COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

DATE: September 13, 2010

TO: Mayor, Councilmembers
Laurel M. Barcelona, City Administrator
June Ailin, Assistant City Attorney

FROM: Lucille T. Breese, AICP, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Supplemental Information for September 13, 2010 Meeting on the General Plan Update

The following Supplemental Information was submitted for City Council review on Monday September 13, 2010:

Correspondence dated Sept 13, 2010 from Tammy Atkin, and Susan Gallachor regarding zoning consistency.

Two (2) items of correspondence dated Sept. 12, 2010 from Art Hibbits

C: Arleen T. Pelster, Community Development Director
Stacey Alvarez, Acting City Clerk
Richard Daulton, Rincon Consultants
City Website – Project File

G:\COMDEV\GENPLAN\Staff reports\2010\CC Memo CC Supp-5 Info.doc

PG1

I hereby certify that I am the owner of real property at the following address: 226 No E St., Lompoc.

I hereby request that the Lompoc City Council not down zone my property.

INITIAL THE APPROPRIATE LINE(S)

✓ I have previously made this request to Staff.

____ I have previously testified at the Planning Commission.

✓ I have previously testified at the City Council.

✓ I have previously sent written correspondence to the city regarding this issue.

SIGN _____ **DATE** 9/13/10

PRINT Tammy Atkin

See attached letter

RECEIVED

SEP 13 2010

CITY OF LOMPOC
PLANNING DIVISION

PG2

I hereby certify that I am the owner of real property at 226 No E St., Lompoc.
I hereby request that the Lompoc City Council not down zone my property or any others that have been built correct to their zoning and codes at the time of construction.

I am also a local real estate agent and owner of a real estate firm here in Lompoc. The Lompoc City Council needs to take a hard look at the short term and long term consequences to their arbitrary decisions to change zoning, attach overlays and create havoc for property owners in our community. Before the Lompoc City Council decides to follow a map and suggested changes that were designed in the 1990's when the community/economy was in a much different state, I suggest that each council member personally visit each of these locations to see how the actual use of the neighborhood exists versus the "intended use" of an outdated plan. In addition, each member should certify in writing that they have visited the site and are making their decision on first hand knowledge of that block as well as then make themselves personally available for a meeting with any of the affected landowners to explain to them what their decision means for that property. In explaining the consequences of down zoning please make sure, as the leaders of the community, that you understand what that now does to the ability to get financing and the usability and value to each property, and be prepared to be honest to that property owner.

If the Lompoc City Council does decide to arbitrarily change the zoning on property, all restrictions to "legal nonconforming" should be waived for existing structures. How can you tell us, as a property owner, that I can't allow my property to be vacant for 6 months or you have the right to take all use away from me. Where is the property owners rights and respect for value? What about the foreclosure properties that we need to sell to a new owner so we can get them cleaned up and furnish housing to people who need it. We have seen multiple units, vacant for 6 months due to a foreclosure, now being brought "into compliance" by taking away units (and value) We have been told that we need affordable housing. I don't understand why you are making policies or changing zoning that will now take away existing housing units.

I trust that the Lompoc City Council wants to enable our community to bounce back from the economic difficulties that have faced the entire nation. Stripping property rights and value from your property owners and tax payers is Not the right way to go about doing that. Please consider all aspects of your actions before proceeding down a path just because it was layed out years ago in very different times.

Thank you for your consideration
Tammy Atkin
Property and Business Owner, City of Lompoc.

9/13/10

I hereby certify that I am the owner of real property at the following address:
214 South F #2 & 224 N.E Street

I hereby request that the Lompoc City Council not down zone my property.

INITIAL THE APPROPRIATE LINE(S)

RECEIVED
SEP 13 2010
CITY OF LOMPOC
PLANNING DIVISION

✓ I have previously made this request to Staff.

✓ I have previously testified at the Planning Commission.

✓ I have previously testified at the City Council.

____ I have previously sent written correspondence to the city regarding this issue.

SIGN Susan F Gallacher **DATE** 9/13/10

PRINT Susan F Gallacher

From what I have witnessed at the planning commission meetings, Some off the planning staff has never driven by the properties. And do not know what they are voting on. How can you take away from people value which they paid for when they brought the property.
People invest in property as a retirement plan.
I think if you can change my investment value. I should be able to vote on your investment value. example 401 k plans etc.
Do not change my values -

I hereby certify that I am the owner of real property at the following address: 430 South C.

I hereby request that the Lompoc City Council not down zone my property.

INITIAL THE APPROPRIATE LINE(S)

✓ I have previously made this request to Staff.

____ I have previously testified at the Planning Commission.

✓ I have previously testified at the City Council.

✓ I have previously sent written correspondence to the city regarding this issue.

SIGN Susan F Gallacher **DATE** 9/13/10

PRINT Susan F Gallacher

Do not change my land value.

