

**From:** Geoff West <1geoffwest@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 20, 2025 3:00 PM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** FDC DISCUSSION

Dear Chairman Harlan and Planning Commissioners.

Regarding Fairview Developmental Center (FDC), which you will, once again, consider at your meeting on Monday, June 23, 2025, I have some concerns to share with you.

I have attended most of the meetings on this subject and have watched the metamorphosis of this project over the years. I agree with most folks that the availability of this huge chunk of land is a windfall for our city at a time when the State has imposed onerous, unrealistic RHNA demands on us. There is no doubt that, regardless of which development scheme is chosen, it will take a big bite out of the State's demand for us to plan for 11,760 new dwelling units. But, we can do better.

For me the biggest negative in this project is the requirement for the inclusion of a regional Emergency Operations Center (EOC) within the footprint of the FDC. It has never made sense to me, especially when it included a plan for a heliport. That element has now been deleted, but the inclusion of the EOC still makes no sense, and especially not in the location specified in the plans.

IF it is necessary to have an EOC in Southern California, and IF it must be located on State property, there is a MUCH MORE APPROPRIATE location a mile away at the State-owned Orange County Fair and Event Center. The parking lot could provide sufficient space for what is basically an office/warehouse complex. The original plans called for 15 acres for the EOC complex, but that included space for the heliport. Now the footprint could be MUCH smaller - it could be one building with a warehouse on the ground floor and necessary offices located above in one or two stories. The Fair and Events Center is an infrequently-used site and sufficient space for the EOC could be carved out of the parking lot at the corner of Fair Drive and Fairview Road. This location is MUCH more conveniently located to both the 55 and 405 freeways and, if it is later determined that helicopter access is important during an emergency, the adjacent parking lot could be easily utilized.

IF the EOC MUST be located on the grounds of the FDC, then the location should be changed to a site closer to the only access point at Harbor Blvd. Again, the smaller footprint could be accommodated near the entrance to the FDC. Using the current location would require what amounts to commercial truck traffic driving through a planned residential neighborhood with parks and walking paths and creating unnecessary dangerous situations for those folks walking, biking or playing in one of the planned recreational sites.

As far as the remainder of the project is concerned, I would prefer to see taller buildings in what will be a self-contained enclave, providing a greater number of dwelling units. By going "up" more land could be used for parks and other recreational amenities. And, by relocating the EOC, it frees-up the most prime piece of residential space on the entire site. That 15 acres could house high-rise, golf course and ocean-view market rate units that could help make the entire development more financially viable.

Oh, yes - the plan should include an emergency access road through the golf course to the site from the fire station on Placentia to significantly reduce response times to the FDC.

As a more than half-century resident of Costa Mesa, I appreciate you considering my thoughts. .

**From:** steve.schaack <schaack21@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 20, 2025 4:13 PM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** Fairview Redevelopment

As a resident of neighboring College Park, I am for the redevelopment of the Fairview complex, but I do have some concerns with each proposed design.

Overall, a main concern is the increased traffic due to the proposed number of units being funneled onto Harbor Blvd and primarily the Fairview/Harbor intersection. Fairview, especially around City Hall/Vanguard/The Fairgrounds already can get backed up during special events at the fairgrounds and the entire month of the OC Fair, often backing up towards the 55. Adding 2300-4000 units will only add to that. I do not want to see Fairview turn into another Adams Ave with that level of traffic. College park will become a cut through to try and miss a that intersection. Creating access off the backside to Placentia would alleviate some of that increased traffic. The lot gets close to Placentia and the fire station there. Creating an access point there would be good from a both a fire response and also easy access to Estancia HS and Wilson Elementary School.

Locating the sports field right next to the golf course is a problem as golf balls could enter the fields and cheering from the fields will not be appreciated by the golfers. Relocating the fields to more center of the complex and then having the housing along the perimeter would also be more enjoyable for tenants with open space views.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Schaack  
222 Wellesley Ln  
CM

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**From:** Mark McAnlis <markmcanlis@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 21, 2025 3:40 PM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** Fairview Developmental Center

Hello,

I prefer plan 1, with the most open acreage and the lowest number of residential housing.

Thanks,  
Mark McAnlis  
2349 Colgate Dr  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**From:** EBG <elizgrant@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 8:43 AM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** No changes to Costa Mesa Country Club Golf Courses!

I am vehemently opposed to the proposed Concept 2 and Concept 3 of the Fairview Developmental Center land development, which both include putting another access road through the Costa Mesa Country Club golf course and rewriting its fairway plans.

Also, there's no reason to consider even replacing the golf course with public park(s). There is already a HUGE public park just behind/adjacent to the golf course and Fairview Developmental Center, which is Fairview Park. We don't need more parkland.

Has anyone considered how much income the golf course brings to the city, which would be lost if it is turned into a park? Or which would be decreased drastically because of reductions to income from fewer golfers because of modifications to the fairways required by Concepts 2 and 3?

My understanding, from personnel at the golf course, was that during and after Covid shutdowns, the golf course brought in megabucks, because so many people were using it for safe social distancing while exercising. I also understand that the golf course continues to make a lot of money for the City of Costa Mesa.

The negative impact on the reduced income generated from the golf course if Concept 2 or 3 are passed should be a critical element to determining what's the best use for this property.

Thank you.

Elizabeth Grant  
1360 Watson Avenue  
Costa Mesa  
elizgrant@yahoo.com

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**From:** MARTINEZ, DAVID  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:28 PM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** Fwd: FAIRVIEW DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN LAND USE PLAN - REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

In case it wasn't sent here as well -  
Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Daniel Thomas Morgan <danielthomasmorgan@gmail.com>  
**Date:** June 22, 2025 at 4:46:34 PM PDT  
**To:** PLANNING INFO <planninginfo@costamesaca.gov>, "HARLAN, JEFFREY" <Jeffrey.Harlan@costamesaca.gov>, "ZICH, JON" <JON.ZICH@costamesaca.gov>, "KLEPACK, KAREN" <KAREN.KLEPACK@costamesaca.gov>, "ROJAS, JOHNNY" <JOHNNY.ROJAS@costamesaca.gov>, "VALLARTA, ANGELY" <ANGELY.VALLARTA@costamesaca.gov>, "MARTINEZ, DAVID" <DAVID.MARTINEZ@costamesaca.gov>, "DICKSON, ROBERT" <Robert.Dickson@costamesaca.gov>  
**Subject:** FAIRVIEW DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN LAND USE PLAN - REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

**To:** Costa Mesa Planning Commission  
**From:** Daniel Morgan  
**Subject:** Request for Deliberate and Transparent Planning – Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the pace and direction of the planning process for the Fairview Developmental Center (FDC) Specific Plan. The May 27, 2025 staff report outlines several significant impacts—particularly to traffic and infrastructure—that merit more deliberate evaluation before a preferred land use plan is recommended.

While the redevelopment of the FDC presents a valuable opportunity to address housing needs, the current planning process risks moving forward without adequately addressing some of the most pressing concerns for existing residents, local businesses, and community infrastructure.

