Scott Carpenter <scottallancarpenter@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, June 6, 2023 10:46 AM

To:

STEPHENS, JOHN; HARLAN, JEFFREY; MARR, ANDREA; CHAVEZ, MANUEL; GAMEROS,

LOREN; HARPER, DON; REYNOLDS, ARLIS; CITY CLERK

Subject:

Petition from Residents Regarding City Budget

Attachments:

Tennis Center Petition to Council.pdf

Dear Mayor Stephens and Council,

Please see the attached petition that has been signed by 219 individuals from the Costa Mesa community in regards to Agenda Item 4 (City Budget) on your regular agenda this evening.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Scott Carpenter Costa Mesa Resident

June 6, 2023

Dear Mayor Stephens and Councilmembers,

Please see below a petition that has been signed by 219 members of the Costa Mesa community who urge your support to revitalize the Costa Mesa Tennis Center. We understand you will be considering the annual city budget at this evening's Council meeting and ask you will take this request into consideration.

Thank you very much for your attention and consideration for this matter.

Sincerely,

Scott Carpenter
Costa Mesa Resident

Modernize the Costa Mesa Tennis Center

We, the undersigned members of the Costa Mesa community, strongly urge City Council to allocate funds in the 2023/24 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget for the comprehensive renovation and modernization of the Costa Mesa Tennis Center.

This project encompasses resurfacing the courts, installing new nets and wind screens, upgrading the spectator viewing area, implementing LED lighting, and constructing a state-of-the-art clubhouse. This renovation will have numerous benefits to our community:

- Enhance Costa Mesa's image, attracting residents, visitors, and investors for a vibrant community.
- Attract tournaments and events, boosting the local economy and showcasing our city.

- Foster community connections by providing a gathering place for people of all backgrounds.
- Promote active lifestyles, benefiting resident's physical fitness and well-being.

Please vote to invest in our city's future by allocating funds in the 2023/24 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget for the comprehensive renovation and modernization of the Costa Mesa Tennis Center.

Thank you for considering our request.

Jim Fitzpatrick <jimfitzeco@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, June 6, 2023 8:22 AM

To:

CITY CLERK

Subject:

Public Comments - Public Hearing #3 - Master Fee Schedule

Attachments:

Industry Letter to Reduce the Badge Fee 6.5.2023.pdf

Please support this industry request.

Cheers,

Jim Fitzpatrick Solutioneer

Cannabis Industry Letter to Costa Mesa - Request to Lower the Badge Fees

TO: City Council, City Manager & Staff

FROM: Costa Mesa Cannabis Industry Stakeholders

The Cannabis Industry has a long history of working with the City of Costa Mesa to create a legal, regulated cannabis business sector. Part of this was established many years ago with the development and implementation of Measure X. And now with Measure Q, residents will finally have safe access to tested products.

With the implementation of Measure Q, it's worth considering the Cannabis Industry's contributions to the city thus far. To date, there have been monetary contributions of roughly \$2.5 million in Application Fees and approximately \$1 million in Traffic Impact Fees. While there are costs associated with developing and implementing Measure Q, these figures are quite substantial, not to mention that the 7% Sales Tax has yet to being coming into the city.

The Costa Mesa Cannabis Industry is graciously requesting to meet with the City to explore options to decrease the initial, and ongoing, burden of costs associated with hiring new employees, specifically how to reduce the \$631 Badge Fee. As reference, we polled Industry Operators regarding how other cities processed Employee Badges. The findings showed that the highest Employee Badge Fee was \$100. To illustrate the impact of the current \$631 fee, a Retail Store initially hiring 20 employees would incur \$12,620 in just Employee Badge Fees. And with an annual turnover rate of 50%, the Year 1 costs would be approximately \$20,000. This would be just for badges, and does not include the typical costs associated with the hiring process such as advertising the position, background checks, and training among others.

It's important to have an efficient and reliable process for onboarding employees for both businesses and the City. This is why we would like to work with the City to find a workable solution to reduce the costs associated with Employee Badges. Preliminarily, we have considered two possible options:

- 1. Reduce the \$631 Employee Badge Fee to a rate more in line with typical industry employee badge fees.
- 2. Decrease the City's required time and costs with a more streamlined process.
 - a. This could be achieved by shifting the employee badge process to the business, as is typical throughout the industry in other jurisdictions. Among other options, this could include:
 - i. Recording and Reporting of Employees
 - ii. Uploading Background Checks
 - iii. Printing Badges

Having discussed the business implications of the current high fee and cumbersome badge issuance process, the Cannabis Chamber of Commerce and many other stakeholders, support taking steps to find a less burdensome solution for both the City and business operators.

