted an updated historic resources report prepared by Kaplan Chen Kaplan (KCK) (2007), and County staff hired Post/Hazeltine to peer review the KCK report (Post/Hazeltine 2007). The KCK report concludes that none of the buildings at the Miramar property are historical resources. Post/Hazeltine’s peer review stated that KCK did not adequately substantiate these conclusions and furthermore, recommended that those buildings that were not 50 years old at the time of the PPA study, but are now 50 years old, should be studied now to determine if they are historical resources. Post/Hazeltine also recommended that the Miramar be evaluated for historical significance during the post-1948 period (i.e., Suburban Period [1945-1965]) which was not studied by PPA.

KCK amended their report in January 2008 in response to Post/Hazeltine’s comments, and Post/Hazeltine peer reviewed the amended report (Post/Hazeltine 2008a). KCK had studied those buildings that are now 50 years old or older, but again concluded that none of the buildings at the Miramar, including the newly studied buildings, are historical resources. In addition, KCK did a brief analysis of the Miramar’s historical significance during the post-1948 period. In Post/Hazeltine’s 2008a peer review, they again concluded that KCK did not adequately substantiate their conclusions and concluded that the analysis of the new buildings and analysis of the post-1948 period was incomplete.

As a result of Post/Hazeltine’s 2008a peer review, County staff hired Post/Hazeltine to complete the analysis of the new buildings and the post-1948 period. Where there are legitimate disagreements amongst experts (between PPA and KCK), it is the lead agency’s responsibility to choose their preferred analysis in light of the whole record. In this instance, County continues to concur with PPA’s original conclusions regarding the historical significance of those buildings that were studied by PPA, as documented in 00-ND-003. The support for this decision is provided below.

- First, in many parts of KCK’s analysis, KCK incorrectly implements the County’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual and therefore, does not adequately

substantiate their conclusions. Specifically, KCK concluded that the Miramar is not a significant historic resource from 1940 on, concluding that the “period of significance for the Miramar is only between 1887 and 1940.” However, KCK then proceeded to erroneously apply this conclusion to eliminate (or screen) most of the buildings as well as the neon roof sign and neon pole sign from consideration as historical resources, where the County’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual has no instructions for applying this approach. For example, when evaluating whether buildings retain integrity of location, KCK states that “If a structure was moved, it is considered to have integrity of location if it was moved during the period of historic significance established for the property” and “in analyzing the Miramar Hotel as a potential district of historic resources, it has ‘fair to poor’ integrity of location. While some of the elements of the Miramar Hotel site/district from the period of significance remain (the cottages), many major elements of the Miramar Hotel that contributed to its integrity of location during the period of significance are no longer in their original locations.”

- Furthermore, under integrity of materials, KCK states that “A property must retain the key exterior materials dating from the period of significance” and concludes that “the 1946 buildings...retain a good level of integrity of materials, however, these buildings do not date from the period of significance of the district and there is no basis for their designation as individually historically significant based on retention of original building materials or any other factors.” In addition, under the criterion no. 2 of the County thresholds above regarding designer, KCK concludes “The 1946 buildings...were constructed after the period of significance as were the 1954 Poolside Buildings...Both were designed by established Santa Barbara architects, and would be rated as ‘E’ as ‘designer who has made important contributions to the community’ if they contributed to the period for which the resource is historically significant (which, as noted, they do not).” Whereas, if KCK were to follow the County’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual correctly, a building that was constructed after “the period of significance” could still be considered historically significant by itself, for example if it was designed or built by an architect who has made an important contribution to the community (criterion no. 2 of the County thresholds above) or if it is associated with a particular architectural style or building type that was important to the community (criterion no. 3 of the County thresholds) etc. Many other examples of this erroneous approach exist.
- Furthermore, in multiple places in the report, the KCK report refers to the Miramar as a potential “historic district” and/or conducts the evaluation of historical significance based on whether the Miramar could be a historic district. A historic district has a very specific definition by the California Office of Preservation as follows: “Historic districts are unified geographic entities which contain a concentration of historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites unified historically, culturally, or architecturally. Historic districts are defined by precise geographic boundaries...” However, KCK does not outright state that they are conducting their analysis of whether the Miramar qualifies as a historic district rather than evaluating the historical significance of individual buildings or the site as a whole with respect to each of the County’s thresholds of significance listed above.
- Finally, KCK fails to discuss the historical significance of the various “out” buildings that remain on site and that were identified by PPA as historically significant including the maintenance building, Linen Building etc. as well as the sandstone caps which are

now described simply as “some piles of sandstone pieces remain on the site.”