#### **Traffic Impacts on Harbor Boulevard**

The proposed plan anticipates a buildout of up to 3,800 residential units, resulting in more than 18,000 additional vehicle trips per day, including over 1,600 during evening peak hours. These volumes would place an extraordinary burden on Harbor Boulevard, which already suffers from congestion and limited capacity.

According to the staff report, even with improvements, the project would result in Level of Service D during peak periods. Without those improvements, the corridor would fall to Level of Service E—indicating significant delays and degraded flow. This has direct implications for public safety, including slower emergency response times, increased accident risk, and congestion that will impact daily life for thousands of residents in adjacent neighborhoods.



## **Economic Impact on Auto Dealerships**

Harbor Boulevard is home to a substantial concentration of auto dealerships, which are among Costa Mesa's most important sources of sales tax revenue. These businesses depend on reliable, uncongested access to Harbor for test drives, service operations, and customer access. Increasing traffic volumes without a detailed circulation and mitigation plan could impair their operations, potentially threatening long-term viability and diminishing a critical component of the city's economic base.

## **Incomplete Planning for Connectivity and Community Amenities**

The Specific Plan, as presented, does not yet fully address integration with neighborhood-serving infrastructure. There is little clarity on how new development will be supported by adequate school capacity, active parks, pedestrian and bike networks, or transit options.

Moreover, the report confirms that none of the current land use concepts meet the city's own General Plan standard of 4.26 acres of open space per 1,000 residents or the existing goal of preserving 25% of the site as open space. These elements are not optional—they are foundational to building a community that is livable, functional, and supported by the public.

## **Request for Action**

Given the long-term significance of this project, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. Extend the timeline to allow for more robust public engagement and feedback.
2. Require a comprehensive traffic and mobility mitigation plan prior to finalizing any land use recommendation.
3. Ensure that the plan complies with the city's own park and open space requirements.
4. Conduct additional analysis on school capacity, emergency response impacts, and economic effects on Harbor Boulevard businesses.

This project will shape the future of Costa Mesa for decades. The community deserves a process that is transparent, inclusive, and grounded in responsible planning. I urge the Commission to take the time necessary to ensure that we get this right.

Sincerely,

Daniel Morgan

2424 Andover Pl,

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

--  
-----

Sincerely,  
Daniel Thomas Morgan

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**PARTIDA, ANNA**

---

OB-1

**From:** Adam Ereth <erethenvironmental@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 7:11 PM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** Public Comments for PC Item # OB-1  
**Attachments:** June 2025 PC Meeting Doc.docx

Public Comment Attached below.

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

Honorable Chair Harlan, Vice-Chair Zich, and Costa Mesa Planning Commissioners:

The City of Costa Mesa has a chance to influence its future through the FDC Specific Plan, which includes three proposals with various advantages and disadvantages. The State of California has reserved 15 acres for affordable housing, as well as land for the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), reducing the expected land availability for development.

The proposal suggesting 2,300 housing units aligns somewhat with the current character of Costa Mesa, but does not reflect its historical low-density planning compared to nearby Los Angeles. With a growing population, there is a concern about the future identity of Costa Mesa, with many residents valuing the city's slower pace, less traffic, and open spaces. There is also a notable shortage of homeownership opportunities, as evidenced by census data indicating that 58% of occupied units are rented, while only 42% are owner-occupied.

Addressing this imbalance is crucial for fostering stability in neighborhoods. The project is seen as a way to increase homeownership and ease rental market pressure, which is currently inflated due to high demand and low vacancy rates. The City's Land Use Element emphasizes various goals for better housing distribution and neighborhood stability, including promoting homeownership and protecting existing communities.

Several notable land use policies apply in this vein:

- LU1.1 - a greater balance of ownership vs. rentership opportunities,
- LU1.2 - balancing economic gains from new development while preserving the character and densities of residential neighborhoods,
- LU1.3 – strongly encourage home ownership opportunities and improve the balance between ownership and rentership,
- LU2.6 – encourage private market investment into declining or deteriorating neighborhoods,
- LU3.1 – protect existing stabilized residential neighborhoods,
- LU3.4 – compatibility with existing residential neighborhoods in the surrounding area,
- LU3.8 – ensure that new development reflects existing qualities and features that are in context with nearby development and residential neighborhoods,
- LU3.10 – minimize effects of new development on the character of surrounding neighborhoods,
- LU3.12 – ensure that new development reflects qualities and features in context with nearby development, and more.

The proposed Project 1 best reflects a desirable ownership distribution, but state goals for affordable housing, especially in Proposals 2 and 3, do not align with the City's General Plan. If a recommendation



is needed, Project 1 should be advanced. Furthermore, you may request planning staff and PLACEWORKS to create a new map that offers a higher percentage of ownership options, potentially by reducing the number of rental units, providing residents with more housing choices and opportunities for equity-building through property ownership.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I wish you all the best in your deliberations this evening.

Respectfully,

Adam Ereth

**From:** GREEN, BRENDA  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 8:00 AM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** FW: Comments for 6-23-25 PC Meeting  
**Attachments:** New Business-1 comments-Toler.pdf; Old Business-1 comments-Toler.pdf

Respectfully,  
**Brenda Green**  
City Clerk



City Clerk's Office | (714) 754-5221  
77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



As City Hall has reopened, we encourage the public to take advantage of our appointment system. Appointments can be made at [www.costamesaca.gov/appointments](http://www.costamesaca.gov/appointments). Please note that it is required that all guests check in with our Concierge Staff, located on the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Lobby, upon arrival at City Hall.

**From:** Russell Toler <russell.toler@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:00 PM  
**To:** CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments for 6-23-25 PC Meeting

Chair Harlan and Commissioners,

Attached are my comments for OB-1 (FDC) and NB-1 (zoning cleanup). I'm unable to make the meeting, but I appreciate the time you'll put into reading what I have to say, and maybe even visiting some of the hyperlinks.

Thanks!  
Russell Toler  
949-375-8682

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

Jun 23, 2025

Chair Harlan and Commissioners,

Before we lock in any vision or preferred plan for the FDC site, we need to think about *what we're even aspiring to*. What would be considered a successful redevelopment of the site? Something looking like Playa Vista in L.A? Riverpark in Oxnard? Some new Irvine or Tustin neighborhood?

While we look to our immediate neighbors, there are places further away that are *somehow doing much better work*—where they are building complete, beautiful, and car-lite neighborhoods despite sharing many of the same constraints that we face.

I would encourage you to spend some time looking at what is actually being built elsewhere (whether the same density or not), and asking staff, the consultants, and the development community what is stopping us from building such beauty and livability. Check out [Freiburg](#) in Germany, [Malmo BO01](#) in Sweden, or [Merwede](#) in the Netherlands.

