

## CC-3 ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Date	Remittance to:	Payment Amount	Explanation of payment
7/10/15	All State Police Equipment Co	\$6,415.20	<p><b>What was this for?</b></p> <p><i>Police Dept. - Ammunition for training. 40mm reloadable steel insert.</i></p>
7/10/15	Anderson Penna Partners Inc.	\$4,208.75	<p><b>What was this for?</b></p> <p><i>Public Services Dept. - Transportation Services Anderson Penna is for design services for Bristol Street Median Project that is currently underway. Anderson Penna is a Civil Engineering Design company who was awarded the contract by the City Council to provide design services for the Bristol Street project.</i></p>
7/10/15	Beverly White	\$686.00	<p><b>What was this for? How many people attended?</b></p> <p><i>Sister City Travel Airfare reimbursement. Traditionally the City has covered half the airline ticket price for all students and teacher chaperone(s). There were seven students and one chaperone.</i></p>
7/10/15	FTOG Inc.	\$2,784.38	<p><b>What was this for? Who is FTOG?</b></p> <p><i>Finance Dept. – FTOG “Forget the Other Guy” is a contract buyer-special projects for the Purchasing Dept.</i></p>
7/10/15	Woodstream HOA	\$1,412.00	<p><b>What was this for? What vehicle was involved?</b></p> <p><i>City tree fell and damaged a condominium. No vehicle was involved.</i></p>
7/2/15	Bubblemania & Co	\$280.00	<p><b>What was this for?</b></p> <p><i>Parks and Recreation Early Childhood Program Balearic Community Center party program for 40 children on Wednesday, July 29<sup>th</sup>.</i></p>
7/2/15	Fantasy Fountains Inc	\$12,974.00	<p><b>What was this for?</b></p> <p><i>Public Services-Maintenance Services</i></p> <p><i>The purchase and installation of the sixth and final aerating fountain at TeWinkle Lake completes the removal and replacement of the ozone water treatment system that was not providing adequate results in the lakes, resulting in extreme algae blooms and a rapid deterioration of the water quality, especially in the warm summer months.</i></p> <p><i>With the east water falls non-operational due to leaks, the mixing of the upper lake has been problematic. The cost effective aerators insure mixing and oxygenating of the lakes with minimal down time, resulting in healthier water and a focal point for the public to enjoy.</i></p>
7/2/15	Janet Fowler	\$200.00	<p><b>What was this for?</b></p> <p><i>Senior Center guest speaker July 28, 2015.</i></p>
7/2/15	Liberty Manufacturing	\$1,674.35	<p><b>What was this for? What was the total cost?</b></p> <p><i>Police Dept. - Range Cleanup Service. Lead mining is necessary as officers' experience ricochets from the lead density within the bullet trap, which is a safety hazard. This is the total cost.</i></p>

**From:** TBON TBON Costa Mesa <tboncostamesa@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 19, 2015 4:04 PM  
**Subject:** [BULK] ZA-15-01

**Importance:** Low

Please take the time to watch the Planning Commission meeting of June 8 regarding ZA-15-01. This will give you an opportunity to thoroughly understand the the decision by the Planning Commission before the next city council meeting on July 21. Thank you.

Ann Parker

**From:** Michael <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2015 4:01 PM  
**To:** GREEN, BRENDA  
**Subject:** Solid Landings Sober Living Office parking

Dear City Council Members,

I am not in favor of reducing the parking requirements for the Solid Landings office.  
Please follow the Planning Commission's denial.

Mike Stewart

[REDACTED]

Costa Mesa

**MEJIA, JESSICA**

---

**Subject:** FW: Comments on Project PA-15-10 & TT-17870

**From:** Remillard, Ashley J. [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:07 AM  
**To:** LOOMIS, RYAN  
**Cc:** Tommy W. Remillard; GREEN, BRENDA  
**Subject:** Comments on Project PA-15-10 & TT-17870

Dear Mr. Loomis,

Thank you for speaking with me this morning regarding the above-referenced project ("Project"). As I mentioned, we are homeowners that live on Norse Avenue. We purchased our home – 2380 Norse Avenue – in December 2013. We are generally supportive of the Project, as we believe new single family homes on our street will increase our property value. That being said, we have a few concerns regarding the Project, as it is currently proposed.