There are three areas in the KCK report where their conclusions represent a legitimate disagreement with the conclusions of PPA, specifically with respect to their evaluation of integrity of location, materials, and workmanship of the cottages. PPA gave the Miramar an overall rating of 3 for integrity given PPA’s determination that the cottages had good integrity in at least 3 of the categories (integrity of location, materials, and workmanship). KCK on the other hand, gave the Miramar an overall rating of 1 for integrity, given their determination that the cottages had poor to fair integrity in all five categories. County staff, however, agree with PPA’s determination of integrity of materials, workmanship, and location of the cottages and disagree with KCK’s determination of integrity of the cottages for these categories as discussed below.

Specifically, regarding integrity of materials, PPA states “the majority of the cottages retain integrity of materials; although they have been modified over the years, they retain physical elements, such as shape, roof line, shingles, clapboard, and skirting boards that indicate their early twentieth century origins” whereas KCK states that because the majority of landscape materials have been removed, the cottages now have poor to fair integrity. Based on the County’s thresholds above, the integrity of materials “*means that the physical elements present during the historic period are still present or, if materials have been replaced, the replacement(s) have been based on the original.*” PPA concludes that a number of the physical elements of the structures themselves are still present and still represent their early twentieth century origins, regardless of whether the landscape materials have been removed. Therefore, the County continues to agree with PPA’s determination as documented in the Schragger ND.

Regarding integrity of workmanship of the cottages, PPA concludes that the construction details of the cottages, such as skirting boards, rafter tails, gable vents, and multi-paned windows remain and even KCK acknowledges that the cottages display a range of construction details...typical of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. KCK dismisses the integrity of workmanship by stating that “there are no details or construction techniques that are of exceptional workmanship or that appear to be the work of an artisan,” however, simply the fact that the construction details represent details typical of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century “*means that the original character of construction details is still present.*” Nothing in the County thresholds indicate that construction details must be of “exceptional workmanship” or “the work of an artisan” to retain integrity. Therefore, the County continues to agree with PPA’s determination as documented in the Schragger ND.

Regarding integrity of location, PPA does not evaluate the cottages on an individual basis, but concluded that the Miramar itself is in its original location. KCK states that because many of the cottages were moved around onsite, they do not retain integrity of location. The PPA report concludes however, that there has been a random pattern of cottage placement at the Miramar and proposed relocation of building under the Schragger Plan therefore “would not destroy the historic relationship between the buildings.” Simply the fact that the cottages have remained on the Miramar site, originally had a random placement on the entirety of the site, and would continue to have such placement when relocated, indicates that they retain good integrity of location. Therefore, the County continues to agree with PPA’s determination as documented in the Schragger ND.

The one conclusion made by KCK that County staff agree with, is regarding the integrity of the

historic landscaping on the site. KCK states that “PPA identified the mature landscaping as one of the two major elements of the Miramar Hotel (the other being the cottages) that ‘conveys an important sense of time and place.’...In the 1998 PPA report, the site description states that ‘the site is landscaped with mature palm trees, evergreens, cacti, lawns with pathways, and perennials.’ The reported noted that ‘the curved entry road and Miramar Avenue remain of the original hardscape.’ In the intervening years all the roads and pathways internal to the site, associated with garden plantings, as well as the paving, have been removed. Some bushes and trees remain, and some of these remaining trees have been boxed. The area with the most trees and landscaping remaining is along the public street, Miramar Avenue. Only remnants of bushes, perennials, and wildflowers remain on the Miramar property.” KCK concludes that “there has been a major loss in integrity for plant and landscape design materials” and PPA, KCK, and Post/Hazeltine (see below) conclude that the Miramar no longer retains integrity of setting primarily due to this loss. Therefore, the landscaping onsite was determined by KCK to no longer retain historical significance and County staff agree.

### **Post/Hazeltine’s Analysis**

Post/Hazeltine (2008b) completed the analysis of those buildings that were not 50 years old or older at the time of the PPA study but are now: specifically the Poolside Rooms and Garden Rooms. The Oceanfront Rooms and Lanai Rooms were also studied fully even though they are slightly less than 50 years old. In addition, Post/Hazeltine studied the historical significance of the Miramar Hotel during the post-1948 period, specifically from 1940 to 1965.

Post/Hazeltine concluded that during 1940 to 1965 the Miramar Hotel as a whole had a potentially significant association with the Regional Culture Period and Suburban Period, particularly as it relates to the growth and transformation of the region’s hospitality industry. However, Post/Hazeltine concludes that “while the property retained several important components relating to its post-1940 period of significance, including the cottages built in 1946, Poolside Rooms, Lanai and Oceanfront Rooms, other important components dating to this period of significance have been removed, including the Convention Center, Lobby/Dining Room (including the neon signage), and the swimming pools. Without these features, the resource no longer retains its integrity of design, setting, materials, or workmanship” during this time period.

