ATTACHMENT 12

YH-2 and MT-4

COLGAN, JULIE

From:

Julie Schaffner < julie1129@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 12, 2018 12:32 PM

To:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Cc:

LE, JENNIFER

Subject:

PA-16-30, PA-16-31, PA-16-36

Attachments:

PA-16-30_PA-16-31.pdf; PA-16-36.pdf

Hello

Please find 2 documents attached for today's hearing.

Both these documents represent signatures from direct residents NOT in favor of approving either of the applications.

Thanks

Julie

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Costa Mesa Planning Commission will hold a public hearing as follows to consider:

HEARING DATE: February 12, 2018

HEARING TIME 6:00 P.M. or soon thereafter & LOCATION:

City Hall Council Chambers

77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA

Application No. Site Address:

PA-16-30 & PA-16-31 321 and 327 Cabrillo Zone:

Applicant/Agent: RAW Recovery, LLC

R3, Multiple-Family Residential

Contact:

Street Planning Division (714) 754-5245

Email:

PlanningCommission@costamesaca.gov

Description: Conditional Use Permits (CUP) PA-16-30 and PA-16-31 are requests to operate a sober living facility housing up to 37 gender-specific adults in six units on two parcels. The applicant also submitted a request for reasonable accommodation to allow these two facilities to be located within 195 feet and 208 feet, respectively, from another property that contains a state-licensed treatment facility; and for relief from other land use requirements of the Zoning Code. The application for accommodation was denied. The applicant has appealed HIMMO UTU DIC SEL that decision to the Planning Commission.

Environmental Determination: The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Quidelines Section 15301 (Class 1), Existing Facilities.

Additional Information: All interested parties may appear and present testimony in regard to this application. If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you, or someone else raised, at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the City, at or prior to, the public hearing. Any written correspondence or other materials for distribution to the Planning Commission must be received by Planning Division staff prior to 3:00 p.m. on the day of the hearing. See reverse for more information.

BY SIGNING BELOW, I INDICATE I AM **NOT** IN SUPPORT OF ALLOWING PA-16-30 & PA-16-31 TO BE APPROVED.

NAME (PRINT)	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS
the schalbre	sulu reluft	328 calanllo & Unit A
JANSAENGER	lan Sit	328 CABRILLO ST. WIT A
Phil Beeder	set	356 cabrilo Street unit is
Nila Lewis	hih Lewis	336 Cabrillo St. #1)
C. Oh Lhaver	Chia Oflhis	240 Vi rainia PLCM
	Jany Rober	
NONA PKINS	o known Humby	336 CARRILLO ST. ACM.
CHARLOTTE !	Chafte Afference	344 Cabrillo St CM
JoHN 50	W - /	

BY SIGNING BELOW, I INDICATE I AM <u>NOT</u> IN SUPPORT OF ALLOWING PA-16-30 &		
PA-16-31 TO BE APPROVED		
NAME (PRINT)	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS
	(Cho	1750 Santa AND AND CM 97127
CHEBOPHER RA	CA LICENTE	2021 Alies Costa Meda, Ca 92627
ANN H. PACKE	grin 14 June	
PEARL HUDSON	Pharl Hudson	322 CABRICLO ST, CH
Amanda Divillago	/ Maria	329 Cabrillo St. CM
Josh Comeran	/ /	318 Cabrillo St. CSNA MRSO
Jessica nikult		318 Cabrillo 51. A Costa Mosa 91627
Sean Corn	Selve	336 Cabrillo A Costa Mesa 92627
thra Gutick Rea	HO	mu cabrille B cista Mova, CA 97477
Annelle Cources	Constitutes	513 Cabrillo St. 4 B Costa M 35054
Allison Vauchin	Won	317 cabrillo St#C Costamesarur
	The Cin Egy ;	313 Cabrilles + A Costation CAGELAR
Jacha KIM	1	329 Cabrills St Costanes CA 92627
Math Erms	GHELL	-317 Cabrillo St Apt A Costa, Mesa 9262;
Natalie Unber	Mu	34 Cabrillo & Com
Phis Marse lle	CHRIS MARSZILLS	322 CABRILLO ST.C.M. 92627
Brandon fratum	PSIA -	329 Cabrillo St Apt B. Costa Mesa 92427
Blake Lemond		329 Cabrillo Apt C, Costa Mess, De
Priscilla Sua	rez Onsul	2 329 Cabrillo Apt C
	V	•

BY SIGNING BELOW, I INDICATE I AM <u>NOT</u> IN SUPPORT OF ALLOWING PA-16-30 & PA-16-31 TO BE APPROVED		
NAME (PRINT)	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS
Victoria Hayes	Who buy	317 cubrillo St. Apt A Costa Mesa, CA 72627
BETHANYMONKA		217 Cabrillo St. Unit B Costa Mesa, Ca 92627 1741 TUSTIN AVE #12A
MEGHAN FINL	er Mylentin	LASTA AMBEA, CA 76067
Vanesa Jones	(VanCom	1765 Sonta Ana Ave, DOO! Costa musa, CA 92627

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Costa Mesa Planning Commission will hold a public hearing as follows to consider:

Application No.