We have two small children, ages 10 months and 3 years. Our next door neighbors have a son, age 3. Our neighbors at the end of the street have two small children, ages 3 years and 6 months. Directly across the street, the owners have two small children, ages 3 years and 18 months. At the other end of the street, the neighbors have two children, ages 4 and 11. Our neighbors on the other side also have two small children, ages 2 and 4. In short, the street is filled with small children.

We are concerned that the Project, as proposed, will encourage Project residents to use Norse as an access street. Specifically, we understand there will be a gate on Orange street, but currently no gate is planned to be installed on Norse. This is concerning for two reasons. First, as a practical matter, gates are cumbersome and take time to open. It is reasonable to assume that Project residents will access their properties via Norse in order to avoid any delay caused by the gate on Orange, particularly if they are going north on Santa Isabel. This increased traffic risk is a danger to our children and the other children that live and play on Norse. Second, it appears that the gate on Orange is being installed for security purposes. It is peculiar to only install a gate on one side of the Project, when the security benefits of the gates can so easily be bypassed by accessing the Project via Norse. We would assume that the Project residents would – for security reasons – prefer a gate also installed on Norse street in addition to the gate planned on Orange.

We therefore urge the City Council to approve the Project, provided that the City Council also include a condition that a gate be installed on Norse Avenue.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Best regards,

Ashley  
**Ashley J. Remillard**  
Attorney at Law  
NOSSAMAN LLP



 **NOSSAMAN** LLP | SUBSCRIBE TO E-ALERTS  
nossaman.com

PLEASE NOTE: The information in this e-mail message is confidential. It may also be attorney-client privileged and/or protected from disclosure as attorney work product. If you have received this e-mail message in error or are not the intended recipient, you may not use, copy, nor disclose to anyone this message or any information contained in it. Please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Thank you.

Hello Ryan,

I am unable to attend the City Council meeting tomorrow night, I will be out of town. I did want to have an opportunity to express my concerns to the proposed changes.

The current location has a total of 10 bedrooms. The proposal has a minimum of 18 bedrooms and a maximum of 24. This will more than double the occupancy.

As an owner of a property close by, I am concerned with the amount of vehicles coming in and out with 25 parking spaces. Even though the motorized gate has been proposed to stop through traffic, the larger homes and extra parking will encourage more vehicles on the property. My tenants all comment how they love the area because it is quiet and peaceful.

Having the trash collection truck drive through the proposed pass through road from Orange to Norse will be an added noise to the adjoining properties.

Property owners who buy on a cul-de-sac do so with an added benefit of no extra vehicles passing through the street, knowing it will be quieter and safer. This proposed change eliminates the dead end cul-de-sac, adds traffic and a concern for safety, and lowers the property values for all home owners on Norse.

I know many of the properties in the area are managed by property managers. Many of the owners do not live in the area. This minimizes their understanding of how they will be impacted by this change, as well as the likelihood that they would be available to attend a meeting. Please consider my concerns as a representation of other concerned home owners.

The proposal will have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

Thank you for considering these concerns in your decision making process.

Concerned Owner

**From:** Adrienne Ainbinder [mailto:~~adrienneainbinder@gmail.com~~]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 16, 2015 1:27 PM  
**To:** Mayor

Public Hearing # 3  
Pg. 1

**Subject:** Resident Concern on Project PA-15-10 and TT-17870

Dear Mr. Mayor,

My family resides at 229 Santa Isabel Ave., at the corner of Norse Ave. We purchased this home in 2011 and have been fortunate to see our young children play in the cul de sac with our neighbors' children, all of similar ages. As a homeowner who recently completed a significant renovation on our home, I am strongly supportive of the proposed 6-unit detached development at the end of Norse Ave. (PA-15-10 / TT-17870). I do however, feel compelled to express my concern for one of the stipulations in this development's proposal – specifically, that which opens the community onto Orange Avenue with a gate, but does not provide for an equivalent gate on the entrance via Norse Avenue.

**My family and I believe that this proposal presents significant safety concerns through the increased traffic in our cul de sac, as well as at the already precarious intersection at Santa Isabel / Norse Avenues.**

The units scheduled for demolition that are accessed through Norse Ave. generate minimal traffic through the cul de sac our children play in. The proposed development allocates six homes, and the developer has seen fit to accommodate parking for a total of 25 vehicles in accordance with city regulations. The proposed single gate configuration will undoubtedly encourage the greatest degree of those drivers to enter from Norse Ave. where their drive will be unimpeded by the delay of an automatic gate. Therefore, in addition to dramatically increasing the number of vehicles that will be accessing this parcel, the developer has created a mechanism to encourage the vast majority of these vehicles to enter the homes from our street, substantially increasing our overall neighborhood traffic.

