

**Comment Letter No. (9A)**

Halla Aldayyat  
32halla@gmail.com

***Staff Response No. (9A.1)***

Refer to Staff Response No. 2A.1 noted above.

---

---

**From:** Halla Aldayyat [mailto:32halla@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 01, 2010 6:43 PM  
**To:** PLANNING COMMISSION  
**Subject:** [BULK]  
**Importance:** Low

hi can you please put a crosswalk from mesa verde plaza 1525 mesa verde dr e to 1500 mesa verde dr e there are many accidents there thank you

9A.1

**Comment Letter No. (10A)**

Trina Moorlach

***Staff Response No. (10A.1)***

Comments in support of the project are noted and forwarded to the City's decisionmakers. The comment letter also includes opposition to any kind of cut through traffic, vehicle, bike, or pedestrian access along the westerly fence line or elsewhere on the property.

---

November 11, 2010

To: Chairman Jim Righeimer  
Costa Mesa Planning Commission  
City of Costa Mesa  
77 Fair Drive  
Costa Mesa, CA 92628

Re: Agenda Item: PA-10-10/R-10-01 – Mesa Verde Senior Housing

Dear Chairman Righeimer:

As a resident that is adjacent to the proposed project site, I would like to confirm my strong support for the Mesa Verde Senior Community that will be located at the corner of Harbor Boulevard and Mesa Verde Drive East.

I believe that the representatives from Segerstrom and their staff have clearly demonstrated a high level of sensitivity in creating a senior living community with our surrounding neighborhood. The architecture is complimentary and ensures residential compatibility with the Mesa Verde Collection homes. The addition of the senior community and its amenities will definitely contribute to the quality of the Mesa Verde/Costa Mesa area.

I also want to mention that the Segerstrom representatives have met with many of the Mesa Verde Collection residents, particularly those of us that live on Ashwood which is adjacent to the project. I personally have met with them individually and also at group meetings held at our neighbor's home. They have listened to our concerns in depth and have responded accordingly with additional project changes.

I understand that there is a request from a local business owner to allow a passage way, either with a traffic light or crosswalk at Harla and Mesa Verde Drive East, which would eliminate all gated access to the site. I am firmly against allowing any kind of cut through traffic, vehicle, bike or pedestrian access along the Westerly fence line or anywhere else on the property. Before the Segerstrom's fenced in the property, residents on Ashwood were subjected to cars driving at high rates of speed, squealing tires and other general nuisances along our fence line with the Mesa Verde Center at all hours, day and night. Since the parking lot has been cut-off from vehicle and pedestrian traffic we now enjoy a calmer and quieter home life. Approving this project as a gated community is the only way to ensure our newfound quality of life is protected. I want to emphasize the importance of supporting this project as submitted. This business owner does not speak for me or the great majority of my Mesa Verde Collection neighbors.

10A.1

I am hopeful that you and your colleagues will vote to approve the Mesa Verde Senior Community Project at the November 15, 2010 meeting of the Costa Mesa Planning Commission.

Respectfully,

Trina Moorlach

Cc: Commissioner Sam Clark, Vice Chair  
Commissioner Jim Fitzpatrick  
Commissioner Colin McCarthy  
Commissioner Steve Mensinger

**Comment Letter No. (11A)**

Darnell Wyrick, President  
Mesa Verde Community, Inc.

***Staff Response No. (11A.1)***

The comment letter expresses concerns with adequate parking as proposed for the Senior Residential Community. These concerns are noted and forwarded to the City's decisionmakers.

***Staff Response No. (11A.2)***

The comment letter expresses concerns with the scale/appearance of the four-story elevation on Mesa Verde Drive and suggests design modifications. These concerns are noted.

***Staff Response No. (11A.3)***

Refer to Staff Response No. 2A.1 noted above.