The Costa Mesa Cannabis Industry requests to a meeting between a small group of the industry's representative, and the appropriate City Staff to discuss potential options and solutions. Please let us know a day and time that works best, as we would like to get something on the calendar within the next 10 working days. We appreciate your time and consideration and look forward to continued collaboration as this new business sector is launched in the City.

Lastly, the process of background checks and issuing badges takes 4 to 6 weeks. We also need to develop a process top shorten that window which is devastating to operators to get open and fill positions.

Sincerely,

Cannabis Chamber of Commerce

Operators (Measure Q & X) Attached

SUPPORTERS:

Operators: (by Address)

2801 Harbor Blvd

- Off the Charts

2275 Newport Blvd

- Nectar

• 2424 Newport Blvd

- Ash & Lex

• 2710 Harbor Blvd

- Stiiizy

• 675 Paulorino

- Stiiizy

1854 Newport Blvd

- Mr Nice Guy

1860 Newport Blvd

- Newport Leaf

2845 Harbor Blvd

- Mr Nice guy - Natures Garden

167 Cabrillo

- Flower Factory

2332 Newport Blvd 2664 Newport Blvd

- Secret Garden

124 E 17 th St

- Polaris

1921 Harbor Blvd

- High Seas

1990 Harbor Blvd

- 420 Central

1687 Orange Ave

- Gold Flora

2146 Newport Blvd

- Off the Charts

2001 Harbor Blvd

- South Coast Safe Access

• 2905 Redhill Ave

- Terra Firma

2301 Newport Blvd

- Culture

2307 Harbor Blvd

- The Drop

141 E 16 th St

- Mercantile

Individuals:

- Jim Fitzpatrick
- **Chris Glew**
- Sean Maddox

Kim Hendricks < kimhendricks26@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, June 6, 2023 10:33 AM

To:

GREEN, BRENDA; TERAN, STACY; CITY CLERK

Subject:

Comments for the record

Attachments:

IMG-6207.jpg; IMG-6208.jpg

Hi Ladies,

Sorry to bother you again.

Here are my comments for the public record for tonight's city council meeting.

Thank you,

Kim Hendricks

Good Evening,

My name is Kim Hendricks and I am here to talk to you about an item that came before you May 2nd that was carried over from city council meeting on March 21, 2023, which was reopened from city council meeting on Sept. 21, 2021, regarding whether or not flying activity is compatible in Fairview Park. This motion was after city staff had already spent months doing a comprehensive evaluation of whether or not flying activity was compatible in Fairview Park. City staff found it was not compatible in Fairview Park due to environmental, public safety, and enforcement issues. The motion on 9/21/2021 was, "Include in the Fairview Park Master Plan update a broader analysis for flying options at the park, identify other potential sites including Fairview Developmental Center, and to only permit gliders going forward in the park."

City staff was following city council's direction, spending 19 months working diligently to give city council the most accurate information gathering information from regulatory agencies, biologists, getting stakeholder and public input and having the FPSC spend almost all their time on this issue. City staff went above and beyond to work with the small group of flyers, with a declining membership, that kept submitting inadequate proposals that didn't deal with the issues raised by their flying activity in Fairview Park. City staff dutifully presented their findings to city council on March 23, 2021, but city council declined to vote and pushed it to the May 2nd meeting.

At the May 2nd meeting, the mayor asked that no information be presented that had already been presented at the March meeting. City staff was told to hold their presentation and city biologist was told to not speak. Who did speak again was the president of HSS, Mr. Matt Garcia, and still spewing the same misinformation, claiming that everyone, including USFW, wanted flying activity in Fairview Park except city staff. This of course wasn't true and I once again confirmed it with USFW with an email the next day, which you probably have seen. USFW knows gliders and ANY flying activity would kick the birds out. But this wasn't the first time Mr. Garcia has so easily spread misinformation in a public setting but perhaps the first time that city council agreed with him and made unreasonable demands of city staff.

Instead of city council being appreciative and respectful of the information that city staff so diligently gathered and presented, city council ignored the information - no one mentioned the findings except council Reynolds. Instead, city staff was berated., stating repeatedly that city staff takes direction from city council as if city staff hadn't. City staff DID follow city council direction and found that flying activity in FP is not compatible due to environmental, public safety, and enforcement issues. You have all heard that USFW do not think flying in FP is compatible with the sensitive resources. If not, give them a call or an email.