The latter is somewhat comparable to our site. It's on 60 acres, but plans 6,000 homes—doubling our densest alternative for the FDC site—while still managing to be car-free, lush with trees and stormwater buffers, and programmed for complete, comfortable, and convenient urban life. Obviously, there are differences between them and us that would preclude us from being so ambitious, but it is absolutely worthwhile to consider this and other [excellent projects](#) when considering an approach for our own.



Regarding the streets specifically, the sections currently proposed for FDC are almost painfully conventional. Yes, there are sidewalks and bike lanes, but they're bolted onto a template that still prioritizes vehicle flow (12-foot lanes is what is typical for freeways!). In places like [Merwede](#), residential "streets" are conceived as green courtyards and linear parks rather than auto throughputs: narrow, shady, social, and deeply livable. The irony is that those examples—easily dismissed as "European"—are actually a closer match to our draft vision statement and guiding principles, and even the goals of our own General Plan (see Goals C-7 through C-12, which call for streets that are human-scaled, walkable, and low-speed). The current FDC sections are falling woefully short. This is frustrating in a time when we say we want to do better, and we [know how to do better](#).

The purpose of this letter is also to urge you to slow down before advancing any preferred plan into the CEQA process: we first must figure out *what we actually care about when it comes to the built outcome* of this place, and then *clearly articulate a very strong set of guiding principles* that reflect such an outcome.

The draft vision and guiding principles are currently too non-committal, abstract, and susceptible to dilution, leaving the door open for what could ultimately be a car-dominated and stagnant bedroom district wrapped in sustainability language. Moving forward with the current vision and guiding principles could allow CEQA to clumsily lock us into a weak foundation, rendering future efforts at shaping this future neighborhood useless.

Below is *an example* of what I think a clearer, more robust, and specific vision and set of guiding principles could look like. I am asking that the Planning Commission lock in *something like this* before any preferred plan proceeds.

## Vision Statement

*What takes the place of the Fairview Developmental Center should be a green and shady **car-lite, connected, and complete** neighborhood—including all of the civic, commercial, and social elements necessary for a vibrant community, and offering the freedom to thrive on foot, bike, and via transit.*

## Guiding Principles: The "Three Cs"

**1. Car-lite.** This new neighborhood must be intentionally car-lite in both design and marketing.

This principle includes:

- Streets designed primarily for people;
- Parking that is limited, unsubsidized, unbundled from residential units, and located below or behind buildings;
- Shared car fleets to enable residents to access vehicles without having to own one;

- Transparent marketing that positions the neighborhood as a place where car ownership is optional—not assumed; and
- Integration with the other two Cs (Connected and Complete) to make car-lite living genuinely viable.

A place built to support car-lite living will allow for a much higher quality of architecture and urban design, lower infrastructure costs, reduced traffic burden on adjacent streets, and lower housing costs—while enabling people of all ages and incomes to live well.

**2. Connected.** This new neighborhood must be physically and socially connected to the rest of the city and region.

This principle includes:

- A land swap with the golf course to allow for meaningful frontage along Harbor Boulevard, improving access and—importantly—commercial viability;
- Early, formal coordination with OCTA on routing, stop design, and service levels;
- A site-wide network of comfortable, shaded, low-stress walking and biking routes that connect outward in multiple directions—not just within the site; and
- Multiple access points, not just one or two vehicle gateways, so that access by all modes is convenient.

A connected neighborhood is not just one that's easy to get in and out of by car—it's one that's easy to reach by multiple modes and from multiple directions.

**3. Complete.** This new neighborhood must be planned as a *complete* neighborhood, not a bedroom district. That means integrating the everyday functions of civic and social life.

This principle includes:

- Space for civic uses like schools, a library or community center, places of worship, etc., and a plan for such uses to be funded and realized;
- Plazas, greens, and/or parks designed with attention to scale, shape, programmability, framing, and placement; and
- Commercial and flexible spaces for studios, shops, services, and local entrepreneurship.

A complete neighborhood contains what people need to live—not just to sleep. That means fewer car trips, more community, and a richer, more resilient local life.

Before moving the preferred plan into CEQA, I respectfully ask that the Commission:

- Redraft the vision statement to reflect a serious commitment to livability and human-centered design;
- Replace or revise the guiding principles to reflect *something like* what I've called the Three Cs: Car-lite, Connected, and Complete; and
- Recommend that the City Council ensures that future design work, developer selection, and environmental review are all explicitly tied to these principles.

Thanks for reading!

Russell Toler



**PARTIDA, ANNA**

OB-1

**From:** Adam Wood <awood@biasc.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:48 AM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** BIA/OC Comment Letter - Fairview  
**Attachments:** BIAOC Comment Letter - Fairview at PC.pdf

Please see our letter, attached.

Thank you!

-Adam



**Adam S. Wood**  
**Senior Vice President**

Building Industry Association of Southern California, Inc.

[awood@biasc.org](mailto:awood@biasc.org)

ph: (949) 777-3860

w: [biasc.org](http://biasc.org)

**Mailing Address: 17192 Murphy Ave., #14445, Irvine, CA 92623**

Los Angeles/Ventura • Orange County • San Bernardino County • Riverside County • Coachella Valley



**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.



# BUILDING INDUSTRY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.

## ORANGE COUNTY CHAPTER

June 23, 2025

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

Chair Harlan and Commissioners,

On behalf of the Building Industry Association of Southern California - Orange County Chapter (BIA/OC), thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Fairview Specific Plan Land Use Review and Recommendation.

By way of background, BIA/OC is a non-profit trade association of over 1,000 member companies affiliated with the home building industry. Our mission is to champion housing as the foundation of vibrant and sustainable communities.

While there is much to discuss about future development proposals, no conversation is relevant if financial feasibility is made impossible. The Staff Report includes Table 1, found on PDF page 6 in public documents. Table 1 clearly demonstrates that Concept 1 is not financially feasible and if selected will result in, at best, the Fairview Development Center remaining in limbo.

Concept 2 is better but realistically, if the decision matrix for the site is 'results oriented,' Concept 3 is the most logical path forward. Proceeding with Concept 3 does not mean maximum development will inevitably occur on the site, but it will provide future applicants with the greatest flexibility. All development projects come with significant risk and a plan that creates the most freedom creates the greatest potential for actual construction.

Again, while there is much to discuss, no conversation is worthwhile on a project that doesn't pencil. We look forward to your guidance to Staff and are excited about the future potential this site holds for Costa Mesa and the entire region.

