

---

**From:** Ramon Hernandez <rahdez92@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 9, 2025 6:59 AM  
**To:** PACS Comments  
**Subject:** Meeting 10/9/25 - Moon Park

Good afternoon,

My name is Ramon and I live in the State Streets Neighborhood. I work long shifts and am unable to attend today's meeting so I am writing in.

I wanted to discuss the neglect of Moon Park. There are safety concerns and overall issues with neglect that we have raised without any action being taken. I have a toddler and an infant. I spend more time at parks today than I ever have. The equipment at Moon Park is outdated and the park is unsafe.

I spoke to Brian Gruner and he told me he had never visited the park despite working his position for nearly a year at the time. The mobile recreation van visited once and the employees did not even know the park existed prior to this visit. It has been severely neglected and not updated in too long a time. Homes are regularly selling for upwards of \$1.5M, bringing more tax revenue but the city is not investing in our neighborhood park at all. There are two very dated playgrounds at Moon Park; one for very young children and one for larger children that are separated by the moon. If I am at one of the playgrounds, my view of the other is obstructed by the moon. I am not able to keep an eye on both of my children at once.

Furthermore, one of the playgrounds is within 10-15 yards of the Santa Ana Riverbed Bike Trail and there are no barriers between it and the playground. With the popularity of electric bikes that easily reach speeds of 25 mph, a wandering child from the playground could be struck by a bicycle on the trail. Suburbia Park, which is a short walk away with no play equipment and used as an unofficial dog park is fenced in.

Lastly, there is ONE swing at Moon Park: a tire swing. And my children cannot use it. If I want to go somewhere with an age appropriate swing, I need to travel over a mile to Smallwood Park. Moon park is less than a 10 minute walk, but sadly it is a park that we do not visit due to its safety concerns and lack of inclusive equipment. Please invest in our community and protect it.

Thank you for your time.

---

**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:** Cynthia McDonald <[cmcdonald.home@gmail.com](mailto:cmcdonald.home@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, October 9, 2025 12:03 PM

**To:** ParkDistrict1 <[ParkDistrict1@costamesaca.gov](mailto:ParkDistrict1@costamesaca.gov)>; ParkDistrict2 <[ParkDistrict2@costamesaca.gov](mailto:ParkDistrict2@costamesaca.gov)>; ParkDistrict3 <[ParkDistrict3@costamesaca.gov](mailto:ParkDistrict3@costamesaca.gov)>; ParkDistrict4 <[ParkDistrict4@costamesaca.gov](mailto:ParkDistrict4@costamesaca.gov)>; ParkDistrict5 <[ParkDistrict5@costamesaca.gov](mailto:ParkDistrict5@costamesaca.gov)>; ParkDistrict6 <[ParkDistrict6@costamesaca.gov](mailto:ParkDistrict6@costamesaca.gov)>; WRIGHT, SHAYANNE <[SHAYANNE.WRIGHT@costamesaca.gov](mailto:SHAYANNE.WRIGHT@costamesaca.gov)>

**Cc:** GRUNER, BRIAN <[BRIAN.GRUNER@costamesaca.gov](mailto:BRIAN.GRUNER@costamesaca.gov)>; CITY CLERK <[CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov](mailto:CITYCLERK@costamesaca.gov)>

**Subject:** Parks and Community Services Commission meeting of October 9, 2025 - NB 1: Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan Status Update

Dear Commissioners:

**Don't be misled by the Agenda Report—there's far more to this project than Staff is revealing.**

Calling the Planning Commission's approval a "preferred land use plan" is misleading. It wasn't preferred by all the Commissioners, and it certainly wasn't supported by the public, who have consistently voiced opposition. One speaker summed it up best: ***"This is not a plan. This is a screw job."***

If you don't have time to review the recordings of the Planning Commission meetings and listen to all the comments about concerns regarding the lack of park space, both from the Commissioners and many members of the public, please watch this recording of a Commissioner voicing his opposition to the plan: <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/8yywhzc3b3k4u0i8a0xx1/Costa-Mesa-Planning-Commission-Meeting-August-25-2025-YouTube-Google-Chrome-2025-08-26-15-45-07.mp4?rlkey=9zbtgmtsey9jfbkxdogzadhfn&st=fnq8f6w6&dl=0>

The Fairview Developmental Center Specific Plan has come before the Commission four times. What began as a public visioning exercise in November 2023 morphed into three land use options that ignored community input—a clear **bait-and-switch**. Even more troubling, the State had already rejected those three options before they were ever shown to the public. Instead, a fourth plan—developed behind closed doors by State and City Staff—was quietly introduced in May 2025 and labeled the "preferred" plan.

