

OUR TOWN-LONG BEACH

February 6, 2012

Dear Council Members, Mayor and staff;

On February 7th, 4th district Council member Patrick O'Donnell along with 5th Council member, Geri Schipske are bringing forth surprise legislation to "fast track" an amendment to SEADIP. As members of "Our-Town-Long Beach", (who appealed Planning Commission's decision to City Council regarding Second + PCH on December 20th, 2011) many of us feel that item 16, (their pending motion) on the agenda, is open to unanswered questions and truly ambiguous. Greasing the vocabulary in this motion are ..."proceed immediately..aggressive timeline.. hurry hurry..."

What in SEADIP do they seek to change?

Is this just a matter of new sentence structure--verbs and adjectives? Why bother?

If approved, this will be the fourth time the city has attempted an update of SEADIP. The results are always the same though...the community has said...no more height nor density.

Their motion states..."The formal filing of (a) proposed SEADIP amendment, (*singular*) should be completed within six months".

They are not calling this a revision--or even Master Planning--but an update, an amendment. (see motion). They have not secured funding, but hope for your support in suggesting that Council accept the generous offer of Lyon Homes to advance the funding!! I am sure the city is well aware that Lyon Homes is the purchaser of Pa's Pumpkin Patch which lies directly across PCH from Second + PCH. Lyons Homes hopes to build Town Homes on the Pumpkin Patch, (although SEADIP does not allow residential there). Who cares? Another fox in the henhouse. How could you deny them?? Letting the developer and the Property Owner fund your city's zoning is obscene, and humiliating to the 7th largest city in California.

And as Councilman O'Donnell commented in the Press Telegram, (2/05/12), "The funds would be repaid later by the city or local stakeholders." Huh?

Strangely, no reference to the Los Cerritos Wetlands are found in O'Donnell's motion.

Isn't he the one that says..."My heart is with the wetlands..."Query: How can you "update" SEADIP without a delineation of the Wetlands? You can't.

This motion has little to do with the wetlands and most to do with Land use and development in SEADIP, (PD1).

And what about Patrick's including PD4 (Marina area) for an update? That is not in SEADIP...but Patrick thinks all the parking lots in the Marina area should be planned jointly with the SEADIP properties. What developer has the most to gain from the parking lots...hmmm?

No money from developers, special interest groups, (including environmental groups) should be used in an update, rewrite, or an amendment to our zoning. If so, your opportunity to make this a transparent approach is lost.

Deny the motion of Patrick O'Donnell's to fast track SEADIP.

Instead--if you feel you must bring some new wording to SEADIP, then consider item #20

where the city, whose job it is to secure funding, charged Planning on 12/20 to

find a path to revise SEADIP and find funding which according to Amy Bodek may be possible with a million dollar Sustainability grant.

Sincerely,
Joan Hawley McGrath
Recording Secretary and members "Our Town-Long Beach"
6257 Marina View Drive
Long Beach Ca 90803
email: ourtownlb@gmail.com

From: cin4711 <cin4711@aol.com>

To: district1 <district1@longbeach.gov>; district2 <district2@longbeach.gov>; District3 <District3@LongBeach.gov>; District4 <District4@LongBeach.gov>; district5 <district5@longbeach.gov>; district6 <district6@longbeach.gov>; district7 <district7@longbeach.gov>; district8 <district8@longbeach.gov>; district9 <district9@longbeach.gov>

Sent: Mon, Feb 6, 2012 8:49 pm

Subject: 2-7-12 City Council Agenda Item #16 -- Approve only with changes & Approval of Agenga Item #20

