



City of Costa Mesa

RESERVE FOR FILING STAMP

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

24 FEB 28 PM 1:34

Appeal of Planning Commission Decision:

\$1,220.00 (Tier 1)¹

\$3,825.00 (Tier 2)²

ATTACHMENT 2

Appeal of Non-Planning Commission Decision:

\$690.00 (Tier 1)¹

\$3,825.00 (Tier 2)²

CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY _____ File with: City Clerk
City of Costa Mesa
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
714-754-5225

APPLICATION FOR APPEAL OR REVIEW

Applicant Name*

S. Swanson

Address



Phone

REQUEST FOR: APPEAL

REVIEW**

Decision of which appeal or review is requested: (give application number, if applicable, and the date of the decision, if known.)

PA-22-37

3150 Bear Street, Costa Mesa, CA. 92626

Decision by:

Planning Comm.

Reasons for requesting appeal or review:

more information to be provided.

Date:

2.28.24

Signature:

S. Swanson

¹If you are serving as the agent for another person, please identify the person you represent and provide proof of authorization.

²Review may be requested only by Planning Commission, Planning Commission Member, City Council, or City Council Member

For office use only – do not write below this line

SCHEDULED FOR THE CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF:

If appeal or review is for a person or body other than City Council/Planning Commission, date of hearing of appeal or review

Updated September 2023

¹ Includes owners and/or occupants of a property located within 500 feet of project site (excluding owners and/or occupants of the project site).

² Includes the project applicant, owners and/or occupants of the project site, and owners and/or occupants of a property located greater than 500 feet from the project site.

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

24 MAR -5 AM 10:52

CITY OF COSTA MESA

BY RG

1. City Planning Determined this was CEQA exempt.
 - a. Was CEQA consulted re: this proposal.
 - b. Did CEQA provide an answer?
 - c. What data supports this project is CEQA exempt?
 - d. Are other examples of like exemptions for administrative zoning readily available to support that this is a common practice?
2. This Facility is zoned AP- Administrative Professional and has never been held to this requirement.
 - a. Obvious use violations were routinely documented and submitted to the City of Costa Mesa beginning in 1996.
 - b. Conditional Use Permits had been issued previously yet the spirit of the conditions, much less the actual conditions as issued, were not observed by the permit holder nor enforced as required by Costa Mesa City Code.
 - c. What monitoring plans do the City of Costa Mesa have to enforce and hold the applicant to the Conditions as prescribed in Costa Mesa Planning Application 22-37.
3. Exhibit A, Page 4, Findings, **Facts in Support of Findings:**
 - a. First sentence. What data did the City of Costa Mesa use to make the determination that the event center would not be detrimental to the nearby properties?
 - b. Who made the decision and what is that person's experience and training to make such a determination?
 - c. **Activity** as used in the final sentence of this paragraph:
 - i. What is the definition of "Activity" as used here?
 1. Does "Activity" include build up and tear down of event support equipment?
 2. Does "Activity" mean event guest, support staff, entertainment, and/or all other "Activities" which produce noise will be concluded by the times outlined in Exhibit A?
4. There is another entrance to this facility. If City Planners/CEQA are confident that there will no disruption to homes abutting the facility, please request they use the Olympic entrance for **ALL** their proposed outdoor and non-administrative activities. Please request that they use the front of their building (freeway side-no homes) be utilized for ALL outdoor/non administrative purposes!! This will prevent outdoor activities from destroying the **Peaceful** enjoyment that was **promised** but never provided to the surrounding homes.
5. Brenda Green called from the City 3/4/24 and stated an immediate document was required stating reasons for this appeal. Brenda Stated the City Lawyers were placing the deadline of 12:00pm 3/5/24 or they would throw the appeal out?
6. There is 25+ years of documentation to the city for 3150 Bear Street, dating back to 1996. It is requested that the city place ALL the previous documentation back into this file. This will allow full understanding of the lengthy history of blatant disregard to the homeowners, and the promised quiet enjoyment of the administrative facility beside their homes. Further documentation will be added after the city attaches ALL past documentation. The city has repeatedly refused to address the many years of violations, while continuously providing the property owners with continuous added CUPS for **loud** outdoor activities.

Appeal-22-27

7. This Appeal, for starters requests the CEQA exemption is removed and that CEQA will allow homeowner documentation and input. It has felt as though the many **years** of documentation, Hours of paperwork and video have been blatantly ignored. The city repeatedly told the homeowners to handle it themselves. This allowed the homeowners to be pulled into multiple legal related issues and put through extensive financial and emotional harm. It felt like the legal issues were used to chill the voice of the homeowners and in the process gain some of their homes. The "Church" has obtained many of the homes in Lifestyles, including most surrounding the Bear facility. The Lifestyle homes have appeared to be selling at well below their potential market value (examples to be provided in future documents). When not under demand of less than 24-hour time constraints!
8. The Bear facility, was reported to have sold for multimillions below the comparable market value(per reports by the LA Times).
9. There will be more information provide when not under less than 24-hour demand to produce information and after the city has added the lengthy years of documentation from **years** of previous files into this file for better understanding of the full situation. It is requested all information dating back to 1996 to provide a basic understanding for this appeal. More will be added when not under time deadline imposed, reportedly by the City Lawyers.
10. The new property owner reportedly owns high performance cars, which he has showcased at the 3150 Bear facility. We are able to hear these cars loudly driving around, exiting the lot and driving up and down Bear Street, The owner has already held a couple of loud events that have required calls for noise violations.

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
24 MAR -5 AM 10:52
CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY BC

Network Visualizer

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
237

19 NOV 18 PM 12:47

CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY BB

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

27 MAR -5 AM 11:00

CITY OF COSTA MESA
BY BB