In addition, individually, the Garden Rooms were found to retain their integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship, and setting, however they received low ranks for the other criteria (e.g., association with an important architect etc.). Therefore, these building were not determined to be individually historically significant. The Oceanfront Rooms and Lanai Rooms also retained integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship (but not setting), and again, they received low ranks for the other criteria and are not quite 50 years old. Therefore, these building were not determined to be individually historically significant. County staff concurs with this determination.

The Poolside Rooms, however, were found to retain their integrity of location, design, materials and workmanship (but not setting) and were found to be associated with an important architect on the local and state level, Lutah Maria Riggs, who was one of the leading architects practicing in Santa Barbara County between 1930 and 1980 and was one of the few successful woman architects during the first half of the twentieth century. Specifically, Lutah Maria Riggs only completed 3 commercial commissions and the Poolside Rooms are one of the few surviving examples of her commissions. Post/Hazeltine concluded that the Poolside Rooms not only meet

the County’s thresholds for historical significance, but that the Poolside Rooms are also eligible to be a Santa Barbara County Historic Landmark and are eligible to be included on the California Register of Historic Resources and on the National Register of Historic Places. County staff concurs with the Post/Hazeltine conclusions.

The Poolside Rooms have undergone a few alterations since their construction (the most significant being the partial demolition of a breezeway that connected the building with the adjoining Convention Center), but Post/Hazeltine concluded that they retain almost all of their character-defining features that identify their architectural type. Holmes Culley did not include this building in their structural conditions assessment report prepared for the proposed project (Holmes Culley 2007), therefore, their structural integrity was unknown at the time of preparation of the draft SEIR. Holmes Culley subsequently did assess the structural integrity of the Poolside Rooms in a report dated April 15, 2008. They conclude that these buildings would require significant rebuild for re-occupancy due to code compliance specifications. Mike Zimmer, the County’s Building Official reviewed the report and concurs with its conclusions (email dated June 11, 2008).

### Summary of Historic Buildings at the Miramar

Table 4-3 provides a final summary of all of the structures and features that the County considers locally historically significant at the Miramar Hotel. In addition, the Poolside Rooms are eligible to be a Santa Barbara County Historic Landmark and are eligible to be included on the California Register of Historic Resources and on the National Register of Historic Places.

**Table 4-3  
Current Existing Historic Structures**

Structure name	Year constructed <sup>2</sup>	Structure/feature considered historically significant under Schrage Plan?	Current status
<b>Cottages</b>			
Matilija	Pre. 1904	No	Existing
Sea Foam	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Cherokee	Pre-1904	Yes	Existing
Honeysuckle	Pre-1904	Yes	Existing
Rose	Pre-1904	Yes	Existing
Aralia	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Marguerita	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Oaks	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Arroyo	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Fairview	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Littlefield	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Pinecroft	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Ivy	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Sea Wave	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Sycamore	1900s	Yes	Existing
Sunnyside	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Bamboo	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Palomita	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Serena	1900s	Yes	Existing

<b>Structure name</b>	<b>Year constructed<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Structure/ feature considered historically significant under Schrager Plan?</b>	<b>Current status</b>
Fuchsia	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Studio	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Doll House	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Las Tunas	1946	Yes	Existing
La Paz	1946	Yes	Existing
Los Pinos	1946	Yes	Existing
La Cumbre	1946	Yes	Existing
Las Flores	1946	Yes	Existing
Los Positos	1946	Yes	Existing
Los Olivos	1946	Yes	Existing
Pine	1907-1918	Yes	Existing
Outlook	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Ocean View	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Magnolia	1918-1924	Yes	Existing
Gray	1900s	Yes	Existing
<b>Other Buildings</b>			
Maintenance Building	1924	Yes	Existing
Storage (tool shed)	1940s	Yes	Existing
Housekeeping	1904	Yes	Existing
Linen Building	1924	Yes	Existing
Poolhouse	1941	Yes	Photodocumented & Demolished
Convention Hall	1920s	No	Demolished
Main Building (aka "Dining Commons")	1940	No	Demolished
Garden Rooms	1940s-1954	No	Existing
Two Garages	1940s & 1970s	No	Existing
Poolside Rooms	1954	Yes	Existing
Oceanfront Rooms	1962	No	Existing
Lanai Rooms	1964	No	Existing
<b>Features</b>			
Miramar train depot	1904, 1980	Yes	Existing
"Miramar" neon roof sign	1941	Yes	Demolished but potentially retained in storage onsite
Neon pole sign	1941	Yes	Demolished but potentially retained in storage onsite
Sandstone caps with "Miramar" inscribed	ca. 1926 or earlier	Yes	Demolished but potentially retained in storage onsite
Kidney-shaped swimming pool	1941	Yes	Photodocumented & Demolished
Pullman car (2 of 2 "railroad cars")	1974	Not studied in 1998 or in 2008 because <50 years old	Demolished
Diner (1 of 2 "railroad cars")	1980	Not studied in 1998 or in 2008 because <50 years old	Demolished