Sincerely,

Adam Wood  
Sr. Vice President  
BIA/SC – Orange County Chapter

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT  
MEGAN ELTRINGHAM  
THE NEW HOME COMPANY

1<sup>ST</sup> VICE PRESIDENT  
DAVE MELLO  
LANDSEA HOMES

TREASURER  
JOE OFTILE  
WARMINGTON RESIDENTIAL

SECRETARY  
NORMAN BROWN  
PULTE GROUP

TRADE CONTRACTOR VP  
ALAN BOUDREAU  
BOUDREAU PIPELINE

ASSOCIATE MEMBER VP  
MARK HIMMELSTEIN  
NEWMAYER & DILLION, LLP

MEMBER AT LARGE  
PETER VANEK  
INTREGAL COMMUNITIES

MEMBER AT LARGE  
SEAN MATSLER  
COX, CASTLE, & NICHOLSON LLP

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT  
BROOKE DOI  
SHEA HOMES

SR. VICE PRESIDENT, OC CHAPTER  
ADAM WOOD  
BIA/SC

**From:** Dick O'Neil <doneil2855@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 10:59 AM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Cc:** Dick O'Neil; William Cloud  
**Subject:** Fairview Developmental Center Redevelop Plan - Written Comment for Meeting Record

Dear City Council,

I am a 40 year Costa Mesa Resident and golfer, living in the same Mesa Verde (District 1) home for the past 32 years. The impact of the Fairview Development Center (FDC) remodel on the future of CM Golf and Country Club (CMGCC) has created significant angst amongst the golf community.

After the CM Senior Golf Association (CMSGA) forwarded an online survey link to members about a year ago, we admittedly lost track of the decision-making process for this massive project and how it may affect the future of our local "gem" of a municipal golf course. Most CMSGA members selected the plan option survey that did not require a road through the Mesa Linda Golf Course. However, recent CM City Council updates indicate this option is increasingly likely, if not already selected by the State and City partnership. While years out, this plan will eliminate at least 9 if not 18 of the current 36 hole CMGCC classic William Bell design layout.

Orange County's municipal golf options are dwindling due to course properties being closed (Mile Square Players Course, El Toro Marine Golf Course, Oak Creek Irvine, pending Newport Golf Course conversion to a surf park) for a variety of reasons, mostly due to the CA housing crunch and State mandates to address the shortage.

With the soaring popularity of golf nationwide, CMGCC has never been busier. Thanks to the experienced and dedicated CMGCC staff, the course conditions and operations have never been better! CM residents, non-residents, high school competitions, youth golf, and tournament play fill the Mesa Linda and Los Lagos tee time sheets from first light to dusk.

The vast majority of our golf community understand and accept the FDC project will bring change needed to help CM meet our CA affordable housing targets. Our objective is to be involved in the decision making process, to provide feedback, and hopefully achieve the best outcome for all parties while minimizing the impact on our beloved CMGCC.

We look forward to working with you and the CM Council!

Sincerely,  
Dick O'Neil

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**From:** Jennifer Tanaka <jletanaka@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 11:32 AM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Cc:** CITY CLERK  
**Subject:** Fairview Developmental Center (Old Business Item #1)

Dear Commissioners:

Off the bat, I want to wholly endorse the comments sent in by former planning commissioner Russell Toler regarding the review of the Fairview Developmental Center (FDC) specific plan. I completely agree with his comments, critiques, and recommended approach.

I particularly agree with Mr. Toler's recommendation to *slow down* and return to *first principles*. My reason for doing so, however, is a bit more legalistic and technical. I do not believe that Placeworks, the contractor engaged to develop the FDC specific plan, has satisfactorily completed the scope of work set forth in its agreement with the city.

In the city's agreement with the CA Department of Developmental Services (DDS), the city has promised that it will deliver a "robust community engagement strategy" (See Section 4(a) of Exhibit A to that agreement). In turn, the City has contracted with Placeworks to develop and implement that community engagement strategy. In the city's RFP for the development of the FDC specific plan, which is incorporated into the scope of work Placeworks is obligated to perform, it states that "the overarching project tasks must, at a minimum, include [...] community visioning and engagement *throughout the process*" (emphasis mine). It goes on to state that the "desired outcome of the Project includes [a] *transparent planning process, inform, engage and solicit input from the community*; [...] including a plan that *promotes use of alternative modes of transportation and connectivity*." Finally, the RFP states that the community engagement to be performed must be "meaningful" and "result in productive and actionable outcomes that are incorporated into the Specific Plan and the Program EIR."

The process run by Placeworks has resulted in two *material* flaws with respect to these requirements.

First, with respect to community engagement, the decision to complete the financial feasibility analysis *following* the gathering of community input about potential land use plans renders that input effectively moot. Many (if not the majority) of residents engaged in the FDC outreach process preferred a land use alternative that is not financially feasible, and therefore cannot be selected by the city. By eliminating the alternative preferred by the majority of respondents, the process has robbed those respondents of an opportunity to re-evaluate their preferences in light of the feasibility analysis results.

It is worse still that the Staff is potentially recommending a fourth alternative that blends together the two land use options that were disfavored by the public.

It is my view, and I believe it is pretty widely shared, that "meaningful" public engagement means asking the public about more than the aesthetics of the ultimate plan. That the public preferred a "grand promenade" is meaningless when, in order to maintain that aesthetic aspect of the plan, many other vital aspects of the overall project (park space, unit count, street design, etc.) will be radically compromised or slimmed down. Would the public still prefer this "grand promenade" if they were informed of the park space and other amenities maintaining it will eliminate? *We don't know*.

Therefore, Placeworks has simply not delivered on this aspect of its scope of work. The State should be made aware of this setback and the city should argue for an extension of time accordingly.



Second, with respect to developing a plan that "promotes the use of alternative modes of transportation and connectivity", none of the proposals achieve such "promotion". As Mr. Toler notes, merely "bolting on" class II bicycle lanes -- a facility disfavored when the reconstruction of streets to create class I bicycle paths is available -- is simply not "promotion." Additionally, the lack of *any* communication with the Orange County Transportation Authority is itself fatal to the notion that Placeworks has performed its obligations here.

It strains credulity past the breaking point that we will be able to "promote" alternative modes of transportation for 8,000-10,000 new residents in an area completely surrounded by golf course or the car-dominated artery of Harbor Boulevard merely by striping a few bicycle lanes and adding a perimeter multiuse path. Has *any* study or analysis been done to determine how feasible it will be for residents to actually use bicycles outside of the FDC? To where will they connect? Have safe routes to the schools where these residents' children will likely attend been address? The answer is almost certainly no, and that is because the work that has been done in this area has entirely performative. Again, Placeworks has failed to deliver on this part of its contract, and it should not be paid another dime of taxpayer money until it produces adequate performance.

There are many other areas where Placeworks's deliverables have fallen short. For today's discussion, however, I think these two clear failures should suffice to support sending this process to the drawing board.