This so-called preferred plan is actually a worst-case scenario, now being used to initiate the Environmental Impact Report. It is important to understand: the plan has changed repeatedly, **often without transparency**. Please see the following:

Resource	Number of Units	Affordability	Commercial	Open Space	Access Points / Traffic
Housing Element (01/01/23 version)	2,300 on 121 ac	40% very-low- and low-income & 30% moderate, & 30% market rate broken down as follows: 575 very-low-income 345 low-income 690 moderate income 690 above moderate income	N/S (Not Stated)	25% of 80 ac, or about 22 ac	N/S
Market Study presented at Planning Commission Meeting (03/25/24)	N/S	N/S	29,500 to 55,900 gross sq ft of retail, plus 76,500 sq ft of other uses	N/S	N/S
Planning Commission Meeting (05/27/25)	3,600 to 3,800 on 95 ac (115 total w/20 ac to be retained by State for housing)	40% very-low- and low-income & 30% moderate, & 30% market rate	35,000 sq ft max	10-12 ac despite not meeting General Plan or Quimby Act requirements	2 Daily Trip Traffic Generation 11,342 to 18,501 additional daily trips; LOS Level E at some peak hours
Planning Commission Meeting (06/23/25) – Financial Feasibility Analysis	4,000 units on 95 ac	40% very-low- and low-income & 30% moderate, & 30% market rate	10,000 to 35,000 sq ft	10-12 ac	2 – Daily Trips should go up but data not provided
Planning Commission Meeting (08/25/25)	4,000 max (10,560 more residents) on 95 ac	40% very-low- and low-income & 30% moderate, & 30% market rate	35,000 sq ft max	12 ac despite needing nearly <b>45</b> ac under the General Plan requirement	2

A previously considered land swap with the State could have created a better golf course layout, but that was scrapped because the State would not consider it. And where are the promised community amenities—libraries, senior centers, meeting spaces? The preferred plan does not set aside acreage for these vital uses.

In contrast, a new mixed-use project in Santa Ana on Bristol Street to be built on **41 acres** will provide **13.1 acres of parkland**. A second project in Santa Ana on Sunflower will provide **7.5 acres of public parkland** on a **17.2 acre** project site.

To be clear, the City **requires 4.26 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents**, exceeding the State's baseline of three acres under the Quimby Act. However, despite collecting developer fees, the City has not acquired much new parkland in years and remains park poor. This plan, in its current state, **does not even meet the Quimby Act requirements**. The Planning Commission set the number of units at **4,000 maximum. That means planning for 10,560 more people.  $10,560 \times 3 \text{ acres per } 1,000 \text{ persons} = 31.5 \text{ acres of parkland}$ . And at 4.26 acres, the need would be close to 45 acres of parkland. Twelve acres is woefully short!**

The Agenda Report mentions an “integrated trail, pedestrian and bicycle network,” but this is a reactive measure to offset the surge in traffic—already projected at over 18,500 daily trips. With congestion worsening on Harbor Boulevard, intersections like Fair Drive may soon reach LOS Level F.

And let us not forget the recent letter from the California Department of Housing and Community Development threatening to take over city planning due to our noncompliant Housing Element and Staff’s failure to respond to repeated requests from the HCD. If the State takes over planning, the parkland will be reduced even more due to the State's push for more housing.

**Commissioners, you are not being asked to approve this update—but you can and should comment.** Please urge the City Council to prioritize open space, transparency, and genuine public input. The future of Costa Mesa depends on it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cynthia McDonald

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments

---