Sources: PPA 1999 as amended and Post/Hazeltine 2008

#### 4.1.2 Thresholds of Significance

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically addresses how to determine the significance of impacts on historical resources and states:

- (b) *A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment*
  - (1) *Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired.*
  - (2) *The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:*
    - (A) *Demonstrates or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or*
    - (B) *Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or*
    - (C) *Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA.*
  - (3) *Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), Weeks and Grimmer, shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource.*
  - (4) *The lead agency shall identify potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource. The lead agency shall ensure that any adopted measures to mitigate or avoid significant adverse changes are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.*

Furthermore, the Secretary of Interior's *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* recommend the following actions in the treatment of historic structures or features, in order of priority:

1. Protect and maintain those materials and features that are historically important;

2. Repair those character defining materials and features; and
3. Replace those character defining materials and features.

The Secretary of Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation* state that repairs and alterations of historical structures or features must not damage or destroy materials, features, or finishes that are important in defining the building’s historic character.

**4.1.3 Impact Discussion:**

Under the Schragger Plan, the cottages were proposed to be renovated but the blue and white color scheme was proposed to be changed, resulting in a Class II (significant but mitigable) impact on historic resources. To reduce this impact to less than significant levels, mitigation measure no. 2 for historic resources in 00-ND-03 required that the cottages be renovated to preserve their historically significant architectural details (e.g., wall cladding, shingle roofs, porches, and historic windows). Incompatible doors and windows were also required to be replaced in this mitigation measure and all new buildings were required to be visually compatible with the existing historic buildings in terms of size, scale, design, materials, color, and texture.

In the Schragger Plan, the following historically significant buildings or features listed in Table 4-4 were also proposed for demolition which was identified as a Class II impact. Table 4-4 also indicates what mitigation measures were required in 00-ND-03 for each of these buildings/features.

**Table 4-4  
Historically Significant Buildings or Features Proposed for Demolition under the Schragger Plan**

<b>Building or Feature</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>
Linen Building	Prior to demolition, the kidney-shaped pool, poolhouse, and Linen building be photodocumented.
Kidney-shaped swimming pool	
Sandstone poolhouse	
“Miramar” neon roof sign	The “Miramar” neon roof sign be displayed either inside or outside the proposed parking garage.
Neon pole sign	The neon pole sign be retained on the corner of Eucalyptus Lane and South Jameson Lane.
Sandstone entrance caps with “Miramar” inscribed.	The sandstone entrance caps be placed on square sandstone piers at the junction of Miramar Avenue and South Jameson Lane, to match those in historic photographs.

Under the proposed project, all existing historically significant buildings or features (i.e., cottages, other storage and maintenance buildings “out buildings”, Poolside Rooms) (see Section 4.1.1 above), would be demolished and currently, there are no plans to display the “Miramar” neon sign, neon pole sign, or sandstone caps. A Structural Conditions Report was recently prepared for the cottages and out buildings on the Miramar property by Holmes Culley (March 19, 2007), which determined that these buildings would either be structurally completely unsalvageable due to extensive water damage, weathering, and other forms of decay, or would

need to have their exteriors completely replaced due to termite and severe mold issues. Based on the Holmes Culley report, repair of these historically significant buildings onsite would not be feasible without completely destroying the character-defining features that determine their historical significance (i.e., shingles, clapboard, skirting boards rafter tails, gable vents, and any remaining multi-paned windows). The Poolside Rooms were studied by Holmes Culley in a subsequent report dated April 15, 2008. Holmes Culley concludes that , while the Poolside Rooms have the high-test potential for reuse, the stucco offers a low seismic resistance and due to the dry rot found, an increased amount of work would be required to rebuild the structures and also a future investigation of the existing concrete foundations would be required to determine integrity.

New mitigation measure HIST-1 below would ensure that each historical structure will be completely documented following HABS/HAER procedures and standards, however, under the proposed project, demolition of all of the existing historically significant structures would be a permanent loss to the historic resource and therefore, would be considered a Class I, significant and unmitigable project-specific impact.

Regarding the “Miramar” neon roof sign, neon pole sign, and sandstone caps, implementation of the mitigation measures contained in 00-ND-003 for the treatment of these features are still feasible and shall be implemented for the proposed project. Therefore, impacts on these historically significant resources would remain Class II, significant but mitigable.