Best,  
Jenn Tanaka  
321 Broadway  
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

---

**PARTIDA, ANNA**

OB-1

**To:** GREEN, BRENDA; TAI, CARRIE; TERAN, STACY; MCGILL, ANNA  
**Subject:** RE: Fairview Developmental center concept 2&3 with a road thru ML course

---

**From:** Tim Bjelland <[timbjelland@icloud.com](mailto:timbjelland@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:54 PM  
**To:** STEPHENS, JOHN <[JOHN.STEPHENS@costamesaca.gov](mailto:JOHN.STEPHENS@costamesaca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Bjelland Tim <[tbielland@att.net](mailto:tbielland@att.net)>  
**Subject:** Fairview Developmental center concept 2&3 with a road thru ML course

This is horrible!  
Bike trail, aquatic park in Tanager?!?  
Please leave the golf course alone.  
2200+ additional units = 4500+ more cars?  
Just hope we are in front of this to maintain some common sense in CM?  
Thanks,  
Tim Bjelland  
C 714 430-1478

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

Sent from my iPhone

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

---



**PARTIDA, ANNA**

OB-1

**From:** HANSON, LIDIAN  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:28 AM  
**To:** PARTIDA, ANNA; TAI, CARRIE  
**Cc:** CONSTITUENT SERVICES  
**Subject:** FW: FDC Development

Good morning Anna,

Please see the public comments for FDC. CM Pettis encouraged Ms. Lippand to attend tonight's meeting.

Thank you kindly,



**Lidian Hanson**  
Assistant to the City Manager  
Office of the City Manager  
Phone: (714) 754-5658  
Cell: (949) 966-8398  
77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL. THANK YOU!

**From:** PETTIS, JEFF <Jeff.Pettis@costamesaca.gov>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 6:56 PM  
**To:** Melissa Lippand <mlippand@gmail.com>; CITY COUNCIL <CITYCOUNCIL@costamesaca.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: FDC Development

Hello Melissa,

I highly encourage you to attend the Monday (tomorrow) evening Planning Commission meeting at 6 p.m. FDC is on the agenda and public input is very much needed.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Melissa Lippand <[mlippand@gmail.com](mailto:mlippand@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 5:46:08 PM  
**To:** [citycouncil@costamesaca.gov](mailto:citycouncil@costamesaca.gov) <[citycouncil@costamesaca.gov](mailto:citycouncil@costamesaca.gov)>  
**Subject:** FDC Development

I have lived in Costa Mesa for more than 50 years and am a resident of College Park. I attended several of the workshops and have been trying to pay attention to the proposed plans for the FDC. I feel the residents of Costa Mesa have not been heard. As I have stated in prior responses and surveys, I am concerned about:

- 1) failure to create a commission composed of members from the community, city and stakeholders to work together to create a workable plan.
- 2) the impact of traffic on Harbor Blvd if the density for this new project is too high.
- 3) lack of response to the community's responses to the various proposed concepts
- 4) waivers provided to developers who do not meet adequate open space and parking requirements but provide fees instead. (Why have codes if developers can pay their way out?)
- 5) recent comments from the Planning Commissioners regarding developing the golf course property along Harbor and even getting rid of the golf course all together. This position is so short-sighted. In addition to it being a public course and affordable, our high schools use the course for their golf teams. It would be a shame to lose this cherished asset.

Please propose a committee be created as stated above. Please assign their first task to revise the Vision and Guiding Principal document so that it is not so ambiguous and will stand as a basis for creating the concept going forward.

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**To:** GREEN, BRENDA  
**Subject:** RE: FDC Redevelopment Plans - CMG&CC Impact

**From:** Dick O'Neil <[doneil2855@gmail.com](mailto:doneil2855@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 9:02 AM  
**To:** STEPHENS, JOHN <[JOHN.STEPHENS@costamesaca.gov](mailto:JOHN.STEPHENS@costamesaca.gov)>  
**Subject:** FDC Redevelopment Plans - CMG&CC Impact

Hello John,

I am a 40 year Costa Mesa Resident and golfer, living in the same Mesa Verde (District 1) home for the past 32 years. The impact of the Fairview Development Center (FDC) remodel on the future of CM Golf and Country Club (CMGCC) has created significant angst amongst the golf community.

After the CM Senior Golf Association (CMSGA) forwarded an online survey link to members about a year ago, we admittedly lost track of the decision-making process for this massive project and how it may affect the future of our local "gem" of a municipal golf course.

Most CMSGA members selected the plan option survey that did not require a road through the Mesa Linda Golf Course. However, recent CM City Council updates indicate this option is increasingly likely, if not already selected by the State and City partnership. While years out, this plan will eliminate at least 9 if not 18 of the current 36 hole CMGCC classic William Bell design layout.

Orange County's municipal golf options are dwindling due to course properties being closed (Mile Square Player's Course, El Toro Marine Golf Course, Oak Creek Irvine, Newport Golf Course conversion to a surf park) for a variety of reasons, mostly due to the CA housing crunch and State mandates to address the shortage.

With the soaring popularity of golf nationwide, CMGCC has never been busier. Thanks to the experienced and dedicated CMGCC staff, the course conditions and operations have never been better! CM residents, non-residents, high school competitions, youth golf, and tournament play fill the Mesa Linda and Los Lagos tee time sheets from first light to dusk.

The vast majority of our golf community understand and accept the FDC project will bring change needed to help CM meet our CA affordable housing targets. Our objective is to be involved in the decision making process, to provide feedback, and hopefully achieve the best outcome for all parties while minimizing the impact on our beloved CMGCC.

We look forward to working with you and the CM Council!

Sincerely,

Dick O'Neil

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

## PARTIDA, ANNA

OB-1

**From:** GREEN, BRENDA  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 11:48 AM  
**To:** PARTIDA, ANNA; MCGILL, ANNA  
**Subject:** FW: June 23, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting- Old Business Item 1 - Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan Land Use Plan  
**Attachments:** City of Costa Mesa re FDC Workshop 4 Concepts and Planning Issues.pdf

Respectfully,  
**Brenda Green**  
City Clerk



City Clerk's Office | (714) 754-5221  
77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



As City Hall has reopened, we encourage the public to take advantage of our appointment system. Appointments can be made at [www.costamesaca.gov/appointments](http://www.costamesaca.gov/appointments). Please note that it is required that all guests check in with our Concierge Staff, located on the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Lobby, upon arrival at City Hall.

**From:** Costa Mesa First <costamesa1st@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 11:25 AM  
**To:** ROJAS, JOHNNY <JOHNNY.ROJAS@costamesaca.gov>; KLEPACK, KAREN <KAREN.KLEPACK@costamesaca.gov>; Jon Zich <PlanningCommissionerZich@gmail.com>; VALLARTA, ANGELY <ANGELY.VALLARTA@costamesaca.gov>; HARLAN, JEFFREY <Jeffrey.Harlan@costamesaca.gov>; DICKSON, ROBERT <Robert.Dickson@costamesaca.gov>; MARTINEZ, DAVID <DAVID.MARTINEZ@costamesaca.gov>  
**Cc:** CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov>  
**Subject:** June 23, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting- Old Business Item 1 - Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan Land Use Plan

Dear Commissioners,

When the State of California began the process of closing Fairview Developmental Center in 2015, a meeting was held at the Center for the public to voice their opinions on what should be done with the property. We attended that meeting and came away with the thought that this was an incredible opportunity for the City of Costa Mesa to develop the property into new neighborhoods that would become the jewel of Costa Mesa.

In late 2023, when the City finally started earnest efforts towards planning, we asked for an advisory committee to begin the planning process. We were told it would take too long for an advisory committee to develop a Vision, the Guiding Principles, the Goals, Policies,



and Objectives, and land use specifications for the Specific Plan document. We knew that wasn't true.