---



MESA VERDE COMMUNITY, INC.  
 Established 1965  
 "To Inform, Educate and Beautify Mesa Verde"

(11A)

**Received**  
 City of Costa Mesa  
 Development Services Department

NOV 12 2010

November 10, 2010

Costa Mesa Planning Commission  
 City of Costa Mesa  
 77 Fair Drive  
 Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Re R-10-01 and PA-10-10

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

Thank you for sending notice to Mesa Verde Community Inc. that you will hold a Public Hearing on November 15 regarding the Segerstrom and MV Partners proposal to build 230 Senior Housing Units at 1500 Mesa Verde Drive East.

We recently were informed that some changes to the plan might be forthcoming. The representative for the developers asked us to wait to send our letter until we saw the proposed changes. We had our first chance to review the changes today, Nov. 10. The project is indeed nicely designed. We now understand the number of units proposed is 224. Our concerns about safety, parking, and integration into the neighborhood remain the same. With the deadline approaching, the Board of Directors of Mesa Verde Community Inc. offers the following comments:

Carol Hoffman McDermott, as a representative for Segerstrom and MV Partners, met with our board a few months ago to present a rough draft of the project to us and solicit our input. We have the same comments now that we made then. 258 parking places for residents, staff, and visitors are still far too few. Only 34 spaces for staff, second cars and likely numerous family visitors is a major concern. That is a mere six more than the first proposal submitted. Please note there is no parking allowed on adjacent Mesa Verde Drive East for overflow parking. The only alternative would be to trespass on Mesa Verde Plaza.

11A.1

Many of our Board members feel that four-story frontage on Mesa Verde Drive is inappropriate because it is not in character or scale with the neighborhood. Mesa Verde is a one- and two-story residential neighborhood. The nearby apartment homes were carefully designed to have a two-story profile on Mesa Verde Drive. The proposed four-story frontage on Mesa Verde Drive, although nicely designed, is overwhelming in scale for this neighborhood. A tiered design, with lower frontage along Mesa Verde Drive would be more harmonious and in scale with the surroundings. The resulting reduction in units could also help bring about a more reasonable parking ratio.

11A.2

Mesa Verde Community, Inc. P.O. Box 4102 Costa Mesa, CA 92628-4102 (949) 225-4296



MESA VERDE COMMUNITY, INC.  
Established 1965

*"To Inform, Educate and Beautify Mesa Verde"*

Another concern is public safety. Although the city's traffic engineers do not see enough vehicle traffic on Mesa Verde Drive East to justify a signal, the pedestrian traffic will include seniors who are slow, some in walkers and wheelchairs. Those who drive may not have the sharpest eyesight or reaction times. In the interest of neighborhood safety, we request a traffic light or crosswalk at Harla and Mesa Verde Drive East and recommend that a thin concrete median be installed near the corner of Harbor and Mesa Verde Drive East to stop the unsafe and illegal left hand turns out of 7/11 back down Mesa Verde Drive East.

11A.3

Thank you for notifying our Board, and for the opportunity to submit our comments. We hope to work together with you to improve this project and better integrate it into our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Darnell Wyrick, President

Board Members: Cindy Brenneman, Arlene Jones, Dave Kinkade, Robin Leffler, Martie O'Meara, Joe Panarisi

**Comment Letter No. (12A)**

Department of Transportation  
District 12  
3337 Michelson Drive, Suite 380  
Irvine, CA 92612-8894

***Staff Response No. (12A)***

Comment Noted.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

District 12  
3337 Michelson Drive, Suite 380  
Irvine, CA 92612-8894  
Tel: (949) 724-2267  
Fax: (949) 724-2592



REC'D NOV 16 2010

*Flex your power!  
Be energy efficient!*

November 10, 2010

Minoo Ashabi  
City of Costa Mesa  
77 Fair Drive  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

File: IGR/CEQA  
SCH#: 2010101043  
Log #: 2621  
I-405 and SR-55

**Subject: Rezone and Master Plan for 230 Senior Housing Development**

Dear Mr. Ashabi,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the **Negative Declaration for the Rezone and Master Plan for 230 Senior Housing Development**. The project requests to rezone a 21.12-acre commercial site from C-15 and C-2 to PDC zone to develop a 7.55-acre vacant portion of the property with 230 senior housing units. The nearest State routes to the project site are I-405 and SR-55.

