

Breese, Lucille

From: Terry/Sheila Hammons [ts.hammons@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2010 8:57 PM
To: Siminski, Mike; boblingl@aol.com; jaruhge@hotmail.com; Durham, Tony; Cecilia Martner
Cc: Barcelona, Laurel; Breese, Lucille
Subject: Oppose Annexation of Expansion Area A and D

All it takes is a City Council meeting to wake a person up to the underlining motivations of a few. Until last week's meeting, I was not in-tune with the enormous push by developers to have the city expand to the west, the east, the south and the north. After hearing the developers address the council about all of the wonderful aspects of what they could do for our fine city, I was then struck - why do I see so much blight in the city, and why is our "Old Town" in such disrepair? Why don't the developers jump into those issues? Because there isn't a "high profit margin."

Now to the nuts and bolts of this expansion issue: In reading through the mountain of material, I have come across some very intriguing information.

1. An important issue is noted in the Final Environmental Impact Report. It has to do with Traffic and Circulation. It states:

With full build out, traffic at the Ocean Avenue and A Street intersection would exceed City thresholds and feasible mitigation is not available. (Traffic Technical Appendix is located in Appendix H of the EIR).

Potential Impacts identified as:***Class I – Significant and Unavoidable***

Action: - Certify FEIR -- adopt Statement of Overriding Considerations for Class I impacts

This can't be the only intersection in the whole town that will be impacted? It seems that all intersections at all areas where the expansion is to occur will be impacted by increased traffic.

2. In the Final Environmental Impact Report Comments and Responses, the County Public Works Department stated, in a letter dated November 9, 2009, concerning the city's proposal to expand, that Lompoc received "more maintenance funding per lane mile than a county(?) and it does not make fiscal sense for a county to maintain a roadway which adjoins and primarily serves a city." The County went on to state, "a portion of Harris Grade Road between Purisima Road and Burton Mesa Road should be annexed into the City of Lompoc concurrently with this General Plan update." It was further recommended by the County that "McLaughlin Road, Bailey Road and any other roadway section that run adjacent into the City Parcel, should be annexed into the City."

This is not adequately addressed to the Final EIR.

3. The "Old Town" should be the primary emphasis to the City. We should not allow the city to

expand just for the sake of expansion. Many areas of the city are experiencing neglect and blight. By not concentrating on the already existing neighborhoods and business areas, the City is contributing to the neglect. Note Local Agencies Formation Commission (LAFCo's) Standards for cities to consider when proposing annexation:

Standards for Annexation to Cities: Factors Favorable to Approval

1. Proposal would eliminate islands, corridors, or other distortion of existing boundaries.
2. Proposed area is urban in character or urban development is imminent, requiring municipal or urban-type services.
3. Proposed area can be provided all urban services by agency as shown by agency service plan and proposals would enhance the efficient provision of urban services.
4. Proposal is consistent with the adopted spheres of influence and adopted general plans.
5. Request is by an agency for annexation of its publicly-owned property, used for public purposes.

Standards for Annexation to Cities: Factors Unfavorable to Approval

1. Proposal would create islands, corridors or peninsulas of city or district area or would otherwise cause or further the distortion of existing boundaries.
2. The proposal would result in a premature intrusion of urbanization into a predominantly agricultural or rural area.
3. For reasons of topography, distance, natural boundaries, or like considerations, the extension of services would be financially infeasible, or another means of supplying services by acceptable alternatives is preferable.
4. Annexation would encourage a type of development in an area which due to terrain, isolation, or other economic or social reason, such development is not in the public interest.
5. The proposal appears to be motivated by inter-agency rivalry, land speculation, or other motives not in the public interest.
6. Boundaries of proposed annexation do not include logical service area or are otherwise improperly drawn.
7. The proposal is inconsistent with adopted spheres of influence and adopted general plans.

Policies Encouraging Orderly Urban Development and Preservation of Open Space

1. The Commission encourages well planned, orderly, and efficient urban development patterns for all developing areas. Also, the county, cities, and those districts providing urban services, are encouraged to develop and implement plans and policies which will provided for well-planned, orderly and efficient urban development patterns, with consideration of preserving permanent open space lands within those urban patterns.
2. Development of existing vacant non open space, and nonprime agricultural land within an agency's boundaries is encouraged prior to further annexation and development. However, where open land adjacent to the agencies are of low agricultural, scenic, or biological value, annexation of those lands may be considered over development of prime agricultural land already existing within an agency's jurisdiction.
3. Proposals to annex undeveloped or agricultural parcels to cities or districts providing urban services shall demonstrate that urban development is imminent for all or a substantial portion of the proposal area; that urban development will be contiguous with existing or proposed development; and that a planned, orderly, and efficient urban development pattern will result. Proposals resulting in a leapfrog, non-contiguous urban pattern will be discouraged.
4. Consideration shall be given to permitting sufficient vacant land within each city and/or agency in order to encourage economic development, reduce the cost of housing, and allow timing options for physical and orderly development.

Policies Encouraging Conservation of Prime Agricultural Lands and Open Space Areas

1. Proposals which would conflict with the goals of maintaining the physical and economic integrity of open space lands, **agricultural lands**, or agricultural preserve areas in open space uses, as indicated on the city or county general plan, shall be discouraged.
2. **Annexation and development of existing vacant non-open space lands, and nonprime agricultural land within an agency's sphere of influence is encouraged to occur prior to development outside of an existing sphere of influence.**
3. A sphere of influence revision or update for an agency providing urban services where the revision includes prior agricultural land shall be discouraged. Development shall be guided towards areas containing nonprime agricultural lands, unless such action will promote disorderly, inefficient development of the community or area.
4. Loss of agricultural lands should not be a primary issues for annexation where city and county general plans both indicate that urban development is appropriate and where there is consistency with the agency's sphere of influence. However, the loss of any prime agricultural soils should be balanced against other LAFCo policies and a LAFCo goal of conserving such lands.

The City should not permit developers to push development into areas that are considered irreplaceable. The City should also recognize that expansion comes at a price and it appears that the county is quite willing to give the city a good dose of traffic and road responsibilities. It may be

appropriate to say, "Be careful what you wish for."

I thank you for your consideration and trust the Council will make the right decision and not expand.

Terry Hammons
736-3377