Here we are, 10 years after that 2015 meeting, and nearly two years after the first City outreach meeting, with nothing but a few ideas floating around. The agreement between the City and State (the one that gave the City the \$3.5 million to do planning, outreach, and environmental work) (the "Agreement") expires December 29, 2025. It is impossible to meet that deadline, mostly due to notice requirements for the Environmental Impact Report.

As stated in Section 16 of the Agreement, "In the event the City does not adopt a specific plan, the State of California reserves its right to pursue, through the Department, other disposition alternatives as permitted by law." In other words, the State can sell the property to a Master Developer who will plan a project with little regard to what the City or the citizens want. The Master Developer would have to get a General Plan Amendment, which requires City approval, but putting the Master Developer in control of planning would be a spin of the roulette wheel.

Is the City hoping that allowing the Agreement to terminate will absolve the City of its responsibilities, and that the State will take over? That certainly isn't the best option for the City or its citizens.

We continually requested an advisory committee because we wanted the best Specific Plan with the best neighborhoods possible. An advisory committee would have helped promote the idea that well-planned higher density-housing will benefit Costa Mesa. We had fears that the City and the consultant would botch the Specific Plan, but they have managed to exceed our expectations.

Ultimately, the inaction and poor work product are the responsibility of management. The Mayor, with the City Council's approval, directed the City Manager to focus on cannabis applications at a time when it should have been concentrating on this important development. There should have been a more vigorous pushback against locating the Emergency Operations Center on prime residential real estate abutting the golf course. The failure to get the EOC moved or to swap land has made the Specific Plan less enticing to Master Developers.

At this point, the City has not produced much to comment on, but here are some thoughts:

- The proposed final Concept puts the State and the Developer first, which is completely backwards.



- The driving force behind the new access road across the golf course is obviously the State, as it is tailored to fit the needs of the Emergency Operations Center.
- A minimum of 12 acres of publicly accessible open space (parkland?) is still below the approximately 42.6 acres the Specific Plan area should provide as prescribed by the General Plan; opening this requirement up to negotiation with the developer is not likely to produce more open space.
- There is no indication of the proposed density of the housing or the FAR of the commercial component; will the buildings be five stories, seven stories, or even taller?
- There is no new developer financial analysis for the New Concept or an estimate of the fiscal impact of an additional 10,000 or more people on City services or revenue for the City.
- It appears little thought has gone into the actual planning of active transportation.
  - Multiuser protected paths are needed throughout the new neighborhoods, not just a “scenic” trail around the perimeter. The “Shelley Circle Trail,” a trail that goes around the circumference of the project, has been added, but there is no description of what that is. Also, there is a “potential” trail that will run along with northeast boundary of the golf course to connect to the Tanager Trail, but we have no description of that either.
  - Paseos is a word that is used, but is typically for walking only (the Spanish word “pasear” translates to stroll).
  - Again, where are the bike lanes and multiuser paths within the Specific Plan area? There is only an indication that they will be accommodated. Unless there is a nexus in the Specific Plan, the developer will not have to provide them.
- There is no estimate of the traffic impact on local roads, such as Harbor Boulevard, Fair Drive, and Merrimac Way.
- The bullet points for what typically appears in Specific Plans are a starting point. The City should have had a draft Specific Plan document by now, but it does not, and that is going to make writing the Environmental Impact Report difficult.

- There are no Goals, Policies, or Objectives. Those are the backbone of any planning document, and without them, you cannot begin to write a Specific Plan.
- Both the Vision and the Guiding Principles have undergone extensive revision, and the attachment to the Agenda is supposed to contain the final versions, but they are anything but final.
  - The Vision and Guiding Principles are part of a planning document, not a flowery sales brochure; the document should use normal planning terminology.
  - There are a number of conceptual issues, but here are two examples: “Streets will be designed to...reduce reliance on automobiles.” The only street that would do that would be one without motor vehicle traffic. “Safety measures on streets, including...convenient bus stops.” A bus stop is not a safety measure.
  - Where are the wishes the public requested at our first outreach meeting at the Senior Center (The “What makes a great neighborhood?” meeting)? Most of them are nowhere to be found. A daycare center was high on the list, but it isn’t included. Is “Weaving nature into the design and construction of buildings...” expected to count as conservation and sustainability?
- None of the Land Use Concepts Illustrations appear to be of the New Concept. The illustrations are messy and appear to be designed to camouflage something. They use “blue-skying” as a technique to hide the canyon effect.
  - The elevations should be from the ground-floor viewpoint, not a second-story balcony, and include streets without parks.
  - They should depict the number of stories that are likely to be built. These illustrations show what looks to be four stories, but the buildings in the distance might be taller.
  - The park/open space seems larger than what is shown on the aerial views.
  - There are no bike lanes.

- These Land Use Concepts Illustrations ignore that the residents asked for a village-like ambiance with pocket parks, playgrounds, community centers and gardens, and mixed-use buildings with services.

Finally, our letter, dated August 9, 2024, was not included in the record of public comments. We request that it is included in the public record (copy is attached).

Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Huffman and Cynthia McDonald  
Costa Mesa First

PO Box 2282

Costa Mesa, CA 92628

[costamesa1st.com](http://costamesa1st.com)

(714) 549-5884

COSTA MESA



Costa Mesa First's mission is to educate Costa Mesans about planning policies in Costa Mesa so they make knowledgeable choices when voting. We encourage residents to choose walkable, bikeable, and inclusive neighborhoods, and the land use and transportation policies and investments needed to make Costa Mesa flourish. Our primary objective is to require Costa Mesa's leaders to put the residents of Costa Mesa first.

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

# COSTA MESA



August 9, 2024

VIA EMAIL – phayvahn@costamesaca.gov

City of Costa Mesa  
Economic and Development Services  
Attn: Phayvahn Nanthavongdouangsy, Principal Planner  
77 Fair Drive  
Costa Mesa, California 92626

Re: Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan

Dear Ms. Nanthavongdouangsy:

First, we appreciate the time and effort put into Workshop #4 for the Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan (FDCSP). The posters had a lot of information packed into them, so the opportunity to ask questions and receive further information was important. We note there was not a sticker exercise. Thank you! One of the reasons we dislike those exercises is that the public is capable of formulating opinions based on their experience of living in Costa Mesa. Eliciting unstructured comments is critical because not only do you get those comments, but you also get the reasoning behind them.

In terms of the survey, the questions are designed to direct the person surveyed to select an option the City wants. In our case, none of the options are appealing, so we could not proceed with the survey. We could have selected one, despite our distaste for all, and proceeded, but that would skew the results of the survey. How many participants did that? Perhaps "none of the above" should have been a choice, along with space to explain why. The only other option is to send comments, so here we are.

