

---

**Amendment to the Sixth Cycle Housing Element to Add Additional Housing Element Sites**

---

From Casey Griffin <cgriffin@loganam.com>

Date Sun 8/16/2026 8:05 AM

To PC Public Comments <PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov>

Planning Commission and Staff,

Being a part of a business (South Coast Toyota) which owns property in Costa Mesa, I applaud the City for the undertaking of a plan to address the much needed addition of housing to the City. In review of the proposed Resolution, I believe that consideration must be given to the proposed lower density levels provided for in the Amendment especially along Harbor Blvd.

In short, my concern with the proposed 30 du/ac maximum density is that it may unintentionally make redevelopment of the property financially infeasible, particularly if the City's objective is to encourage projects that utilize the State Density Bonus and provide a meaningful affordable housing component. As I'm sure you are aware, the economics of an affordable housing component depend heavily on the market-rate units within the project. Those market-rate units effectively support the cost of delivering the affordable units. At a base density of only 30 du/ac, I am concerned there simply are not enough market-rate units to make a quality mixed-income project economically viable. Based on our preliminary analysis, I believe a density in the 60+ du/ac range would provide a much more realistic opportunity to support the level of affordable housing the City is seeking while also encouraging actual redevelopment of the site.

I also believe the higher density is more appropriate from a land-use and urban-planning perspective. Harbor Boulevard is one of Orange County's major commercial and transportation corridors and, in my view, is precisely where the City should be concentrating additional housing density. A project limited to 30 du/ac could ultimately be significantly under-scaled for such a prominent location and inconsistent with the character and intensity of other developments the City has already approved along Harbor Boulevard, including Lux Costa Mesa. My concern is that by setting the base density too low, the City could inadvertently accomplish the opposite of what the overlay is intended to achieve: rather than facilitating new housing and affordable units, the economics may discourage property owners from pursuing redevelopment altogether.

For that reason, I would encourage the City to consider increasing the allowable base density to at least 60 du/ac. Doing so would improve the economic feasibility of redevelopment, create greater opportunity for affordable housing, and establish a scale of development that I believe is more appropriate for the long-term vision of Harbor Boulevard.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide input and please call me should you have any questions.

Casey Griffin  
(949) 307-6883

**Casey Griffin**  
**Logan Asset Management**  
**30262 Crown Valley Pkwy., Suite B-410**

**Laguna Niguel, CA 92677**

**(949) 503-3400 ext 2**

**(949) 307-6883 cell**

**<http://www.loganam.com>**

*Real Estate Broker*

*CA license #00840708*

**Privileged And Confidential Communication.**

This electronic transmission, and any documents attached hereto, (a) are protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC §§ 2510-2521), (b) may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information, and (c) are for the sole use of the intended recipient named above. If you have received this electronic message in error, please notify the sender and delete the electronic message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of the information received in error is strictly prohibited.

**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.

---

**FW: Comment on the NWWAB plan**

---

**From** HALLIGAN, MICHELLE <MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov>

**Date** Sun 8/16/2026 5:51 PM

**To** PC Public Comments <PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov>

**From:** Austin Mattison <uclaustin@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, August 10, 2026 11:27 AM

**To:** HALLIGAN, MICHELLE <MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov>

**Subject:** Re: Comment on the NWWAB plan

Yes

Best,  
Austin

On Tue, Aug 4, 2026 at 4:56 PM HALLIGAN, MICHELLE <[MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov](mailto:MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov)> wrote:

Hi Austin,

Did you intend the email below to be a public comment on the Neighborhoods Where We All Belong Draft Program Environmental Impact Report or for a future Planning Commission meeting about Neighborhoods Where We All Belong?