Site Address:

HEARING DATE: February 12, 2018

HEARING TIME 6:00 P.M. or soon thereafter

& LOCATION:

City Hall Council Chambers 77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA

PA-16-36 Applicant/Agent:

RAW Recovery, LLC

Zone:

R2-MD, Multiple Family Residential, Medium

Density

Contact:

329 Rochester Street Planning Division

(714) 754-5245

Emeil:

PlanningCommission @costamesaca.gov

Description: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) PA-16-36 is a request to operate a sober living facility housing up to aight gender-specific adults. The applicant also submitted a request for reasonable accommodation to allow this facility to be within 120 feet of another property that contains a state-licensed treatment facility, and for relief from other land use requirements of the Zoning Code. The application for accommodation was denied. The applicant has appealed that decision to the Planning Commission.

Environmental Determination: The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1), Existing Facilities.

Additional Information: All interested parties may appear and present testimony in regard to this application. If you challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you, or someone else raised, at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the City, at or prior to, the public hearing. Any written correspondence or other materials for distribution to the Planning Commission must be received by Planning Division staff prior to 3:00 p.m. on the day of the hearing. See reverse for more information.

BY SIGNING BELOW, I INDICATE I AM **NOT** IN SUPPORT OF ALLOWING PA-16-36 TO BE APPROVED.

NAME (PRINT)	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS
Julieschafne	pulipeleft	328 caballo st., Unil A
JAN SAENGER	Jan Sarty	328 CABRILLO ST., WITA
Phil Beed	like	336 Cabrillo St. UnitB
Nila Lewis	hil Lyins	334 Cabrillust #D
C. Ohlhaver		240 Virginia PL. C.M.
		336 CABELLO ST. #A C.M
Charlotte L John		344 Cabrillo St CM
PURISTORIE PAR	+ all	1750 Santa AND AND CM 92625

BY SIGNING BELOW,	I INDICATE I AM NOT IN SUPPORT	OF ALLOWING PA-16-36 TO BE
APPROVED		

NAME (PRINT)	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	
ANN H. PARKE	Ann H Parker	2021 Aliso (92627	
PEARL HUDSON	Alead Hudson	322 CABRILLO SY., CH	
Amond Pretly many	Mary	329 aprilo St on	
Sort Coneron	1/ Len	318 Cabrillo St Coola Mesa	
Jessta Villett	AAA	318 cobrillo St. A Cosa M	
Sear (oran	26	336 CHANDRIL-A COHAN	
tina ciutica rog	MA	mo cabaillist & cista Masa Gan	un
Annex Creno	Control of	313 CabrilloSt # Octo Mesa	2627
Allison Vaughn	MYZ	317 Cabrillo St C, CoSta Mesa, 9	1
Hisdienveces	21-6 Conqueyo	213 cabrillo st Costa Mara CA 92	627
Kacha KIM	m	327 Cabrillo St Cofance (\$ 920	27
Matt Euras	MM/2 ~	317 cabrille st Costa Mesa CA	9262
Natal & Umbr	nur	314 Cabrilog CM	
CHRIS MARSEILES	Chis Mpre ile	322 Cycrillo ST. C.M. 9262	2.
Brandon Frething		329 Cabrillo St Apt B, Costs Mess 92	627
Blake Armond	New 11	329 Cabrillo Apt C. Losta Mesa	
Priscilla S	arez Pursi	Den 329 Cabrillo Ar	
	1		

BY SIGNING BELOW, I INDICATE I AM <u>NOT</u> IN SUPPORT OF ALLOWING PA-16-36 TO BE APPROVED		
NAME (PRINT)	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS
Victoria Hayes	un pur	317 Labrillo St. Apt A Costa Alesa, CA Guels
BETHANYMONKA	Bu	317 caballo st. Unit B Costa Mesa, Ca 92427
MEBHAN FINLEY	melecty	COSTA MESA, UM 92427
Vanessa Jones	Van Jos	1765 Sonta Ana Ave, Apt 0201 costa mesa, ca a2627
,		

Hi, name is Helen Rivera, and I live at 306 Cabrillo. I am writing to tell you that I am against permitting the properties at 321, and 327 Cabrillo to operate as sober living facilities.

