

From: Bertram Johnson <Bertram.Johnson@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2023 12:30 PM
To: Natasha@sblafco.org
Subject: Annexation at Highway 135 & Union Valley Parkway
Attachments: STANDARDS FOR ANNEXATIONS TO CITIES.pdf

Dear LAFCO,

As a resident of Orcutt I just wanted to present my opinions on this matter. I looked into the LAFCO standards regarding annexation into cities and find that this area in question violates the #1 item in their list of factors favorable to approval. ==> (Proposal would eliminate islands, corridors, or other distortion of existing boundaries.) In reality this annexation does not eliminate islands, corridors or other distortions of existing boundaries. It actually would create a distortion (i.e. peninsula).

I also looked at the factors unfavorable to approval and found that it too violates the #1 item in their list. ==> (Proposal would create islands, corridors or peninsulas of city or district area or would otherwise cause or further the distortion of existing boundaries.) This is basically the same as the item above but you get my point.

The second factor unfavorable to approval that is my main concern is item #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.) the key part of this item that I am interested in is the "public interest". Many people live with blinders on or feel like their opinion does not matter enough to make a difference so they go about their business letting things just....happen. I would like to know what the public interest is on this proposal. Is there a way to take a poll of Orcutt residences to find out if this annexation is or isn't in their own interest. I know that I have never been asked.

Item #5 of the factors unfavorable to approval ==> (The proposal appears to be motivated by inter-agency rivalry, land speculation, or other motives not in the public interest.) seems a little suspect. I do not know for certain if this is true but it appears that the City of Santa Maria is wanting to eventually take over Orcutt and I am not sure that this really is in the interest of the public. Again this needs to be a focus to find out what the residents of Orcutt want. As a side note, I think that water is being used as weapon to help the City take over Orcutt

Finally, #6 of the factors unfavorable to approval ==> (Boundaries of proposed annexation do not include logical service area or are otherwise improperly drawn.) It is not a logical service area as shown by the need to use Sheriff and County Fire as the main services for this annexation. Also, I read that Righetti is at 145% of capacity. this too does not bode well for the idea of a logical service area.

I am not big on grandstanding at public meetings, and I don't believe that I communicate verbally very well, but I did want to make my points to someone even though I believe the powers that be have already made up their minds. I hope that the County has a representative at that meeting tomorrow.

I have attached the STANDARDS FOR ANNEXATION INTO CITIES for your information.

Sincerely,
Bert Johnson
4061 Loch Lomond Drive
Santa Maria, CA 93455

P.S. yea it also sucks that the post office lists our address in Santa Maria though we live in Orcutt

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

STANDARDS FOR ANNEXATIONS 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.

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.