Michelle Halligan  
Senior Planner

**City of Costa Mesa** | Community Development Department (formerly  
Economic and Development Services)

77 Fair Drive 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor | Costa Mesa | CA 92626 | (714) 754-5608

**“The City of Costa Mesa serves our residents, businesses and visitors while promoting a safe, inclusive, and vibrant community.”**

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

Hi Michelle,

Please pass these comments on to the Planning Commission, City Council, and the Mayor:

Mayor Stephens, Council Members, and Planning Commissioners,

My name is Austin Mattison, and I am a resident of West Costa Mesa. While I agree that Costa Mesa must address housing needs—and I support thoughtful redevelopment—I am deeply concerned about the current "Neighborhoods Where We All Belong" proposal. As written, this plan disproportionately places the city's housing burden onto West Costa Mesa. This directly contradicts the core intentions of the State's Housing Element guidelines, which mandate that high-density rezoning be concentrated near major transit corridors and transportation centers, not tucked away into established, independent neighborhoods. By forcing it here,

the proposal risks undermining the exact qualities that make our community one of the most unique, livable areas in Orange County.

But this is not another NIBMY email; we need more affordable housing. The problem only focuses on compliance, meanwhile ignoring aspects that will create huge future livability issues.

The City's vision heavily promotes mixed-use development as a tool to create walkable neighborhoods.

However, the economic reality is very different. Because residential development yields the highest returns, developers naturally prioritize housing over retail. Consequently, projects advertised as "live-work" often deliver little to no meaningful commercial space. I see this firsthand as a resident of the Lighthouse development, where **not a single one of the 40+ units is occupied by a commercial business today.**

West Costa Mesa already possesses authentic walkability along 19th Street and Placentia Avenue, where residents can easily walk to grocery stores, coffee shops, restaurants, and entertainment venues. These organic, local businesses cannot simply be engineered later through design guidelines or ground-floor retail mandates. In fact, replacing these commercial properties with high-density residential projects will reduce walkability by forcing residents to drive farther for daily necessities.

Furthermore, this plan seriously underestimates the importance of "third places"—the informal gathering spaces that build community, culture, and social connection. West Costa Mesa's character was built by artists, musicians, entrepreneurs, and small businesses, not by luxury apartment projects.

Local institutions like the Quonset Hut Village on 17th Street, The Wayfarer, the Tiki Bar, Wilson Coffee, MoonGoat, Eagle & Pig, and Trenta are not accidental. They exist because West Costa Mesa has historically offered older commercial buildings, industrial spaces, and modest strip centers that remain affordable enough for independent businesses to survive and grow. This is the exact environment where legendary Costa Mesa brands like Volcom and RVCA got their start.

The economics of the proposed rezoning place these invaluable community assets at immense risk. When investors can replace aging commercial properties with high-density luxury apartments, culture and creativity cannot compete with those financial returns. Over time, the artist villages, local music venues, and independent markets will disappear, replaced by high-return projects that contribute nothing to our culture. Housing units alone do not create community; third places do. If every aging shopping center and industrial building becomes housing, we may meet state housing targets while simultaneously destroying the very ingredients that make Costa Mesa a desirable place to live.

If the City moves forward with these zoning changes, I respectfully ask that four revisions be considered:

1. **Provide stronger protections** for existing neighborhood-serving retail centers that offer daily necessities. Don't create food deserts and more car trips.
2. **Require meaningful, economically viable commercial space** within mixed-use developments, rather than allowing token retail components that remain permanently vacant.
3. **Identify and protect cultural, artistic, and entertainment uses** that contribute directly to Costa Mesa's identity.
4. **Evaluate the cumulative impacts** of commercial and industrial land conversion on neighborhood livability, walkability, entrepreneurship, and culture—not just housing production.

Cities must evolve, but housing alone does not make a great city. The question before you should not just be how many units we can build, but what kind of city will remain once they are built. Once our unique character, local businesses, and authentic culture are lost, they cannot be rebuilt. If this plan goes forward unaltered, it will strip away the soul of our neighborhood and leave us looking no different than the endless housing of Yorba Linda or the sterile blandness of Aliso Viejo. Costa Mesa is better than that, and we can do better than this plan. I urge you to revise this proposal to protect our neighborhood-serving retail and creative spaces before they are gone for good.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Austin Mattison  
West Costa Mesa Resident

**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.

---

**Fwd: Study Session - (NWWAB) Zoning Code Amendment Items**

---

**From** TAI, CARRIE <Carrie.Tai@costamesaca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 8/17/2026 11:24 AM  
**To** PC Public Comments <PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov>

Carrie Tai, AICP  
Community Development Director  
CITY OF COSTA MESA  
(714) 754-5270

Sent from a mobile device.