I am 86, live alone, and am afraid. There is a facility across from my home, and some of the tenants are loud, up late, and frankly look scary.

There already are at least three facilities very close to my home.

There is a new family with small children two doors away. Please, please, say "no".

Yours truly,

Helen Rivera

Application No. PA-16-30 and PA-16-31

Received

City of Costa Mesa Development Services Department

FEB 1 2 2018

From:

Anne Koenig <ruthlesskoenig@dslextreme.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 09, 2018 2:49 PM

To:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Subject:

[BULK]

Importance:

Low

Just wanted to let you know that the signs that were posted on the two properties at 321 and 327 Cabrillo, were taken down a couple days after they were put up.

These signs were notifying the neighbors of the proposed sober living facilities at those two addresses.

Anne Koenig

310 Cabrillo

Costa Mesa, Ca. 92627

From:

Anne Koenig <ruthlesskoenig@dslextreme.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 12, 2018 7:55 AM

To: Subject: PLANNING COMMISSION Alley behind the 300 block.

Please advise the Sober living owners that the alley that separates them from the 300 block on Cabrillo is a private alley belonging to the residents of Cabrillo only.

The alley was paved a couple of years ago and was paid for by these residents.

Thank you, Anne Koenig 310 Cabrillo Costa Mesa, Ca. 92627

PH-2 and PH-4

COLGAN, JULIE

From:

julie1129@gmail.com

Sent:

Sunday, February 11, 2018 8:14 PM

To:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Cc:

LE, JENNIFER

Subject:

PA-16-30, PA-16-31 & PA-16-36

Attachments:

Doc Feb 11, 2018 at 8-07 PM.pdf; ATT00001.txt

Hello

Attached is my written correspondence documenting my challenge to the applications for CUPs and reasonable accommodations for 329 Rochester, 321 Cabrillo and 327 Cabrillo.

Thank You Julie Schaffner (949) 232-5226 February 9, 2018

Planning Division
City of Costa Mesa
77 Fair Drive
Costa Mesa, CA

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in response to the following application numbers: PA-16-30 & PA-16-31 (321 & 327 Cabrillo Street)
PA-16-36 (329 Rochester Street)

I am not in support of either of these applications getting approved. Our neighborhood already has an acceptable amount of facilities functioning at a proximity that is too close to one another. Approving the Conditional Use Permit would disrupt the quality of living for the residents of our neighborhood. In addition to our street already having parking and traffic issues (due to Grit Cycle & The Country Club's insufficient parking), approving the CUP and 'reasonable' accommodations would add to the issue.

With the current code requiring any facility needing to be "at least 650 feet from any property that contains a group home, sober living home or state-licensed drug and alcohol treatment facility", both applications are in obvious violation of the standards that were originally set to maintain the quality of living in Costa Mesa. Both of these would create a negative impact to our neighborhood. As a homeowner, it would be misleading to have rules and regulations in place for the benefit of the community and neighborhood be allowed to be circumvented.

Specifically for PA-16-30 & PA-16-31, housing up to 37 adults in 6 units is excessive. While the property may be able to meet the residential off-street parking standards, the parking requirements are based on the unit's bedroom count – which is not an accurate correlation to the added traffic (from the tenants and visitors) the facility will generate.

Julie Schaffner 328 Cabrillo Street TO! COSTA MESA PLANNING COMMISSION

Received

City of Costa Mesa

Development Services Department

344 CABRILLE ST

COSTA MESA 92627

FEB 0 9 2018

DATE: FEBRUARY 9, 2018

Subject! Public HEARING - FEB 12, 2018
329 ROCHESTER PA-16-36
321 CABRILLO PA 16-30
327 CABRILLO , 16-31

I AM WRITING TODAY BECAUSE I WILL NOT BE FIDE TO ATTEND MONDAY'S MEETING, THIS PUBLIC HEARING CONCERNS MY NEIGHBORHIOD, MY HOME.

THE PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE I RECEIVED
IN THE MAIL AND THE YARD SIGNS
IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD MADE ME VISIT
CITY HALL AND LOOK INTO THE
BUSINESS OF SOBER LIVING AND REHAD
HOMES, I SAW MORE SIGNS THAN THOSE
ATTACHED TO THE NOTICES I RECEIVED
IN THE MAIL, I WONDERED WHAT
ARE THE TRIGGES / CATALYSTS FOR
THESE SIGNS AND NOTICES.