Regarding cumulative impacts, the Montecito Community Plan (MCP) EIR (pp. 5-192 to 5-199) identified potentially significant cumulative impacts to historic resources from the introduction of disruptive visual or auditory elements and from physical or aesthetic impacts to historic structures. The MCP EIR concluded that potential impacts to historic resources/structures could be reduced to a level of insignificance through existing procedural measures and then-proposed policies where proposed projects received discretionary review. However, significant cumulative impacts were anticipated due to loss of known and unknown historic structures. Due to the fact that the Miramar Hotel was the first tourist resort established in Montecito, the first cottage style resort, and the first resort to be close to and oriented towards the ocean, the loss of the historically significant cottages, and out buildings at the Miramar would also be a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on historic resources in the community. In addition, because the Poolside Rooms is one of the only intact commercial works of Lurah Maria Riggs, the loss of these structures would also be a considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on historic resources. Even with documentation, the loss of these structures would be permanent and unmitigable under the proposed project.

#### **4.1.4 Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

Implementation of measure1 (HIST 2, below)in the historic resources section of 00-ND-003 is still feasible and would reduce potentially significant impacts on the “Miramar” neon roof sign, neon pole sign, and sandstone caps to less than significant levels.

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to minimize project-specific and cumulative impacts on the remaining historically significant structures on the Miramar property. However, residual impacts on historic resources would remain significant.

**HIST-1.** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented for all existing structures on the

Miramar property, except for the Garden Rooms, Lanai Rooms, Oceanfront Rooms, and two garages, using the Secretary of the Interior's HABS (Historic American Buildings Survey)/HAER (Historic American Engineering Record) procedures and methods:

1. Photodocument the building and adjacent landscaping using large-format negatives (4"x5", 5"x7", or 8"x10" size). These photographs shall preserve a visual record of each structure and its setting. The documentation shall include photographs of each building's four elevations, as well as selected images of the each building's interior and the grounds.
2. Prepare measured drawings of each building before its exterior or interior alteration or relocation.
3. Submit written data on each building, including the history and description of each building (the detailed history and architectural descriptions in the historical reports prepared for the proposed project fulfill the requirements for written data) (Santa Barbara County Guidelines 1986, revised 1993: 18).
4. Additionally, the photographs, measured drawings, as well as a copy of all of the combined historical resource reports for the property, shall be archived at the Santa Barbara Historical Society's Gledhill Library for future use by researchers and members of the community
5. Photographs and other memorabilia of the historic Miramar shall be placed on display in a prominent location on the property

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** An architectural historian shall be hired by the applicant to complete this mitigation measure. The applicant shall submit a copy of the package that is required to be archived at the Santa Barbara Historical Society's Gledhill Library for review by P&D and the County's Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission prior to issuance of the Coastal Development Permit for demolition, grading, or construction of the proposed project.

**Monitoring:** P&D and the Historic Landmarks Advisory Commission shall confirm that these measures are implemented prior to issuance of a follow on Land Use Permit.

**HIST 2:** Potential impacts to historic resources at the Miramar Hotel site shall be mitigated through implementation of the recommendations of the December 1998 Preservation Planning Associates study, including subsequent Addenda as appropriate. Specific measures to be implemented are:

- a. The "Miramar" neon roof sign shall be retained in working order on the site. The sign need not be lit, but shall remain functional. The preferred site for relocation is on the outside wall of the proposed parking garage. If the sign is placed inside the garage, it shall be accompanied by a display of historic postcards and photographs of the Miramar Hotel, including the 1940s period.
- b. The neon pole sign at the corner of Eucalyptus Lane and South Jameson Lane shall be retained at this location.
- c. The sandstone entrance caps with "Miramar" incised in them shall be placed on square sandstone piers to match those in historic photographs, at the junction of Miramar Avenue and South Jameson Lane.

- d. Prior to demolition, the kidney-shaped swimming pool, sandstone poolhouse, and Linen building shall be documented with large-format black and white photographs according to Santa Barbara County guidelines and the remaining buildings shall be documented with color photographs. These photographs shall be deposited in the Montecito Historic Committee archives, with a copy of the Preservation Planning Associates report (including Addenda).

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** Each requirement shall be noted on appropriate demolition/building plans. A plan detailing procedures to implement these requirements and providing for notice to Permit Compliance staff prior to any demolition/renovation of historic components shall be prepared by a P&D-approved historian and reviewed and approved by P&D prior to approval issuance of any ~~Coastal Development~~ Land Use Permit for demolition/renovation of any historic structure.

**MONITORING:** Permit Compliance shall site inspect to ensure adherence to the historic resources mitigation measures.

## **4.2 Other Issue Areas**

The impact analysis for the other issue areas (e.g., air quality, aesthetics/visual resources etc.) is contained in the Addendum prepared for the proposed project (attached as Appendix A) pursuant to Section 15164 of CEQA and as explained in Section 1.0 above.