It is very difficult for me to urge an approval on this given the lack of information. What is wrong with SEADIP? I understand it and the LCP just fine, I'm the average citizen who simply takes time to find SEADIP online and read it. It seems the driving force for this motion was the 2nd+PCH fiasco. First off, that wasn't SEADIP's fault. It is clearly stated in the general provisions about height and our General Plan, LCP, SEADIP all spell out what you can and cannot do in regards to development. No other developer or land owner seems to have had a problem understanding the zoning laws over the years. And the friendly staff at Planning & Building and Code enforcement or whatever seems to have had no trouble in pointing out zoning laws or codes all these years either. So what disturbs me is why exactly are we doing this? The agenda item states "an accelerated SEADIP development process". However it is vague exactly what "development" means in this regard. The motion states "may involve amendments". Amendments would make sense given that SEADIP is an already developed document yet it is not unreasonable to make slight modifications from time to time to add items, further clarify a provision, etc. If this is the pure intent then updating SEADIP in a few places makes sense. Or is this a total re-write of SEADIP? Or does the city seek to eliminate the height and density currently in SEADIP not only for Subarea 17 but for the entire South East area? The use of "accelerated" is also disturbing. If you want to make a plan that *conforms to the Coastal Act* and fairly addresses all the public input from all sides, to ensure its success you must plan carefully--which I don't believe rushing things will facilitate.

Example "acceleration" or rushing the SEADIP amendment process isn't so good is the funding process which the motion requires funding to be secured in 30 days or accept a land owner or developers funding (Lyons) for amending SEADIP. Lyons may expect favorable amendments resulting in personal gain for example, since that company has holdings directly affected by SEADIP. The public may again be given the impression developers are given more say in what goes on in SE Long Beach than the citizens get. The same goes for any community groups, environmental groups or others; to make it even they should not donate any funding either. I strongly urge you to approve agenda item #20 for grant funding and if that does not work simply find another grant source, once funds are secured from an uninvolved grant source then begin your SEADIP update effort.

About the outside project manager I believe you should find one who is a neutral party not recommended by or affiliated in any way with any environmental group, land owner or developer. The project manager should have a strong track record in Coastal Law and be familiar with the Long Beach area. Under no circumstances should the environmentalists or the developers provide the project manager to "update" SEADIP, to ensure fairness to all.

Community input on SEADIP is a concern. I know many people who missed that opportunity last time because they didn't know. Looking at some of the old SEADIP webpages on the city website it seems communities in Belmont Shore, Island Village, College Park Estates and University Park Estates were the targets for public input. No mention of any effort to invite those of us living North of Anaheim and Studebaker--we shop at Marina Pacifica, The Market Place the 2nd & PCH area, we travel to Seal Beach or use PCH to visit Orange County beaches, etc. What you do in the SE Long Beach affects many more than just the adjacent neighborhoods. Many people cannot make meetings due to work schedules--public input should devise a way to include those of us experiencing this issue but who still want to participate. Perhaps taped SEADIP meetings available online, surveys online and advertising the fact all the meetings and public input/comment methods exist in a variety of ways with plenty of advance notice, such as an insert in the Gas & Water bill and all local newspapers (Beach Comber, Grunion, LB Business Journal, PT to name a few).

I urge all Council Members to also include on their newsletters, blogs and websites SEADIP, LCP, Coastal Act tutorials, links and information to educate the public on what this is all about--an "accelerated" process does not facilitate properly informing the public of what this is all about and why. Please also include in your email newsletters (and blogs) hot links to the current LCP, SEADIP and General Plan as is

before proposed amendments. Coastal has a wealth of resources for updating LCP (which SEADIP is just a subset of an LCP) at <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/la/publications.html> which also includes a link to the Coastal Act itself which Chapter 3 is what an LCP (or SEADIP) should be based on, or conform to. Every Californian should read Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. You need to please point all these resources out to your citizens and make available the opportunity for public input to everyone.

Should you approve Agenda Item #16 also approve Agenda Item #20 and please re-think the motion as proposed and outlined in Agenda Item #20 and make these sensible modifications I describe, carefully avoid giving the appearance of any one side having an "advantage". Fast is not always good, accuracy is a must, especially given the cost of these changes. Unless the motion to update SEADIP is a redo which includes all my all my comments in this letter I do not support this motion and respectfully urge Council not to approve.

I would support a no approval of Agenda Item #16 motion to update SEADIP and approve Agenda Item #20 Grant Funding for SEADIP and once that grant is secured then come back with a revised and improved motion to update SEADIP.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cindy Crawford

6821 Mantova St.

Long Beach CA 90815

(562) 508-1369