We find it interesting that at the recent meetings we attended that the City is now discussing with the public the fact that the Shannon's Mountain project is proceeding and, therefore, less land is available for the City to plan for housing. One of the flaws of all the options presented by the City is the assumption that the State will want to build housing in the areas shown on the three

Costa Mesa First (FPPC 1332564), P.O. Box 2282, Costa Mesa, CA 92628  
[costamesa1st@gmail.com](mailto:costamesa1st@gmail.com)  
costamesa1st.com  
(714) 549-5884

site plans. While it initially makes sense to have all the State housing located together, the condition of the site may dictate other plans.

We obtained copies of environmental reports the State of California (State) had prepared in connection with planning for the sale of Fairview Developmental Center (FDC). We presume the City obtained these reports as well, but if it did not, we are happy to supply them. It concerns us that the State went beyond having a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) prepared and had a two (2) Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (Phase II) prepared as well, one for the Main Campus and the other for the Plant Operations Area. An additional Phase II Environmental Phase Assessment for the Plant Operations Area was commissioned in July 2021 (Additional Phase II). As full disclosure, the State sent a draft of that document, but we have not been able to locate a final version of it in all the many documents it sent. We have requested a copy of the final document.

It is typical for a Phase I to be prepared when there is a prior use of the land (lenders often want one). A Phase II being needed tells us something in the Phase I raised a red flag. And it did. We now understand why the State selected the parcel it did for the Emergency Operations Center as it is the one with the fewest problems. But if that is true, then why would it also select the Plant Operations Area for housing, as it is contaminated?

While the reports indicated that none of the contamination is beyond remediation, more than just the usual steps should be taken to protect the public, such as golfers on the golf course, from breathing the dust from the contaminated/hazardous substances during demolition and grading. In addition, the Additional Phase II indicates that (i) a further Phase II investigation be performed to collect indoor air samples to verify the preliminary vapor intrusion assessment, (ii) performance of site-specific Human Health Screening Risk Evaluation, and (iii) consideration of engaging a regulatory agency (e.g., Department of Toxic Substances Control) to provide oversight. The referenced air samples would be collected from the Harbor Village apartments. Why would the State select the Plant Operations Area for housing, if there is contamination warranting a further investigation and air samples? In addition, it does not appear that the State has taken the air samples of Harbor Village, as there is no report in the documents it supplied. The people in Harbor Village deserve to know they are living near a contaminated property and that contamination could be drifting into their apartments.

With respect to the planning options provided by the City, we have the following comments:

**CONCEPT 1 – FAIRVIEW PROMENADE.** This Concept was designed to meet the Housing Element (HE) goal of 2,300 dwelling units at specific income levels (575 units for very low-income households, 345 units for low-income households, 690 units for moderate-income households, and 690 units for above-moderate income households).



Included in those income levels are the 483 units on 20.32 acres that are required by the State. Which of the income levels are those units? The City cannot determine if this will meet the HE goals without that information.

We understand the reasoning behind putting the approximately 25,000 square feet of commercial space near Harbor Boulevard, however, it would not serve any disabled resident of FDCSP or Shannon's Mountain well. The same is true of the approximately 14 acres of open space that would be mostly concentrated near Harbor Boulevard.

Concept 1 widens and extends Fair Drive, including a rotary that might be large enough for park space in the middle of it, in addition to what is labeled parkland in the median, but that park space likely won't be used much due to its proximity to traffic. There is a chunk of green space at the end of the Fair Drive extension. We do not consider this new, wider roadway a "promenade." Making the roadway the focus of a new residential development does not reflect modern urban planning principles.

The single entry/exit of Fair Drive discourages residents from outside FDCSP from entering the redeveloped space. This means FDCSP will not satisfy the request that it become an amenity that all of Costa Mesa can enjoy. The new neighborhood needs to connect with the rest of Costa Mesa, both physically and socially. The active transportation facilities should connect to the Harbor and Joann trails. It needs a central gathering place to meet societal needs. There is no commercial development near the parks, which are the only gathering places. This garnered a "NO" vote from us because of the parkland deficiency, the strange layout of buildings and streets, the remote commercial, and the lack of social amenities and connection to the rest of the city. Further, most developers will find this Concept to be a nonstarter due to its economic infeasibility.

**CONCEPT 2 – FAIRVIEW FIELDS.** This Concept introduces the notion of a density bonus, and we appreciate the consultant's transparency in pointing out the lessons learned by studying what is happening with the Sonoma Developmental Center Specific Plan in that regard. The number of dwelling units would be 3,450 which, despite the increase, misses the target in the HE in the low-income and moderate-income categories but bounces up the above-moderate income substantially because the density bonus is going there (575 units for very low-income households, 325 units (misses the RHNA target by 20) for low-income households, 325 units (misses by 365) for moderate-income households, and 2,225 units for above-moderate income households). It includes 213 units of senior housing contained in an eight to nine story building. This option anticipates that the State housing would consume the entirety of the northernmost portion of the property.



This Concept is laid out with a gridwork of tree-lined streets, which makes the neighborhoods more walk and bike friendly. In addition to the Fair Drive entrance, a second entrance located across from the main entrance to Home Depot would be added to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the extra above-moderate income housing units. That entrance would cut across the golf course to a new roadway on the perimeter of the southeast corner of the property. This new roadway would require realignment of a fairway.

The parkland has increased to 18 acres, which is 22% of the 80 acres. The City has noted that its calculation excludes the projected population for the State-owned land, but it could meet the park level of service if an exemption for density bonus units was used, but otherwise the developer would need to subsidize it by the payment of fees. That sort of mentality is what has made Costa Mesa park deficient. Harbor Village does not have easy access to park space and the residents there will want to use the new park facilities, so a mathematical trick will not help.

This option shows most of the park space being in the lower southeast corner of the property, next to the EOC. It is large enough to accommodate a sports complex, particularly if the proposed roadway by the State is relocated at the perimeter of the property. The remaining parkland would be in two areas near the north and west of the parcel. The 25,000 square feet of commercial would be in the buildings off Harbor Boulevard that parallel the largest chunk of parkland.

This Concept is (i) designed to satisfy the public's desire for sports fields, and (ii) likely favored by developers because it gives them the ability to sell more market-rate homes, which would help them recoup the costs of the "affordable" housing. This is an improvement over Concept 1, but still has many of the same problems. Due to the fact the density bonus will only be used to build higher-income units, this Concept fails to address the fact that Costa Mesa needs more housing for lower-income residents. The affordable housing ordinance approved by a slim margin by the City Council on Tuesday night will do nothing to help, so the burden will fall on the FDCSP. Because of this, along with the parkland issue and the odd location of commercial development, Option 2 also gets it a thumbs down.