## **5.0 OTHER CEQA CONCERNS**

### **5.1 Growth Inducement**

A project would be considered growth inducing if it fostered economic or population growth in the area, involved construction of additional housing, or removed obstacles to population growth. The proposed project would likely increase the tourist population in the area and would introduce four employee units, however, the project would not cause increased commercial or residential development in the area nor would the four new employee units significantly increase the population in the area. The new infrastructure planned for the hotel would not increase the capacity of the sewer system or water delivery system in the area either. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a growth inducing impact on the community.

### **5.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes**

The proposed project is anticipated to have a significant and unmitigable impact on historic resources due to the proposed demolition of several historical buildings. Therefore, the project would result in a significant irreversible environmental change. The project is not anticipated to have any additional significant irreversible environmental changes as discussed in the Addendum contained in Appendix A.

## **6.0 CONSISTENCY WITH ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES**

CEQA requires that proposed projects be analyzed to determine potential conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located (CEQA Guidelines §15125(b)). This analysis points out potential inconsistencies between the project and local land use policies. Please see the Land Use section of the Addendum, in Appendix A, for this analysis.

A final determination concerning the project's overall consistency will be made at a later date by County discretionary bodies, with the advice of County planning staff.

## **7.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

In accordance with CEQA Section 15126(d), a range of reasonable alternatives that are capable of eliminating or reducing project impacts are evaluated. Analysis of impacts under the No Project alternative and consideration of other reasonable project alternatives is limited to the scope of this EIR, which only addresses potential significant impacts to historical resources.

### **7.1 No Project (Approved Schrage Plan)**

A detailed description of the environmental setting of the site is provided in Negative Declaration 00-ND-003, and summarized below.

The project site lies within an area currently developed as a resort hotel which has been shut down since 2000, with approximately 97,382 square feet of existing structures. Surrounding uses are: residences, church, and transportation corridor (Highway 101 and railroad). Farmland at the site was converted over a period of years, beginning in the late 1880s, to the current hotel use; the site has not been farmed for many years. Sewer and water lines currently exist on the site.

The entire subject property has been previously developed and contains several native trees (including large native sycamores) and many ornamental plantings (although much of the landscaping was removed post-2000 by the past owner). The eastern property line of the Miramar Hotel site is within the former riparian corridor of Oak Creek, as indicated by the location of remnant western sycamore trees offsite to the east. A mature hedge of *Myoporum* and *Pittosporum*, both common non-native plants often grown for screening, occurs offsite against the fence that delineates the eastern property boundary. One sycamore is located at the intersection of the eastern property line with South Jameson Lane and one multi-stemmed sycamore is located within the eastern fence line south of South Jameson Lane.

A significant portion of the Miramar site is within the 100-year floodplain of Oak Creek, which is located just east of the property boundary. The southern part of the site, north of the train tracks, has been known to flood during major storm events, likely as a result of ponding water backed up behind an offsite railroad culvert. In 1995, this portion of the site flooded, depositing in some locations up to one foot of silt and some building damage occurred.

The Miramar Hotel site is a nearly flat to moderately sloping site with gradients generally to the south and southeast. Elevations range from a high of  $\pm 42$  feet above sea level near the northwest corner of the property to sea level along the southern edge of the property. Surface drainage on the parcel is generally from the northwest to the southeast with minor variations depending on the local topographic configuration. Some areas have been recontoured by past grading activities that have modified some of these drainage patterns. Average slopes on the property range from 1.75 to 5.2 percent. The entire site is underlain by Goleta Fine Sandy Loam, 2 to 9 percent slope series. This soil is characterized by medium runoff and moderate erosion hazard. Permeability is moderate.

Under the no project alternative, either the site could remain vacant and abandoned or the existing entitlements could be exercised. In the event that the site were to remain vacant and abandoned, all buildings on site would continue their ongoing degradation to the point of collapse, posing both an

attractive nuisance and a health and safety hazard. Continued degradation of the historic structures would cause irreparable damage to the historic structures resulting in Class I impacts to the resources. Alternatively, because the Schrager Plan may proceed under its existing permits, it is reasonable to expect that if this proposed revised plan were not approved at least some of the approved development would be constructed under the no project alternative. Repair of the existing cottages and “out-buildings” was proposed at the time of the Schrager approval, and was feasible in 2000. However, repair of these structures is no longer feasible due to the fact that the character-defining features that define the historical significance of the buildings would be completely destroyed in order to ensure that the buildings are structurally sound and safe. In addition, under the approved plan, the historically significant Poolside Rooms were slated for demolition. Therefore, impacts on historic resources would be considered significant and unmitigable (Class I) under either No Project Alternative scenario.