Mr. Chavez's berating city staff for not taking city council direction and repeatedly saying that city staff takes direction from city council, when they already had was threatening and bullying. Mr. Chavez' comments were abhorrent and an assault on city staff, committee members as well as the community. Have you forgotten Mr. Chavez that it is community members that put you up on the dias? Have you forgotten that it is community members who care enough to become committee members? Mr. Chavez's attack on Measure AA for being 'contradictory' was so wrong and demonstrates his lack of understanding. Mr. Chavez has let his district down as well as the whole community by his divisive and unprofessional language.

Mr. Stephen's added to the assault with his unrealistic motion. I guess you need to be reminded of what you said Mr. Stephens that Costa Mesa is a great place with many activities but Costa Mesa doesn't need to have every activity. Please listen to the Sept. 21, 2021 meeting.

The motion on May 2nd is unreasonable and hypocritical of city council to demand city staff, park rangers, and city resources to devote more time and energy to a declining membership group that degrades the park when city council has said that it doesn't want to waste city staff time with committees. Ms. Marr already spoke about such ideas on Sept. 21, 2021, - Regulating into compliance isn't realistic and HSS doesn't have the capacity to support any of it, - yet these ideas were put into a motion on May 2nd.

How can city council demand that a vernal pool be used as a fly area no matter what the impacts are? To do what city council wants regardless of the impacts is leading the city in a bad direction like what happened in 2013 when city council demanded a dg trail be put in on a vernal pool. Fairview Park is a unique nature park with endangered, threatened, and species of special concern being plants as well as animals. No other city around has such a place. There are 5 other flying fields within 21 miles from Costa Mesa with better amenities. The flyers have already been using them. The flyers are mostly a small group of retired men who have the time to drive 20 minutes to fly their planes to a place with better amenities. In fact, they do this now.

By the way, there is no 'fly field' in the FPMP. That just another problem with the May 2nd motion.

Like you said Ms. Marr, the endangered birds can't be here to speak and there is a legitimate environmental concern which all of you have acknowledged. It doesn't take much to contact USFW to see they do not think ANY flying activity in FP is compatible with the resources in FP. Not just planes kick the birds out but so do gliders.

Mr. Gameros said it at the Sept. 21, 2021 meeting with his motion, that Ms. Reynolds undermined. Mr. Gameros said, "So while I do appreciate that the flying field does bring opportunity and joy for some people it doesn't represent a large group of people in our community and that's what I was elected for, to bring what the masses want to see. From my understanding, there is only 20 residents in the city of Costa Mesa that actually use this field. There are several others outside our city that use it. There is opportunity for bird migration in this park, the birds do feed off those shrimp from what I understand and from what I've heard, and to say that we really don't know if the planes interfere with the birds activities is kind of an unsupported statement because I can tell you right now that planes flying around would interfere and do interfere, we can see that because the birds have migrated back. I for one want to recreate and enjoy the park just like everybody else but I also want to see an opportunity provided for the Fairview Park Committee to expand what's going on now and I believe that having a flying field with model airplanes is going to be interrupted."

It is high time for the city council to listen and respect their city staff and not try to bully them by making unreasonable demands of policies, procedures, and permits on a vernal pool.

Jennifer Tanaka < jletanaka@gmail.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, June 6, 2023 10:01 AM

To:

CITY COUNCIL; MINTER, JASON; PARKS COMMISSION

Cc:

CITY CLERK

Subject:

Letter re: Harper Park for City Council/Parks Commission

Attachments:

Harper Park Letter to CC and PC (Final).pdf

Dear Members of the City Council, Members of the Parks & Community Services Commission, and Director Minter:

Please find attached a letter regarding the temporary fencing set up in Harper Park, signed by several residents of the surrounding neighborhoods. Please include this letter as a public comment for tonight's City Council meeting.

We are deeply disappointed by the decision to allow NMUSD to erect this fence with no resident, elected official, or appointed official input. We hope that the City can work with NMUSD to promptly remove the fence and come up with a better solution.

Best, Jenn Tanaka

Costa Mesa City Council
Parks and Community Services Commission of the City of Costa Mesa
Jason Minter, Parks & Community Services Director
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Dear Members of the City Council, Members of the Parks and Community Services Commission, and Director Minter:

We write to express our strong opposition to the recent installation of a temporary fence by Newport-Mesa Unified School District (NMUSD) between the playing fields and the playground/park area of Harper Park. As residents of the surrounding neighborhood, we are deeply disappointed by the decision to physically separate these two areas without any public engagement or consultation with our elected and appointed officials.