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** George Sakioka <gmks@sakioka.com>  
**Date:** August 16, 2026 at 21:04:14 PDT  
**To:** "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>  
**Cc:** "TAI, CARRIE" <Carrie.Tai@costamesaca.gov>, "MCGILL, ANNA" <Anna.Mcgill@costamesaca.gov>, "CARON, MARTINA" <Martina.Caron@costamesaca.gov>, "YEAGER, CHRISTOPHER" <CHRISTOPHER.YEAGER@costamesaca.gov>, "HALLIGAN, MICHELLE" <MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov>, Mark Sakioka <mark@sakioka.com>, CMeany <CMeany@wilsonmeany.com>, "Forbes, Amy R." <AForbes@gibsondunn.com>, ELesk <ELesk@wilsonmeany.com>  
**Subject: Study Session - (NWWAB) Zoning Code Amendment Items**

Dear Chair Harlan and members of the Costa Mesa Planning Commission,

We are looking forward to Monday's Planning Commission meeting. Our team is in the process of reviewing the updated NWWAB documents that were released at the end of last week, and we applaud the City's efforts to adopt clear, consistent, usable standards that will lead to high-quality, well-designed housing, to serve Costa Mesa for generations to come.



We have not had a chance to review the complete package of documents, but at a high level, we think it is important that the final approvals incorporate some flexibility to address the needs of larger scaled master planned development, and we hope the Planning Commission will consider some changes to ensure consistency across various plans and zoning requirements.

1. Open Space. The draft Mixed-Use Overlay District (MUOD) standards require that 30% of each lot be kept as usable open space. We appreciate the City's commitment to open space and believe that well designed and substantial open space is a critical element of a successful housing project. However, the City has also set goals for development of a significant amount of new housing. As a practical matter, the open space goals may make it impossible to accomplish the City's housing goals. We suggest the City consider additional flexibility in both the minimum amount of open space required and in the types of spaces that are recognized as open space, particularly on Housing Element sites.
2. Streets. The City's Objective Design Standards require that all private streets be designed to meet the same standards as publicly dedicated local or collector public streets. This standard would require streets that are at least 60' wide. In the context of a larger scale master planned community this mandate will result in streets that prioritize automobiles over a pedestrian's neighborhood experience. We suggest that, so long as internal streets within a master planned community meet fire department and safety requirements, they could be allowed to have different street standards.
3. Future Meetings with Staff. We appreciate all of staff's efforts over the last few months and look forward to meeting with them later this week to discuss the updated documents, including the points above, as well as to review the practicalities of some of the design mandates. Our goal is to be able to implement the City's hard work in the context of a vibrant master-planned neighborhood in North Costa Mesa that is a place we can all be proud of.

We look forward to working with all of you soon.

Best always,

George

**George M.K. Sakioka**  
Sakioka Company, LLC

14850 Sunflower Avenue  
Santa Ana, CA 92707  
714-545-8611  
[gmks@sakioka.com](mailto:gmks@sakioka.com)



NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY: The information contained in this communication (and any attachments) is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, your disclosure, copying, distribution or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this

information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately, then delete this communication and any attachment.