Additionally, I have noted that the development plans allocate only one guest parking space for the entire community. It would stand to reason that guests will similarly be encouraged to enter via Norse Ave. and to park their vehicles in the Norse cul de sac and enter the community by foot where they will be unrestricted by a gate or remembering a code. This cul de sac is already highly crowded with cars from our current residents and will be overburdened with guests taking up curbside parking. More importantly, this is another generator of vehicular traffic which will present a safety concern on our street. While some increase to the traffic here will be unavoidable with the new development, **I urge the City Council to deny approval to a proposal which will encourage the greatest degree of this development's traffic through the Norse entrance, and to require the developer to implement a gate equal to that which is proposed at Orange Ave.**

Finally, as it relates to the increased traffic that should be expected to enter from Santa Isabel-Norse intersection, the City Council should be aware that the intersection of these two streets can be very precarious. This corner does not have a stop sign for the East/West-bound traffic and lies between a wide span of road between the 4-way stop at Orange and the next 4-way stop several blocks down at Santa Ana Ave. My home is positioned on the SE corner and every day I observe the East/West traffic moving significantly faster than is permitted; often dangerously faster. Additionally, this corner is frequently a "blind" turn as a result of the large SUVs that park on the SE and SW corners of this intersection. Per my earlier comment, I anticipate parking in this area would only become more impacted.

Given the family nature of our neighborhood, I often fear for the safety of the children playing in our yards and for the neighbors headed up the street toward the Back Bay. Encouraging increased traffic in and out of this intersection without also implementing appropriate safety measures to slow or stop traffic here (or to increase visibility onto Santa Isabel) is asking for serious damage to the persons or property that surround and travel through this area.

We urge the City Council and the Planning Commission to consider the safety and interests of the neighbors who reside in the immediately affected homes. I ask that the governing committee require Kings Road Partners LLC to incorporate an equally gated entrance and ask that the City evaluate the intersection(s) that will be affected by this development.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss the matter further, I can be reached at [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. I have sent this letter to the members of your council and plan to participate in next week's hearing in order to represent the concerns that my family and my neighbors carry regarding the current proposal. I hope that we have your support in our requests.

Regards,

Adrienne Ainbinder

Costa Mesa Resident Since 2004

**LOOMIS, RYAN**

---

**From:** Remillard, Ashley J. <aremillard@nossaman.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:07 AM  
**To:** LOOMIS, RYAN  
**Cc:** Tommy W. Remillard; GREEN, BRENDA  
**Subject:** Comments on Project PA-15-10 & TT-17870

Dear Mr. Loomis,

Thank you for speaking with me this morning regarding the above-referenced project ("Project"). As I mentioned, we are homeowners that live on Norse Avenue. We purchased our home – ~~2580~~ Norse Avenue – in December 2013. We are generally supportive of the Project, as we believe new single family homes on our street will increase our property value. That being said, we have a few concerns regarding the Project, as it is currently proposed.

We have two small children, ages 10 months and 3 years. Our next door neighbors have a son, age 3. Our neighbors at the end of the street have two small children, ages 3 years and 6 months. Directly across the street, the owners have two small children, ages 3 years and 18 months. At the other end of the street, the neighbors have two children, ages 4 and 11. Our neighbors on the other side also have two small children, ages 2 and 4. In short, the street is filled with small children.

We are concerned that the Project, as proposed, will encourage Project residents to use Norse as an access street. Specifically, we understand there will be a gate on Orange street, but currently no gate is planned to be installed on Norse. This is concerning for two reasons. First, as a practical matter, gates are cumbersome and take time to open. It is reasonable to assume that Project residents will access their properties via Norse in order to avoid any delay caused by the gate on Orange, particularly if they are going north on Santa Isabel. This increased traffic risk is a danger to our children and the other children that live and play on Norse. Second, it appears that the gate on Orange is being installed for security purposes. It is peculiar to only install a gate on one side of the Project, when the security benefits of the gates can so easily be bypassed by accessing the Project via Norse. We would assume that the Project residents would – for security reasons – prefer a gate also installed on Norse street in addition to the gate planned on Orange.