Harper Park holds a special place in the hearts of many residents as a beloved community gathering spot. Its best feature is the combination of playing fields and city park, which has fostered a sense of unity and freedom for residents and visitors alike. Young adults (and the young at heart) play pickup soccer and flag football games on evenings and weekends. The park's small playground and picnic area receives heavy use by the many young families that live nearby. In fact, Harper Park is the *only* neighborhood playground and playing field in the lower Eastside that does not require residents to cross busy and dangerous arterial roads like 17th Street, Irvine Avenue or Newport Boulevard. It is the epitome of a walkable, bikeable park.

The fence has undermined Harper Park's value as a community asset by making these uses more difficult, more crowded, or completely impossible. The sudden introduction of this eyesore – the temporary fencing is cheap, hostile, and unwelcoming in every respect – negatively impacts the aesthetic appeal of both the playing fields and Harper Park, which have previously been valued for their natural beauty and open atmosphere. Cutting the fence directly through some of the most beautiful trees in Eastside Costa Mesa feels like an insult. And the visual impact of the fence, and the lack of respect for residents and their park it implies, not only disrupts the overall ambiance but also has the potential to deter residents from utilizing the park as frequently as before.

All of this could have been avoided. The abrupt installation of this fence, much to our shock and dismay, was done without any prior resident outreach or consultation with the residents. Even our relevant elected and appointed officials, such as our representatives on the City Council and Parks and Community Services Commission, were left out of the loop.

In particular, the "resident-last" posture by City staff is deeply troubling and

<u>unacceptable</u>. We have been told that NMUSD has been complaining to City staff about off-leash dogs in Harper Park for some time now, and that the fence was installed by NMUSD with the City Staff's blessing as a potential solution. That's all news to us. There have been only 8 citations for leash law violations in the park since Park Ranger reports resumed post-COVID in October 2020, over 30 months ago, and the last violation was in July 2022. And furthermore, we do not recall anyone from the City or any relevant signage pointing out the difference between school and park property. In other words, we have seen no recent efforts to change resident behavior either through education or enforcement. And certainly no one has approached the residents to discuss how to address conflicting uses. The lack of transparency and failure to engage the community by City staff in this affair — and to instead work through NMUSD — not only undermines trust but also disregards the voices and concerns of the residents who utilize and cherish these spaces.

In light of these concerns, we urge the City Council and the Parks and Community Services Commission to take immediate action to address this matter. We respectfully request the following actions be taken:

- Work with NMUSD to immediately remove the temporary fence between the playing fields and Harper Park, reinstating the open and interconnected space that has long been enjoyed by the community.
- 2. Promptly initiate a collaborative effort between the City Council, the Parks and Community Services Commission, City Staff, NMUSD and relevant stakeholders, *which must include resident representatives*, to develop a comprehensive plan for the future use and preservation of the playing fields and Harper Park.
- Conduct a review of the joint use agreement between the City of Costa Mesa and NMUSD to determine how to maximize the ability of residents to use school fields for recreation and enjoyment purposes while respecting NMUSD's security and maintenance concerns.

It is essential that our elected representatives and city officials prioritize the well-being and satisfaction of the community they serve. We implore you to carefully consider the impact of the fence on the residents and their ability to enjoy these valuable *public* spaces.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We eagerly await your prompt response and actions.

Sincerely,

Jenn Tanaka
Andrew Nowobilski
Mike Lingle
Michael Reynolds
Lily Reynolds
Karyn Banner
Jim Fitzpatrick

Mohammed Elayan Eric Wayman Jon Garner Karen Peca Tony Peca Wendy Leece Summer Jarratt Adam Hickam

Gray Enterprises, LP <mbaldwin2200@sbcglobal.net>

Sent:

Wednesday, May 31, 2023 4:07 PM

To:

CITY CLERK

Subject:

Northgate Market Public Hearing on 6/6/23

Attachments:

Scan.pdf

Please see attached letter regarding the above referenced submitted by John R. Hundley Sr. of Gray Enterprises LP.

Thank you,

Michelle Baldwin c/o Gray Enterprises, L.P. 2200 Harbor Blvd., Suite B-170 Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Phone: 949/722-0143 Fax: 949/722-7394 Cell: 714/719-2415

GRAY ENTERPRISES, LP

2200 Harbor Blvd., Suite B-170 · Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Tel (949) 722-0143 • Fax (949) 722-7394

May 5, 2023

TO: The Costa Mesa Planning Commission

RE: Northgate Market Public Hearing

I represent the Owners of Gray Plaza, located at 2200 Harbor Blvd., Costa Mesa and we just received the Official Public Notice regarding the above.