The California Department of Transportation (Department), District 12 is a commenting agency on this project and we have no comment at this time. However, in the event of any activity within the Department's right-of-way, an encroachment permit will be required.

Please continue to keep us informed of this project and any future developments, which could potentially impact State transportation facilities. If you have any questions or need to contact us, please do not hesitate to call Damon Davis at (949) 440-3487.

Sincerely,

Chris Herre, Branch Chief  
Local Development/Intergovernmental Review

C: Terry Roberts, Office of Planning and Research

**Comment Letter No. (13A)**

Department of Toxic Control  
Maziar Movassaghi  
5796 Corporate Avenue  
Cypress, CA 90630

***Staff Response No. (13A)***

The MND did identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances. A Phase 1 had been prepared for the project site and included an ASTM-compliant radial search report from a number of Federal database listings, including National Priorities List (NPL), Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS), Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRA), and Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS).

The project site has been vacant for several years and was previously used as a commercial site (movie theater, bowling alley, and ice rink) consistent with State and federal regulations. The proposed project site is not included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>1</sup> The potential for unknown hazardous contamination to be revealed during project construction is very low. However, if significant surface or subsurface staining is uncovered during grading or excavation activities, it will be investigated for hazardous content and appropriate measures will be taken in accordance with all applicable local and State regulations.

Borings of the site had been taken and it was determined that the material onsite is suitable for reuse. No additional studies or investigations are warranted.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List – Site Cleanup (Cortese List), [http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese\\_List.cfm](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Cortese_List.cfm), accessed August 11, 2010.



Department of Toxic Substances Control

Maziar Movassaghi  
Acting Director  
5796 Corporate Avenue  
Cypress, California 90630

Arnold Schwarzenegger  
Governor

REC'D NOV 16 2010



Linda S. Adams  
Secretary for  
Environmental Protection

November 10, 2010

Mr. Mino Ashabi  
City of Costa Mesa Planning Department  
77 Fair Drive  
Costa Mesa, California 92626

DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR REZONE AND MASTER PLAN FOR 230 SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT (SCH# 2010101043)

Dear Mr. Ashabi:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted document for the above-mentioned project. As stated in your document: "A request to rezone a 21.12 acre commercial site from C15 and C2 zone to develop a 7.55 acre vacant portion of the property with 230 senior housing units. The project includes two buildings that are two to four stories high with common amenities and parking areas. The request is for discretionary approval of a Horizontal Mixed Use Development Master Plan for the senior housing development as a complementary residential use to the existing commercial center and a rezone".

Based on the review of the submitted document DTSC has the following comments:

- 1) The ND should identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project area may have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances.
- 2) The document states that the ND would identify any known or potentially contaminated sites within the proposed project area. For all identified sites, the ND should evaluate whether conditions at the site may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies:
  - National Priorities List (NPL): A list maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).

- EnviroStor, a database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, at [www. Envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.Envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov).
  - Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.
  - Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.
  - Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.
  - GeoTracker: A List that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.
  - Local Counties and Cities maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.
  - The United States Army Corps of Engineers, 911 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 90017; (213) 452-3908, maintains a list of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS).
- 3) The ND should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If hazardous materials or wastes were stored at the site, an environmental assessment should be conducted to determine if a release has occurred. If so, further studies should be carried out to delineate the nature and extent of the contamination, and the potential threat to public health and/or the environment should be evaluated. It may be necessary to determine if an expedited response action is required to reduce existing or potential threats to public health or the environment. If no immediate threat exists, the final remedy should be implemented in compliance with state laws, regulations and policies.
- 4) The project construction may require soil excavation and soil filling in certain areas. Appropriate sampling is required prior to disposal of the excavated soil. If the soil is contaminated, properly dispose of it rather than placing it in another location. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to these soils.