## **7.2 Alternative 1 - Replacement of Historically Significant Features on Existing Cottages and “Out Buildings” and Repair of the Poolside Rooms**

Under Alternative 1, in order for the project to meet most of the project objectives, all of the other proposed new buildings on the property (e.g., Main Building, Ballroom, spa, Beach and Tennis Club etc.) would need to be redesigned with a style that would be differentiated from the old style, but that would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the historically significant buildings pursuant to the Secretary of Interior’s *Standards for Rehabilitation*. If repairs are not possible, then the character-defining features could be replaced while maintaining a compatible size and shape of the buildings. Under Alternative 1, the cottages and out buildings would be either completely replaced or the exteriors would be completely replaced as recommended by the Holmes Cully Structural Conditions Assessment Report (“Holmes Culley Report”) (see Section 4.1.2 above) and the character-defining features that define the historical significance of the buildings would be replaced with materials that match the old design, while maintaining a compatible size and shape of each building.

In order to be considered a reasonable alternative under CEQA, an alternative must meet the project objectives and be feasible to implement. Alternative 1, however, does not meet several project objectives for the proposed project and has technical constraints so severe that it cannot be considered feasible. Alternative 1 would not comply with project objectives to create a cohesive site design of bungalows, cottage clusters and other buildings around resort amenities nor would it include expansive landscaping grounds and paths to serve guests and visitors. Many buildings cannot be restored and others would have to be remodeled or would require extensive foundation and engineering work. By replacing features on certain salvageable cottages and repairing the poolside rooms, Alternative 1 would not be consistent with those project objectives to create site uniformity and would interfere with the entire site layout. Due to the current building configurations and the required engineering adaptations, Alternative 1 would not provide for a cohesive design, site uniformity or allow for the type of landscaping and paths that are specific project objectives.

Other project objectives, which correspond to policy objectives in the Montecito Community Plan (MCP) (e.g, LU-M-1 “Encourage excellence in architectural and landscape design”), call for a project that reflects a historical period: “the mystique of a bygone era... that reflects the charm and elegance” of the Montecito Community. Under Alternative 1, repairs to the Poolside Rooms would also be implemented, assuming the building is in adequate structural condition. The

poolside rooms, however, are more modern and contemporary and thus, do not meet the objectives for the older era cottage style buildings referred to in the MCP and the project objectives. The existing Poolside, Group A and Group B rooms are extremely small and reconstruction of the rooms would not only be limited by engineering constraints but could well be impossible to design, alter, and build without destroying almost all historical aspects of those rooms. In addition, most of the rooms are very small and did not include any modern resort amenities and thus, would require extensive redesign and reengineering to meet modern standards provided for in the project objectives. Finally, due to size and design, the Poolside Rooms and the Group A and Group B buildings would not meet project objectives for charm and elegance of the Montecito Community and would not meet project objectives to provide for first rate amenities, and for elegant and stately architecture.

Due to existing technical and physical constraints, Alternative 1 would not be feasible and thus not be considered a reasonable alternative. The Holmes Cully Report states that it would be infeasible to repair the character-defining features that define the historical significance of the cottages and out buildings. (The Santa Barbara County Building Department has confirmed the methodology and accuracy of the Holmes Cully Report.) Replacement of the character-defining features on these buildings would be the next priority according to the Secretary of Interior's *Guidelines for Rehabilitation*.

The Holmes Cully Report states that; "The first three types of buildings, listed on pages 2 & 3, have low to no capacity to resist seismic forces and lack any sort of sufficient foundation system. Plus due to water damage, weathering and other forms of decay significant work would be required to rebuild the bungalows." Even the buildings that have sufficient structural support would need extensive work: "The bungalows of the fourth building type have the highest potential for re-use because the exterior walls consist of metal lath and stucco; the stucco offers a low seismic resistance. Due to termite and severe mold found in each of the bungalows an increased amount of work would be required to partially rebuild the structure." Therefore, it would be infeasible to bring most of the buildings up to state Building Code and modern safety standards without extensive, painstaking design, construction and fabrication for all buildings, resulting in exorbitant costs and time delays. The Holmes Cully Report does not state that it would be impossible to rebuild the structures. However, the cost, time and scale of rebuilding all of these projects would be exorbitant in relation to the project scale and the project objectives. For instance, the Poolside rooms are in the 100 year floodplain of Oak Creek and raising the existing structure above the floodplain would likely cause significant damage to the building. Further, maintaining the Poolside rooms would eliminate the proposed underground parking which could have significant impacts due to parking and could necessitate redesign of the entire project. Therefore, due to the structural, construction, and financial constraints, Alternative 1 is not feasible.