We therefore urge the City Council to approve the Project, provided that the City Council also include a condition that a gate be installed on Norse Avenue.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Best regards,

Ashley

**Ashley J. Remillard**

Attorney at Law  
NOSSAMAN LLP  
18101 Von Karman Avenue  
Suite 1800  
Irvine, CA 92612  
[aremillard@nossaman.com](mailto:aremillard@nossaman.com)  
T 949.833.7800 F 949.833.7878  
D 949.477.7635

---

**From:** RODELIUS, SHARON  
**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2015 8:05 AM  
**To:** GREEN, BRENDA  
**Subject:** FW: Wilson Street development, Item 3

Hi Brenda – FYI - Sharon

---

**From:** sylvia marson [mailto:sylviamarson@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 19, 2015 9:31 PM  
**To:** CITY COUNCIL  
**Subject:** Wilson Street development, Item 3

Honorable City council,

Please accept this letter in lieu of attending the council meeting on Tuesday July 21 to express opposition to Public Hearing Item #3: Appeal 6 unit 2 story development abutting single family one story homes on Wilson Street for the following reasons:

**CONCERNS:**

- \* **Quality of life issues for existing homeowners**
- \* **Traffic impact for neighborhood, also citywide**
- \* **Safety issues for children and pedestrians**
- \* **Privacy issues for existing homeowners on Wilson**
- \* **Effect on property values of surrounding homes and throughout city**

**There has been a huge amount of development in Costa Mesa recently and the quality of life and housing values here is negatively impacted by increased traffic and congestion. Please consider denial of high density development; encourage more single family homes and low density, controlled development. Thank you.**

Respectfully,

Sylvia Johnson, [REDACTED] Walnut St, Costa Mesa

EMERGENCY TRANSPORT PROGRAM

	HB		CM
Number of Calls (All Emergencies)	<u>16,400</u>	71%	<u>11,599</u>
<b>HUNTINGTON BEACH</b>			
<b>ADOPTED BUDGET - FY 2014/15</b>			
<b>CONFORMING COSTA MESA PROJECTION</b>			
<b>REVENUE</b>			
Fire Med Billing Service	\$ 5,812,108		
Fire Med Memberships	<u>\$ 1,146,000</u>		
<b>TOTAL FEES</b>	<b>\$ 6,958,108</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>\$ 4,940,257</b>
<b>EMERGENCY TRANSPORT EXPENSES</b>			
Salaries (30 ambulance operators/EMTs)	\$ 585,854		
Overtime	\$ 312,000		
<b>Benefits</b>			
CAL PERS	\$ 130,959		
Retirement Supplement	\$ 31,349		
Workers Comp	\$ 62,686		
Health Insurance	\$ 118,662		
Disability	\$ 17,846		
Dental Insurance	\$ 7,542		
Retiree Medical	\$ 69,862		
Life Insurance	\$ 2,145		
FICA Medicare	<u>\$ 12,611</u>		
Total Benefits	<u>\$ 453,662</u>		
Total Personnel Services	\$ 1,351,516		
Operating Expenses	<u>\$ 145,230</u>		
<b>TOTAL TRANSPORT EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$ 1,496,746</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>\$ 1,197,397</b>
<b>FIRE MED ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES</b>			
Personnel Expenses	\$ 435,832		
Operating Expenses	<u>\$ 348,235</u>		
<b>TOTAL ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$ 784,067</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>\$ 627,254</b>
<b>NET TRANSPORT REVENUE</b>	<b><u>\$ 4,677,295</u></b>		<b><u>\$ 3,115,606</u></b>
<b>Costa Mesa Revenue &amp; Financing Sources FY 15-16</b>			
EMS- First Responder Fee	\$ 226,600		
Paramedic Fee - Advanced	\$ 285,400		
Medical Supply Reimbursement	<u>\$ 124,800</u>		<u>\$ 636,800</u>
<b>Note: These fees may be additional or may offset revenue (assume all offset)</b>			
<b>PROJECTED COSTA MESA NET TRANSPORT REVENUE</b>			<b><u>\$ 2,478,806</u></b>
<b>ADDITION SAVINGS: METRO STATION (12 POSITIONS NOT BUDGETED)</b>			
12 FIREFIGHTERS @ \$95,000 X 150% overtime (in current budget as overtime)			\$ 1,710,000
<b>Redeploy currently budgeted 24 man shift (4 man crews @ all six stations)</b>			
<b>TOTAL ANNUAL POSITIVE IMPACT ON COSTA MESA BUDGET</b>			<b><u>\$ 4,188,806</u></b>