**CONCEPT 3 – FAIRVIEW COMMONS.** This Concept has the least amount of parkland (7.9 acres) the most housing units (4,000 consisting of 575 units for very low-income households, 345 units for low-income households, 690 units for moderate-income households, and 2,390 units for above-moderate income households), none of which are designed for seniors, and more commercial development (35,000 square feet) than the other Concepts, and would only make sense to a developer. It contains the two entry/exit

points from Harbor Boulevard, but this version preserves the location of the roadway requested by the State for the EOC. The increase in commercial might include an office/medical building, which would alter the peak traffic counts. More land (22.7 acres) would be set aside for the housing the State wants. Almost all the housing is high-density (four to eight stories). It incorporates all the worst things about Concepts 1 and 2, and then adds some of its own blemishes, making it the most terrible of the three.

We understand the City is only starting on the planning concepts and it needs to get more information from the State before proceeding. The State may appear invested in beginning construction on the EOC later this year, but has the State provided the final plans? If the plans are not final, now is the time to try to make adjustments.

With respect to putting a road through the golf course, realigning the fairway is easy to say, but harder to do, and would involve a loss of income to the operator of the golf course and the City. If the design of the golf course changes, it should be improved. Why not do a land exchange with the State for the EOC property? Placing the EOC on the current golf course property abutting Harbor Boulevard would give it a separate entrance and cueing lane off Harbor and leftover land from the golf course could be swapped for the land that is currently the school at the rear of FDC. This would allow the commercial to move to Harbor Boulevard where it would be visible for everyone and shrink the traffic impacts for the FDCSP area.

The focus of the Concepts has been on housing and playing fields. But what happened to the things the public wanted? Daycare center? Preservation of historic trees? City facilities (like an art center and community garden)? Ensuring a high ratio of very low- and low-income affordable housing? Mixed-use housing? Central community gathering place? Some of those items were contained in the draft "guiding principles," that still need revision.

In addition, active transportation and/or public transportation improvements in this area will be needed. This community requires more connections to the rest of the city than one or two roads. Multiuser paths connecting to Joann, Tanager/Golf Course and Harbor paths are required to encourage active transportation.

It does not seem that the input given by the citizens at the first few meetings has had much impact on the planning. It is not too late for an advisory committee comprised of residents, advocates for people with disabilities, seniors, and affordable housing, representatives of youth and sports groups, along with builders and developers to be engaged in the planning process. That group can be guided by professional urban planning staff, and City Council members and Planning Commission members can act as liaisons. The more the community is engaged in the planning process, the better!

City of Costa Mesa  
Economic and Development Services  
Attn: Phayvahn Nanthavongdouangsy, Principal Planner  
August 9, 2024  
Page 6

We appreciate consideration of our thoughts and look forward to the next steps of the FDCSP project. Please feel free to contact us should you have any questions.

Very truly yours,



Richard J. Huffman  
Treasurer



Cynthia McDonald  
Assistant Treasurer

cc: Assembly Member Cottie Petrie-Norris  
Senator Dave Min  
Supervisor Katrina Foley  
Costa Mesa Mayor and City Council  
[FDCHousingPlan@costamesaca.gov](mailto:FDCHousingPlan@costamesaca.gov)

Costa Mesa First's mission is to educate Costa Mesans about planning policies in Costa Mesa so they make knowledgeable choices when voting. We encourage residents to choose walkable, bikeable, and inclusive neighborhoods, and the land use and transportation policies and investments needed to make Costa Mesa flourish. Our primary objective is to require Costa Mesa's leaders to put the residents of Costa Mesa first.

Costa Mesa First (FPPC 1332564), P.O. Box 2282, Costa Mesa, CA 92628  
[costamesa1st@gmail.com](mailto:costamesa1st@gmail.com)  
[costamesa1st.com](http://costamesa1st.com)  
(714) 549-5884

**PARTIDA, ANNA**

NB - 1

**From:** GREEN, BRENDA  
**Sent:** Monday, June 23, 2025 8:00 AM  
**To:** PC Public Comments  
**Subject:** FW: Comments for 6-23-25 PC Meeting  
**Attachments:** New Business-1 comments-Toler.pdf; Old Business-1 comments-Toler.pdf

Respectfully,  
**Brenda Green**  
City Clerk



City Clerk's Office | (714) 754-5221  
77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



As City Hall has reopened, we encourage the public to take advantage of our appointment system. Appointments can be made at [www.costamesaca.gov/appointments](http://www.costamesaca.gov/appointments). Please note that it is required that all guests check in with our Concierge Staff, located on the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Lobby, upon arrival at City Hall.

**From:** Russell Toler <russell.toler@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 22, 2025 11:00 PM  
**To:** CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov>  
**Subject:** Comments for 6-23-25 PC Meeting

Chair Harlan and Commissioners,

Attached are my comments for OB-1 (FDC) and NB-1 (zoning cleanup). I'm unable to make the meeting, but I appreciate the time you'll put into reading what I have to say, and maybe even visiting some of the hyperlinks.

Thanks!  
Russell Toler  
949-375-8682

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Report any suspicious activities to the Information Technology Department.

Jun 23, 2025

Chair Harlan and Commissioners,

Tonight you're being asked to approve a set of zoning code edits, one of which involves formalizing a staff handout that allows six-foot-tall walls within ten feet of the front property line. I urge you to reconsider and *reject* this particular provision, or at the very least, direct staff to study a more appropriate alternative.

I want to speak on this edit specifically because 1) it's one of the few edits that's proposed at the moment and 2) I want to be respectful of the quick and nimble speed at which staff is seeking to fix things and do not want to bog down the process with too many complicated requests. Having said that, there are dozens of amendments we could and should consider—ranging from easy to complicated—that can help improve *process* (streamlining and facilitating good things) and build outcome (the physical results of what we're actually enabling with our zoning): see the [Lean Code Repair Checklist](#), starting on page 8).

But regarding fences and walls—for years, I've tried to convince staff and Commissioners about the negative effect of front and perimeter walls on the quality of our public realm. Our General Plan promotes walkability, safety, and attractive neighborhoods, yet our zoning continues to permit—and now seeks to codify—practices that *directly undermine* those goals. Walls along front yards and street frontages:

- Block natural surveillance, removing the eyes and ears that help deter crime.
- Discourage walking and biking and encouraging speeding by making the street feel unwatched, closed-off, and lifeless.
- Signal surrender—that the street is too unpleasant to face, thus weakening the case for improving our streets (a positive feedback loop in the wrong direction).

We can see old and new results all over Costa Mesa from this thoughtless allowance. These walls deaden the street and make it harder for future improvements to take hold. Once walls go up, *they don't come down*.

The solution is not complicated. Many cities across the country (if not most!) share the practice of limiting front-yard walls to three or four feet, especially in urban or suburban contexts where we want walkable, human-scale environments. *Our current standard of six foot walls being allowed between the sidewalk and a building is both extreme and self-defeating.*

I ask the Commission to:

- Reject the codification of the current wall handout as-is;

- Direct staff to return with recommendations for height limits of *all walls that seal off a building from the public realm* that support street life and neighborhood character—yes, even on arterials;
- And to *seriously evaluate* our broader pattern of allowing development to turn its back on the street.

This is a small but high-impact fix. The city *is* our streets, and it is largely shaped by how we regulate private development.

Thanks for reading!

Russell Toler