---

**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.





---

**FW: NWWAB Comments for August 17 PC Meeting**

---

**From** TERAN, STACY <STACY.TERAN@costamesaca.gov>

**Date** Mon 8/17/2026 11:54 AM

**To** PC Public Comments <PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov>

**Stacy Teran**

Deputy City Clerk

City of Costa Mesa | City Clerks Office

Phone: (714) 754-5213

Email: [Stacy.Teran@costamesaca.gov](mailto:Stacy.Teran@costamesaca.gov)

77 Fair Drive | Costa Mesa | CA 92626



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

**From:** Russell Toler <russell.toler@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2026 11:50 AM

**To:** HALLIGAN, MICHELLE <MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov>; CITY CLERK <CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov>

**Subject:** NWWAB Comments for August 17 PC Meeting

Hello NWWAB Team,

Thank you again for all of the work that's gone into these revisions. I think the ODS has improved, and I appreciate the team's willingness to thoughtfully consider public comments. I think I've said everything I want to say in previous letters, so I'll only mention a few items that I think actually make a difference and can be updated without too much work.

**Façade Design B.2**

Some façade standards are still not reflecting the intent well:

- 
- 
- "Discourage blank walls"
- - 
  - 
  - 
  - The exceptions to blank walls in
  - B.2(e)2

- and C.8(b)2.b
- completely swallow the standard. Blank walls are allowable as long as they plant some Boston Ivy, paint a mural, or screw in some lattice. Does this mean that, north of the 405, podium buildings could have exposed garage bases rather than being wrapped with
- leasable space? Such a building would kill the lively streets envisioned throughout the document.
- 
- 
- 
- 
- "Reflect the eclectic character of the built environment"
- 
- 
- 
- Buildings are rarely described as "eclectic" (maybe Jeff Shelton's buildings in Santa Barbara, though those are absolutely not the result
- of design codes). People describe the Eastside as eclectic *because all the buildings were designed and built*
- *by different people at different times*. People who say they like this sort of eclecticism are in favor of variety and the coexistence
- of different styles and tastes in a given area. This is in contrast to the bland housing tracts in south OC. When people say they like eclectic neighborhoods, I don't think they're imagining the sort of façade breaks and modulations these standards require
- *on each building*. Just because every other city has these standards doesn't mean we have to. In fact, I would wager that if you showed 100 Costa Mesans a set of buildings with these sorts of breaks and modulations and another set with buildings that
- are coherent and simple, most would prefer the latter. As a side note, I think
- B.2(b)1 should explicitly state that it does not apply to townhouse projects.
- 
- 

## Street-Facing vs. Interior-Facing Units

Section B.3(d)3 *may* be sufficient if the intent of the standard is truly understood by all parties. But I'll reiterate my fear: that projects site new buildings to face a *new internal street* and back up against the existing street. I understand that there is a 48-inch limit on walls along the street, but that is likely an easy standard to justify an exception for once everyone understands that these will protect someone's backyard.

Other than that, I think this is a great code, especially given that it's only 25 pages. Some of the concerns I've mentioned elsewhere remain (the inherent design issues with townhouse projects and the fact that this is the only type of development feasible and likely under our proposed density maximums south of the 405, etc.). But you've clearly read through the public's comments and made meaningful and thoughtful changes where needed.

Thanks!  
Russell Toler

**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.

---

## Housing Element - 1485 Dale Way

---

**From** Annie McCray <annie@mccrayco.com>

**Date** Mon 8/17/2026 10:31 AM

**To** PC Public Comments <PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov>

**Cc** HALLIGAN, MICHELLE <MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov>; MCGILL, ANNA <Anna.Mcgill@costamesaca.gov>; Michael Johnston, Mike <michael.johnston@credegroupp.com>; Anne McCray Pauley (annie@mccrayco.com) <'annie@mccrayco.com'>; Graham Tingler <grahamtingler@gmail.com>

 1 attachment (30 KB)

MCP CM Housing Element Letter dated 2026 08 AUG 15 - DALE WAY BOTH PARCELS.docx;

Attached please find my comments for tonight's Special Planning Commission Meeting.

---

Anne M. McCray  
McCray Properties, LLC  
1930 Placentia Avenue, Ste. A4  
(714) 540-4058  
annie@mccrayco.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.