WHAT I HAVE LEARNED!

- 1. NOTICES ARE MAILED TO ALL
 PROPERTIES WITHIN 500' OF
 A PROPOSED ACTION
- 2. THERE MUST BE 650' BETWEEN

 SOBER LIVING / REHAB HOMES

 (2 FOOTBALL FIELDS plus A LITHEMORE)
- 3. HOUSES WITH 6 OR FEWER
 RESIDENTS NEED STATE
 APPROVAL ONLY NOT CITY
- 4. HOUSES WITH MORE THAN 6
 RESIDENTS MUST HAVE CITY
 APPROVAL CONDITIONAL USE
 PERMIT (C.U.P.)
- 5. IF PROPERTY OWNER REQUESTS
 REASONABLE ACCOMODATIONS,
 THE REQUEST MUST BE GRANTED
 BEFORE A CUP CAN BE
 GRANTED
- A CIT CUP FOLLOWS THE LIFE OF A PROPERTY (THE LAND) NOT THE BUSINESS ON THE LAND, WHAT IS DECIDED TODAY CAN LAST FOREVER.

WHAT I SEE IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD: 2000-02-04-06 (ABRILLO ST 46 RESIDENTS 321 (ABRILLO ST) ONE PROPERTY 327 CABRILLO ST) 37 RESIDENTS 1730 SANTA ANA AVE LOOKS TO BE A GROUP HEME (NOT STATE LICENSED AS OF 2/5/18) LARGE VAN(5) IN PARKING

317 ROCHESTER STATE LICENSED
329 ROCHESTER 8 RESIDENTS

171-175 ROCHESTER REQUEST DENIED

THE TO POLICE REQUEST DENTED

207-209 18th ST. SINCE 1987
MORE THAN 6 RESIDENTS

1775-1777 ORANGE AUE LOOKS VERY CARED FOR

THE TRIGGER FOR THE NOTICES!

THE STATE LICENSED HOUSE AT 317
ROCHESTER, THE THREE PROPERTY ARE
TOO CLOSE (LESS THAN 650 FT.) TO
317 ROCHESTER.

321 CABRILLO ST 195' 327 CABRILLO ST 200' 329 ROCHESTER 120'

I BELIEVE MY NEIGHBORHOOD IS HEAVILY
SATURATED WITH GROUP HOMES. HEAVILY
SATURATED WITH BUSINSSES OPERATING
IN A RESIDENTIAL THEA. I BELIEVE
WE HAVE GONE FROM 'ENOUGH IS ENOUGH'
TO STOP THIS CRAZINESS."

FROM THE LETTERS OF THE APPLICANTS!

329 ROCHESTER

PAGE 5 ON APPLICATION UNDER PROPERTY DESCRIPTION"

(TALKING ABOUT PARKING) "ACCESS TO THE
GALAGE IS VIA + PRIVATE ALLEY in the
REAR OF THE PROPERTY!"
-216-

THIS IS A PRIVATE ALLEY FOR THE CABAILLO ST RESIDENTS AND PERMISSION FOR ACCESS From ROCHESTER ST. MUST BE GRANTED,
DO THE OWNERS OF 329 ROCHESTER
STREET HAVE SUCH PERMISSION?

321 and 327 CABRILLO ST

LETTER TO CLAIR FLYNN
FROM DAVID ALEXANDER
12-21-2015

Page 28 - LAST PARAGRAPH #1

OUR PROPOSED USE WILL NOT BE MATERIALLY DETRIMENTAL TO OTHER PROPERTIES IN THE AREA FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

#1

THERE IS AN ABUNDANCE OF

PARKING SINCE THERE WILL

BE ONLY ONE (1) STAFF VEHICLE

PARKED ON THE PROPERTY ATTONE

TIME, PARKING AT THIS LOCATION

HAS NEVER BEEN AN ISSUE, VEHICLES

FOR THIS FACILITY WILL ONLY USE

PARKING SPACES DESIGNATED FOR

THIS PROPERTY, AND OFF-SITE

PARKING WILL NOT BE IMPACTED

BY THE USE.

-217- 5

HOW CAN THIS BE TRUE? 5 PARKING SPACES 37 RESIDENTS ??? ALSC! PARKING CODE REQUIRES 13 SPACES PROPOSED/PROVIDED 5 SPACES ???? HOW CAN THAT LETTER FROM M. ALEXANDER TSE TRUE?

