

From: Wayne nelson <wrn2835@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 3:56 PM
To: sbcob
Subject: proposed mobile home closure conversion ordinance

To the honorable members of the
Santa Barbara County Supervisors

Dear Board members:

I reside in Rancho Santa Barbara mobile home park. I have lived here for a little over three years. I have been a resident of Santa Barbara for nearly 40 years, and during those many years I owned conventional homes, and I must say that Rancho Santa Barbara is one of the nicest places that I have ever lived. It is a peaceful, quiet, and safe park. I don't want to even think about one day having to leave this idyllic environment due to a closure of the park. Rancho Santa Barbara is a community within a community. We look out for one another. The majority of us are approaching if not already in the seventh decade of our lives and beyond.

I hasten to state that I have no reason to think that the owners of this park have any plans to close it. They are well liked and held in high regard by the residents. What gives me grave concern--and that is why I want to address those concerns with you--is the fact that the trend in California and, indeed, across the Country is to close mobile home parks and convert them to another use. One cannot fault an owner for wanting to convert his or her property to a higher and better use, but it is frightening to think that based on the discretionary, as opposed to mandatory, language of the proposed closure conversion ordinance dealing with "in place market value" and relocation costs, that our entire investment and equity in our homes could be wiped out in one fell swoop, and we would end up with nothing. In my particular case, I stand to lose 160 thousand dollars, and there are many others who stand to lose much more than I have invested. We all know that we pay a premium to live in Santa Barbara. This isn't Podunk.

For most of us, Santa Barbara has been our home for the greater portion of our lives. Even under the best of circumstances it would be difficult for most of us to have to re-locate. I frankly feel that there are some of us who may not survive if we are forced to move due to a closure and end up interned in a strange location and environment, away from our families, loved ones, and medical facilities. But, most importantly, under the present draft language, it seems almost unconscionable that an owner could close a park and send us packing to fend for ourselves, simply by having the option to give us nothing for the considerable equity in our homes. With the discretionary "may" language, why would an owner want to be magnanimous and pay us anything, let alone "in place market value"?

I strongly feel that the closure conversion ordinance that you will ultimately enact has to have as its quintessential ingredient "in place market value." And I respectfully entreat you to make it an essential part of the ordinance. You may stand as our only hope for many more peaceful and restful years of living in this lovely park.

Respectfully submitted,

Wayne R. Nelson

333 Old Mill Road, Sp. 166
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

#2