**McCray Dale Way Partnership, LP**

1930 Placentia Avenue, Suite A4  
Costa Mesa, CA 92627  
(714) 540-4058

---

August 15, 2026

Michelle Halligan  
Senior Planner  
Planning & Community Development  
City of Costa Mesa  
77 Fair Drive, 2nd Floor  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

**RE: Additional Parcel to be added to HCD State Housing Element:  
1485 Dale Way, Costa Mesa – APN #s: 418-102-10 and 418-102-11**

Dear Michelle:

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me last week. As we discussed, we intended to have both parcels of the 1485 Dale Way property added to the HCD State Housing Element. However, through my review of the Housing Element Sites on the City's website, I noticed that only one parcel was included in the Housing Element Site map.

My letter dated 6/12/26 (see attached) included both APNs but were not spelled out completely, so I believe one of the parcels was overlooked. Therefore, I request that both parcels be included in the HCD State Housing Element:

- o 418-102-10
- o 418-102-11

I am sending this to be presented to the Planning Commission before the Special Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Monday, August 27, 2026.

The same reasoning in the previous letter is still relevant. I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Thank you,



Anne McCray  
McCray Properties, LLC  
General Partner  
McCray Dale Way Partnership, LP  
McCray CAIP Partnership, LP



Outlook

P4-1

---

## 2925 & 2945 College Avenue - Special Planning Commission Meeting Housing Element

---

From Annie McCray <annie@mccrayco.com>

Date Mon 8/17/2026 11:49 AM

To PC Public Comments <PCPublicComments@costamesaca.gov>

Cc HALLIGAN, MICHELLE <MICHELLE.HALLIGAN@costamesaca.gov>; MCGILL, ANNA <Anna.McGill@costamesaca.gov>; michael.johnston@credegroupp.com <michael.johnston@credegroupp.com>; Anne McCray Pauley (annie@mccrayco.com) <'annie@mccrayco.com'>; Graham Tingler <grahamtingler@gmail.com>

 1 attachment (90 KB)

MCP CM Housing Element Letter dated 2026 08 AUG 15 - COLLEGE AVE BOTH PARCELS.pdf;

Attached please find my comments for tonight's Special Planning Commission Meeting.

---

Anne M. McCray  
McCray Properties, LLC  
1930 Placentia Avenue, Ste. A4  
(714) 540-4058  
[annie@mccrayco.com](mailto:annie@mccrayco.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.



**McCray CAIP Partnership, LP**

1930 Placentia Avenue, Suite A4  
Costa Mesa, CA 92627  
(714) 540-4058

---

August 15, 2026

Michelle Halligan  
Senior Planner  
Planning & Community Development  
City of Costa Mesa  
77 Fair Drive, 2nd Floor  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

**RE: Additional Parcels to be added to HCD State Housing Element:  
2925 College Avenue, Costa Mesa – APN #s: 418-102-08  
2949 College Avenue, Costa Mesa – APN # 418-102-09**

Dear Michelle:

I am requesting to have our 2 parcels added to the HCD Housing Element proposed site plan. Although these parcels are not in Measure K, we respectfully request they be included, as the site is adjacent to our other site at Dale Way, which is included in the Housing Element.

Additionally, the site is across the street from Seapoint Villas and Pinecreek Apartments, both which are existing apartment complexes, so the location is compatible with existing and proposed use. Considering the city of Costa Mesa's situation with the State HCD, these would be beneficial for adding additional housing sites.

My letter dated 6/12/26 included both APNs but both addresses were not spelled out completely, so I believe this site would be an excellent candidate for additional housing. Therefore, I request that both parcels be included in the HCD State Housing Element:

- o 418-102-08
- o 418-102-09

I am sending this to be presented to the Planning Commission before the Special Planning Commission meeting scheduled for Monday, August 27, 2026.

The same reasoning in the previous letter is still relevant. I appreciate your attention to this matter.

Thank you,



Anne McCray  
McCray Properties, LLC  
General Partner  
McCray Dale Way Partnership, LP  
McCray CAIP Partnership, LP