The impacts of Alternative 1 were briefly reviewed in order to compare the potential impacts of Alternative 1 to the Modified Project. Due to the fact that it is infeasible to repair the character-defining features that define the historical significance of the cottages and out buildings and due to the need to use mainly non original, historic materials Alternative 1 would mainly rely on rebuilding and documentation, not on preservation. Under CEQA, storage and display of some historical materials and documentation on their own are not considered sufficient to fully mitigate significant impacts. Since Alternative 1 would also involve rebuilding units in the relevant historical style (duplication) and would include limited reuse of historical materials impacts would be reduced, however the impacts would still remain Class I.

### **7.3 Alternative 2 - Relocation of Historically Significant Structures**

Alternative 2 would involve relocation of the historically significant cottages, out buildings, and Poolside Rooms, and replacement of their character-defining features. However, the cost, time and scale of rebuilding all of these structures would be exorbitant in relation to the project scale and the project objectives. Also, a potential alternate site for these buildings is unknown and impact analysis of this alternative would be almost entirely speculative. Therefore, this alternative is anticipated to be infeasible and was rejected from further consideration.

### **7.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative**

In addition to the discussion and comparison of alternatives to the proposed project, CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be selected and the reasons for such selection be disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the least number of adverse impacts and meets the basic project objectives.

The no project alternative, resulting in the Schragger plan, is considered environmentally superior. However, as the present condition of the structures prevents their reuse, this alternative is not feasible. In that case, Alternative 1 is considered environmentally superior. However, Alternative 1 does not meet all of the project objectives and therefore may not be feasible.

## **8.0 REFERENCES**

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 1991. *Architectural Inventory/Evaluation Form*. Map Reference No. M-37. November 27.

Holmes Culley. 2007. *Miramar Hotel, California, Structural Conditions Assessment Report*. Prepared for Caruso Affiliated. June 4.

Kaplan Chen Kaplan (KCK). 2007. *Historic Resources Evaluation for Miramar Hotel*. August 14. Amended by Revised Report dated January 18, 2008.

Post/Hazeltine Associates. 2007. Peer Review of the August 14, 2007 Kaplan Chen Kaplan Historic Resources Evaluation Report for Miramar Hotel. October 30.

Post/Hazeltine Associates. 2008a. Peer Review of the January 18, 2008 Kaplan Chen Kaplan Revised Historic Resources Evaluation Report for Miramar Hotel. February 7.

Post/Hazeltine Associates. 2008b. Phase I/II Historic Resources Report for The Miramar Hotel. Prepared for the County of Santa Barbara. March 26.

Preservation Planning Associates (PPA). 1998. *Phase I Historical Cultural Resources Study. Miramar Hotel, Montecito, California*. Prepared for Cearnal Architects, Inc. December. Amended by Addenda dated September 21, 1999; December 1999; March 20, 1999; January 6, 2000; February 7, 2000; and June 13, 2000.

San Buenaventura Research Associates. 1999. *Historic Resources Report Peer Review, Miramar Hotel*. November 12.

## **9.0 PERSONS AND AGENCIES CONTACTED**

Jim Langhorne and Kirk Johnson, Montecito Fire Protection District

Tom Mosby, Montecito Water District

Diane Gabriel, Montecito Sanitary District

Chris Schaeffer, Caltrans District No. 5 Development Review

Will Robertson, Santa Barbara County Traffic Division, Department of Public Works

Tom Fayram and Jon Frye, Santa Barbara County Flood Control District

Cathleen Garnand, Santa Barbara County Water Agency

Vijaya Jammalamadaka, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District

Norman Fujimoto and Paul Jenzen, Santa Barbara County Environmental Health Services

Jeff Thomas, Santa Barbara County Building and Safety Division

Shana Gray, Steve Hudson, Gary Timm, and Jack Ainsworth, California Coastal Commission

## **10.0 LIST OF PREPARERS**

This SEIR and the attached Addendum (Appendix A) was prepared by Planning and Development staff.

G:\GROUP\PERMITTING\CASE FILES\RVP\07 CASES\07RVP-00000-00009 MIRAMAR\CEQA\PROPOSED FINAL SEIR & ADDENDUM\MIRAMAR\_PROPOSED FINAL SEIR\_MAIN BODY.DOC

**APPENDIX A**  
**15164 Addendum for the Miramar Beach Resort and Bungalows Project**

**APPENDIX B**  
**Negative Declaration for the Approved Schrager Plan (Schrager ND) (00-ND-003)**

**APPENDIX C**  
**Public Comments on the Public Draft SEIR and Responses to Public Comments**

**APPENDIX D**  
**Applicant's responses to comments**

**APPENDIX E**  
**Vicinity Map**

**APPENDIX F**  
**Site plans**