We have great concerns about the outside dining area, the outside live entertainment and the serving of alcoholic beverages in such close proximity to our center. We are concerned about the possibility of increased litter, noise and the lack of supervision of customers who may eat and drink both inside and outside of the established seating area.

We are also concerned about their customers using our parking lot to park and then cross the street to patronize that center. When Albertson's was operating, the parking lot in front of their store was busy and pretty full. With Northgate combining a grocery store with a restaurant and the City allows a reduction in the number of parking spaces they should have for these two uses, our parking lot will most certainly be impacted by their overflow of customers. This situation already exists with the Newport Rib Company Restaurant whose customers frequently use our parking lot, reducing available parking for our Tenant's employees and customers.

Our Security Guards and Janitorial Staff already have their hands full dealing with vagrants, drunks, drug addicts, noise complaints, litter and people who leave their car here all day to work somewhere else. Allowing an outside area to serve alcohol could encourage more of the same. Over the years, we have had to increase the amount of security, janitor services and recently added several security gates on this property in the amount of \$50,000.00+ to deal with these problems, all paid for by Ownership and the Tenants. We do not want increased problems and more expenses. We get very little support from the police department when we have had to call for their assistance in dealing with these issues. Many potentially dangerous situation by themselves. And, when the police do arrive during a situation, the security guard reports that sometimes the police do not support their position in protecting our private property.

When Northgate was considering moving into our shopping center years ago, we visited several of their stores and not one of the stores we visited had an outside eating area that served alcohol with entertainment. Instead, they had a few tables inside their markets located near their deli and salsa bar and they did not serve alcohol. Managing a large supermarket and a restaurant serving alcohol are two very different types of businesses requiring experience and enough personnel to help ensure their businesses do not affect the public or neighboring private properties. Monitoring, reporting and dealing with the potential negatives these use requests might bring have become the responsibility of surrounding private property owners using their own resources with not much help or response from City officials regarding our complaints.

We strongly disagree with the City allowing Northgate Market to have a reduction in parking requirements and an outdoor restaurant with live entertainment where they are allowed to serve alcohol.

Thank you for the opportunity to make our objections known.

Sincerely,

GRAY ENTERPRISES LP

John R. Hundley, Sr., General Partner

From: Mick Meldrum < mmeldrum@icidevco.com>

Sent: Thursday, June 1, 2023 10:06 AM
To: John Stephens < john@sf-lawyers.com>
Cc: Scott Bell < rsbell@icidevco.com>

Subject: Harbor Center Good Neighbor Measures

Hello Mr. Mayor,

ICI and Harbor Center Partners, L.P. would like you to know that we support Northgate's request for an outdoor patio and are hopeful some of the conditions that were imposed on them in their Planning Commission hearing can be modified to work better for Northgate.

In an effort to help with this, we thought it might be good to remind everyone of the measures we took when we redeveloped Harbor Center in 1999. Here are some of the things we did that was beyond what is normal:

- Limited truck access to the back of the center during night time hours
- Posted signage across the back of the center stating "Turn Engines off while Parked" and Quiet Please"
- Added multiple sound walls as high as 14 feet to mitigate noise.
- Added sound deadening materials to the walls to further mitigate noise.
- Created a separation zone (berm area) between the shopping center and the homes that varies from 20 feet in depth to 40 feet, installed a berm with landscaping so they did not have to look at a tall wall.
- Added dual pane windows to 10 homes behind the center.
- Added HVAC to 10 homes behind the center. Many had to have their electrical panels replaced due to capacity loads.
- Added HVAC and dual pane windows to the Seawind Apartments.

I've attached a site plan that shows where many of these measures are located. Please let me know if you have any questions. I will see you at the hearing next Tuesday.

Kind regards.

N. Mick Meldrum
V. P. Development
ICI Development Company
2222 E. Seventeenth Street
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Email: mmeldrum@icidevco.com

Tel: 714-541-1200; Fax: 714-543-1900

This email may contain material that is confidential or privileged. It is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, reliance or distribution by others, or any forwarding or copying by means, without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not clic



From: Scott Bell < rsbell@icidevco.com> Sent: Thursday, June 1, 2023 10:21 AM

To: Mick Meldrum < mmeldrum@icidevco.com Cc: John Stephens < john@sf-lawyers.com

Subject: Re: Harbor Center Good Neighbor Measures

Mick, we also put air conditioners in the Seawind apartments and I also want to point out that we are on very good terms with Seawind apartments and Mediterranean apartments. They completely support our project, they're excited about northgate and they have never complained about any noise because of our extra ordinary and unprecedented mitigation measures and good neighbor majors that we implemented

I am also not aware of any complaints from the 10 homes in the rear also . They have double sound walls in most of the area because the RV storage has sound walls and so does the back of the shopping center.