RECEIVED

SEP 13 2010

CITY OF LOMPOC
PLANNING DIVISION

TO: LOMPOC CITY MAYOR and CITY COUNCIL
FROM: ART HIBBITS
DATE: SEPT. 12, 2010

LOMPOC GP UPDATE COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY ART HIBBITS

Long ago Pete Seeger wrote the song **Where have all the flowers gone?**...which might be worth considering at this time.

"Where have all the flowers gone....?" And a related question today is: "Where has all the money gone?" ... the money my friend Harrell Fletcher and Assoc. promised. We were told the economic benefits to the people of Lompoc, resulting from paving over 270 acres of prime ag land west of Lompoc would generate benefits of $680,000,000 for the Lompoc Valley. By any standard that's a lot of money.

Unfortunately it just doesn't add up. We don't need an expensive study to show that urban sprawl, in addition to the loss of prime farm lands, makes no sense at all. Sure, the property tax base increases and jobs are created, but the bottom line is more red ink for the City and higher utility bills for the residents, not to mention further delays in fixing up our **Down Town Area.**

Think about it: The growth of Lompoc, and other Cities of similar size over the last couple of decades, has been mostly out in the surrounding areas. In Lompoc the growth has meant lots of residential units in the Wye area and on the North of the City, plus lots of Commercial N. of Central Ave.

This huge amount of growth over the last decades, if you believe the Fletcher report, should have resulted in Billions flowing into Lompoc...The City should have been flush with money; our elected officials and public employees should be drawing salaries like those in Bell, LA area; our schools, hospital, parks, and the public should have all benefited according to this economic theory.

So..."WHERE HAS ALL THE MONEY GONE...?" and later in the same song: "WHEN WILL THEY EVER LEARN...?" Let's think about this...it isn't working. Cities like Lompoc have been chasing this **URBAN MYTH** for years, and we still can't pay our firemen and police officers a competitive wage...our schools are suffering, parks, recreation, and other public service budgets are being cut. Massive budget deficits are the norm.

Overall, the myth that sprawling growth is good for everybody, is not only an **URBAN MYTH**, but it is a **CRUEL HOAX**. Cities have been chasing this mirage for years...when will we ever learn?

Before I close I would like to offer an alternative: The Plan before you seems to encompass a very good concept: SMART GROWTH...a term that has been around for a while and is grossly overused...and yet it has a very important meaning. Smart Growth implies that there might be something else out there. There is, and it is the direct opposite, and for lack of a better word, how about DUMB GROWTH/ STUPID GROWTH? I would offer this definition of this type of Growth:

(a) Urban Growth at the expense of PRODUCTIVE AG LANDS.

b) Growth that occurs in the wrong places...next to airports or in the flight pattern, in the known flood zones.

(c) Growth next to sources of noise, dust, or odors, and other obvious conflicts.

(d) Growth that requires expanded urban services and more red ink, as opposed to **INFILL.**

The Plan before you SEEMS to promote SMART GROWTH and yet the Expansion and Annexation areas are the direct opposite.

In closing, I would urge you to reaffirm our previous Lompoc City Council's decision in 1983, (nothing has changed much,) and maintain the BUFFER on the east of City using the SY River... and take all steps necessary to protect the valuable ag lands surrounding our City which define and make LOMPOC UNIQUE.

To summarize: JUST SAY NO, AND NO THANK YOU, when you consider the two expansion annexations proposed in our productive AGRICULTURAL AREAS on the West and East of the existing City.

Respectfully submitted, ART HIBBITS, 1251 E. HWY 246, LOMPOC, CA. 93436

RECEIVED
SEP 13 2010
3:26 pm
CITY OF LOMPOC
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

TO: LOMPOC CITY MAYOR and CITY COUNCIL
FROM: ART HIBBITS
DATE: SEPT. 12, 2010

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM #1 (b) Sept 13, 2010

SPECIFIC REFERENCE: PROPOSED RIVER PARK ANNEXATION and MAPS

There are several issues related to "Expansion Area B" as follows:

(1) The actual assessor parcels proposed for annexation: A quick comparison of your recently approved EIR maps shows conflicting data and inclusion of private property along with the City owned River Park parcels. (Maps 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 4.1.1, etc.)

(2) This proposal was supposed to address: (a) the issue of the City paying taxes to SB County and (b) the related issue of jurisdiction conflicts between the City and the County for police, fire, and other emergency response.

My comments are below:

Response to (1) above: As per previous testimony, please **remove** any and all reference in the text and maps showing annexation East of the Santa Ynez River...in particular annexation of private property.

Response to (2) (a) above: Request your staff provide the actual current taxes paid for River Park, and in particular the amounts for Sheriff, Fire, and Emergency Services. I suspect this amount is relatively small since most of the property tax revenue (approx. 80%) is designated for Schools.

Response to (2) (b) above: Please consider, as an alternative to annexation of River Park, working out a *Memorandum of Understanding between the City and the County, whereby whoever can provided* the necessary services in the most efficient and cost-effective manner, takes on the responsibility, w/ backup through existing mutual aid agreements.

Thank you for your consideration, ART HIBBITS