

**From:** Colin McCarthy

**Sent:** Thursday, March 13, 2014 4:21 PM

**To:** RIGHEIMER, JIM; MENSINGER, STEPHEN; LEECE, WENDY; MONAHAN, GARY; GENIS, SANDRA

**Cc:** ARMSTRONG, GARY; GREEN, BRENDA; Jim Fitzpatrick; HATCH, THOMAS

**Subject:** Old Business Item No. 1

Mayor Righeimer and Councilmembers,

On March 10th the Costa Mesa Planning Commission unanimously approved a tentative tract map and design review to construct 6 detached for sale homes at 2183 and 2187 Miner Street, off of Victoria in our City's westside. This project was proposed within existing density (12 dwelling units per acre), although adjoining densities went up to 19 dwelling units per acre. As proposed all homes are properly parked.

The application consisted of 5 deviations- one variance, three administrative adjustments and one minor modification.

With the passage of the Small Lot Ordinance, this application would have required only one administrative adjustment and one minor modification, saving both the applicant and our staff valuable time.

I have attached the "before" and "after pictures from the property. According to the neighbors, the abandoned structure on this property is a haven for homeless, drugs, trash and noise. By all accounts, it is a blighted property. Parking on Miner Street is a nightmare according to those same residents.

The attached "before" photograph reflects where we were. The attached "after" photograph reflects where we are going. I hope you will agree this is an improvement. I encourage you to visit this property before Tuesday's meeting. This is not "HUD housing." It is not a "developer giveaway." It is a project built within existing densities (actually at lower density than neighboring properties), and fully parked. It exemplifies why we need an SLO in our City.

I, and many others in our community, look forward to the second reading of the proposed Small Lot Ordinance and more projects like this in our City.

Thank you for your time.

Colin McCarthy





**From:** Daniel Hoffmann  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2014 10:13 AM  
**To:** LEECE, WENDY; WENDY LEECE- City Council; GENIS, SANDRA  
**Subject:** Small Lot Development Ordinance

Dear Sandy and Wendy

I have been following from a bit afar the development with the small lot development ordinance ("Ordinance")

I understand during the last city council meeting the Ordinance was voted on and, not surprisingly, was vote 3:2 with the two of you voting against it.

I also understand that the Ordinance is up for a second vote.

Could you please advise me when the second vote will be and if it is adopted along the same voting record, either or both of you would submit an appeal.

I personally see the Ordinance highly flawed for two reasons:

1. Facts vs Fiction – Entry level homeownership

The fact is touted that the Ordinance will be beneficial for entry level homeowners. Case in point: 2525 Santa Ana Ave Project that would easily fall under the Ordinance. With a project's price of \$750K, which first homeowner can afford this? The targeted first homeowner are typically kids that have college background. Alas their salary might be good to qualify, yet, they are mired down with student loans (at a tune of \$1000 to \$1200/mo) plus car payments, making them ineligible for homeownership. Lastly where, with all the student debt, do they find \$150K (20% of asking price) for a downpayment.

Should the parents step in and part of the "historic wealth transfer", provide the downpayment or co-sign the loan, then the kids will want to move into a neighborhood with single family dwellings where they have a yard, as they are thinking having kids.

Case in point: A young couple under 30 with a kid and a second one on the way just moved into our neighborhood, paying cash \$1,050M for a 3 BR/2Ba home. It was a gift from both parents!

2. Traffic

Small lot development are ideally suited for downtown areas where things are within walking distance, thereby alleviating the need for cars. Many kids have delayed buying a car; in fact, many do not want to have a car, if they live in a downtown area where everything is within walking distance. Examples of such development are downtown LA, downtown Santa Monica. Therefore, any development under the Ordinance should be (1) limited to downtown areas and (2) coupled with public transportation improvements so that the purchaser of such property does not have to rely on having a 1:1 ratio of vehicles to inhabitants.

A straightforward development is just densification to the benefit of the developer (and of course the city's tax base) and to the detriment of the general population.

Thanks for allowing me to share this with you

Best  
daniel

Daniel Hoffmann

Costa Mesa, CA 92627

-----Original Message-----

From: [news@costamesaca.gov](mailto:news@costamesaca.gov)

Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2014 11:59 AM

To: GREEN, BRENDA

Subject: weigh in on charter

Submission information

---

Survey answers

---

Name:

Carol L Beck

Address:

City: Costa Mesa

State: CA

Zip Code: 92627

E-mail:

Give us your thoughts on the charter:

I can't figure out why anyone is working on a charter. We voted against it...and we will again.

**WARRANT INFORMATION For March 18, 2014**

Payment Ref.	Date	Remittance to:	Remittance ID:	Payment Amount	Explanation of payment
0178353	2/28/14	AAA Container Sales & Rentals	22352	\$4,127.20	<b>Where was this placed?</b>  Fire Station #2 for Snoopy House display. 40' storage container
0178379	2/28/14	CSULB Foundation	9724	\$307.00	<b>What is this for?</b>  Police Dept. Cpt. Sharpnack Internal Affairs Seminar 6/16-18/2014
0178380	2/28/14	CSULB Foundation	9724	\$326.00	<b>What is this for?</b>  Police Dept. Sgt. Stafford Civil Liability Seminar 5/5-7/2014
0178496	2/28/14	Balboa Bay Club & Resort	22432	\$540.00	<b>Costs for rental?</b>  Deposit for Executive Team Meeting March 22th (10 people). Includes meeting room, breakfast, lunch, and snacks for team for the day.