We did a good effort with community outreach when we built the shopping center, and the parting comment to them was, if you cannot see it, here it or smell it, it does not exist essentially what we did as we put in sound mitigation walls, and planet, Sherwood Forest on top of the berm. In other words, we environmentally separated the shopping center from the residences.

The fact the matter is the sound mitigation in the outside patio is redundant because the noise mitigation that we have for the trucks is adequate

I need a parting statement I would say why don't we let these people run their business because they're the ones that know how to do it

There are noise meters, and if there's problems they'll be addressed we're dealing with people with integrity that want to do a good job and we've demonstrated integrity over the last 20 years that we have been good neighbors

OK that's my spiel

Thanks

R Scott Bell
President
ICI Development Company, Inc.
2222 E. Seventeenth Street
Santa Ana, Ca. 92705

Phone: 714 541 1200 x 207

Fax: 714 543 1900

From: Gray Enterprises, LP <mbaldwin2200@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 2:12 PM

To: CITY CLERK

Subject: Northgate Market Public Hearing

Dear Sirs: I attended the Public Hearing for the Northgate Market held by the City of Costa Mesa Planning Commission on May 8th. At that meeting one of the Planners asked the representative from Northgate Market how many employees were going to be working there. Please check your recording for that night, but I heard the representative say 150 to 175 at peak times! That is a lot of employees and I don't see where Harbor Center has the parking stalls for those employees. I reviewed the parking study and no where did it bring up where the parking will be for that many employees. I can assure you that the parking stalls along the wall behind all the buildings, from Wells Fargo down to Home Depot will NOT be used by employees or customers. I am the Property Manager for the Gray Plaza across the street and have tried for 20 years to get Kmart's employees and the tenants and their employees in buildings D, C & B to park behind the Kmart building and generally park anywhere in the rear of the center and have had little success. Most of the cars that park behind the Kmart building are the residents who live in all the apartments on College Street and down Avocado Street.

So, I'm pretty sure the employees for Northgate Market will be parking at Gray Plaza, or the surrounding neighborhoods and run across the street to their job at Northgate Market.

Another point made at this Planning Commission meeting acknowledged there will be no one from Code Enforcement or from other departments at the City who will be proactive in checking to make sure that Northgate employees are parking at Harbor Center instead of Gray Plaza or surrounding neighborhoods, nor will they be proactive in checking on noise violations or drinking alcohol out in public--until someone complains about it. It was explained to the City Planners that once a complaint is made about parking, noise or other matters, then the City Code Enforcement (I guess) will check it out and do something about it. I'd like to know exactly what will be done to Northgate from the City's investigation, if it finds a violation of the conditions after receiving a complaint? If the Police are constantly responding to calls about noise, or drinking in public nuisance calls, or parking issues, will the City rescind their conditional use permit? I myself have complained to Code Enforcement about problems and have received little help. The Owner, John Hundley Sr. and myself have visited the Mayor and Chief of Police regarding dangerous and serious situations we are dealing with and again, have received very little help.

It was mentioned at the meeting that Northgate Market is going to be required to put some kind of sound measurement device out on the 3 exterior patios and Northgate has stated they will be installing lots of security cameras and it will be these types of devices the City can request to have access to if they investigate a complaint. However, we all know these devices don't always work, or are frozen and need to be re-booted, etc, etc. There seem to be multiple problems with keeping these cameras and sound devices

working properly, to the point where many tenant's stop using them altogether. How often will the City be checking the camera and sound equipment at Northgate to make sure the equipment is working and an employee of Northgate is doing the monitoring this requires?

We are okay with the supermarket part of Northgate Market. We see many potential issues that will most likely arise with the outside patios and selling alcohol at two bars within the premise and allowing entertainment and we don't see how Northgate Market or the City of Costa Mesa will be solving the complaints from these issues.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Michelle Baldwin, Property Manager c/o Gray Enterprises, L.P. 2200 Harbor Blvd., Suite B-170 Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Phone: 949/722-0143 Fax: 949/722-7394 Cell: 714/719-2415