6.25.15 12:07 PM



6:25.15

9:43 AM



6-29-15 2:57 PM





6.29.15 7:57 PM



6:30:15 12:06 PM



6.30.15 12:05 PM

MEJIA, JESSICA

---

**Subject:** FW: List for PA-15-10  
**Attachments:** Wish list for PA-15-10 7-20-15.pdf

Hi Ms. Green,  
Please find the attached list for today's hearing.  
Thanks,  
Doug Gorrie

--- On Mon, 7/20/15, [REDACTED] wrote:

> From: Tuyet Mac [REDACTED]  
> Subject: List for PA-15-10  
> To: [REDACTED]  
> Cc: [REDACTED]  
> Date: Monday, July 20, 2015, 1:15 PM  
> Dear Mayor Stephen Mensinger,  
>  
> Thank you again for taking the time to meet with Cole Reddin and me  
> last Friday. As you suggested, I compiled a short list of items for  
> your consideration. Items 1 through 6 reflect things we discussed  
> last Friday.  
>  
> Regarding item 1, the request for a block wall, that would help us out  
> a lot. You had discussed the developer providing a 7 feet high block  
> wall. If it could be 8 feet, it would help us a lot.  
>  
> Regarding item 2, the request for all 2nd floor windows facing south  
> to be clerestory windows, the bedroom window is not a clerestory  
> window. I checked the planning commission conditions, which ask for  
> only 2nd floor windows at 5 feet setback walls to be clerestory. I am  
> not sure why the planning commission did not make the 2nd floor  
> windows at 8 feet setback walls to be clerestory as well.  
>  
> Regarding item 3, the developer is indicating landscape screening on  
> the developer's property. We just wanted a landscape plan made for  
> this and the landscaping installed per plan.  
>  
> Regarding item 4, we discussed this at the meeting.  
>  
> Regarding item 5, we discussed this at the meeting as suggested by  
> staff.  
>  
> Regarding item 6, we discussed this and if the developer can achieve  
> this it would be a big help to us.  
>  
> Regarding item 7, this was not discussed on Friday, but the issue of  
> the loft being converted into a bedroom was an item of concern which

- > was brought up during the planning commission hearing and was
- > addressed by the planning commission via HOA conditions.
- >
- > If you need to speak to me, I can be reached at [REDACTED] home, or
- > [REDACTED]
- >
- > Very best regards,
- >
- > Douglas Gorrie

## **WISH LIST (for PA-15-10)**

- 1) 8 Foot high **CMU BLOCK** wall (height measured from Wilson Street houses existing top of grade) along the side boundaries of the site (specifically along south side of the site). This block wall to be installed on the developer's property.
- 2) **ALL 2<sup>nd</sup> floor** windows (including 2<sup>nd</sup> floor recessed wall windows) abutting south property line to be **clerestory**. Supplemental memo indicates clerestory windows at 5 foot setback walls only.
- 3) Provide a landscape plan clearly showing landscape screening on developer's property at south property line. The Supplemental memo rear elevation indicates landscaping trees installed on the developer's property. Install landscape screening per plan. Developer/HOA shall maintain.
- 4) Developer to provide a landscape plan for Wilson Street homeowners and provide suggestions for plant species. Developer to provide a monetary allowance for each homeowner for the purchase and installation of landscaping screening for homeowners at 214, 218, 222 and 226 E. Wilson Street. Landscaping to be coordinated by the Wilson Street homeowners individually.
- 5) Developer shall maintain landscape screening installed on all properties abutting south property line (214, 218, 222 and 226 E. Wilson Street) for a period of 24 months after installation of landscape screening.
- 6) Proposed slab height on developer's property to be lowered by 12 inches (grading can be done at this level!) Existing slab heights are approximately 18 to 24 inches below the Wilson houses natural grade and there is an existing retaining wall.
- 7) **Bonus Room at unit A** to have clerestory window(s) and **NO closets** (to prevent bonus rooms from being converted to bedrooms).