PARKING IN THE 300 BLOCK OF CABAILO ST
15 REALLY MAXED OUT. RESIDENTS ALL
USE STREET PARKING. BUT WE ARE
REALLY IMPACTED BY THE CLIENTS OF
GRIT CYCLE (1781 SAWTA ANA ANA). They
PARK ON CABAILO ST ON BOTH SIDES OF
THE STREET IN BUTH THE 200 AND
300 BLOCKS . GRIT CYCLE'S PARKING LOT
15 EXTREMELY UNDER SIZED.

Employees or TITE NEW COUNTRY CLUB LOUNGE ALSO PARK ON CABAILLO ST. THEIR TACKING LOT IS NOT ADEQUATE. IF THE CITY LEADERS REALLY TOOK THE

TIME AND EFFORT TO RESEARCH AND THEN
CRAFT A THOUGHTFUL ORDINANCE (#1511),

I BELIEVE WE SHOULD NOT DISMANTLE
THEIR WORK. THESE SO CALLED REASONAL
ACCOMODATIONS ARE NOT REASONAL— THEY
WILL CONTINUE THE OVER-SATURATION OF
GROUP HOMES IN MY NEIGHORHOOD AND
ALL OF COSTA WESA. IF THESE REQUESTS
ARE ALLOWED, THEY WILL WORKEN OR
ELIMINATE ORDINANCE ISILAND COSTA MESA
WILL CONTINUE TO BE A PLACE WHERE
LEHAB HOMES CAN PROVIEWATE.

BUSINESS OWNERS PARMISE THE CITY MANY
THINGS TO GET ESTABLISHED, OFTEN THESE
PARMISES CAN NOT BE MET, THE UNKERT
PARMISES AND VIOLATIONS ARE NOT AWAYS
ENFORCEABLE (NOT GNOVEH CITY STAFF, HAPPENS
AT NIGHT) SO THE CITIZENS GET TO CIVE
WITH UNFORTUNATE (BAD) AGREEMENTS. I
THINK COSTA MESA NEEDS TO STAND BEHIND
CRDINANCE 1511 AND LET IT DO WHAT
IT WAS WRITTEN TO DO. ALL RESIDENTS
OF COSTA MESA WILL BENEFIT.

PLEASE DENY THESE 3 REQUESTS, PLEASE
DENY ALL FUTURE SIMILAR REQUESTS

From:

Lesley L < lmn007@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 11, 2018 4:56 PM

To:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Subject:

PA-16-33, PA 16-36, PA 16-30 and PA16-31 - SLH CUPs

"planningcommission@costameca.gov".

To whom it may concern,

For all the reasons mentioned by others (who are non SLH affiliated community residents or property owners), I would like to state that I am against the Planning Commission approving the following CUPs granting the SLH use in our residential neighborhoods.

I own property near 16-30 and 16-31 321 and 327 Cabrillo Street; 16-36 329 Rochester Street and so the approval of these CUPs would directly impact my property. Especially since they are asking for a proximity exception to existing facilities.

Also, being a former NHES Parent, i am against 16-33 on Knox Street as it is so close to an elementary school. I am unable to attend the meeting but wanted to state my opposition for the record.

L. Love

From:

Suzanne R <4suzanne@msn.com> Sunday, February 11, 2018 9:04 PM

Sent: To:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Subject:

Jeffrey-Daily Pilot - More permit requests for sober-living 2/9/18

I object. I understand the federal law, but these homes have to be closely monitored and the distance between them is important for the residents of neighborhood's (who are not in recovery). This is most heavily impacting our more affordable neighborhoods. Certainly the safety of resident's and their families is important to the city (whether they be owners or tenants).

More permit requests for sober-living homes await Costa Mesa Planning Commission

By <u>LUKE MONEY</u> Feb 09, 2018 | 1:40 PM

Groundhog Day may have been last week, but Costa Mesa residents — like Bill Murray in the movie of that name — may feel a sense of déjà vu as they look over Monday's Planning Commission agenda.

As has been the case at many meetings in recent months, commissioners again are set to make decisions on a series of requests for conditional use permits from sober-living home operators.

Such approvals are necessary under a <u>city ordinance</u> adopted in 2015. Costa Mesa also requires that group homes, licensed alcohol and drug treatment facilities and sober-living homes — which typically house recovering alcoholics and drug addicts — be at least 650 feet from one another in residential areas.

Most of the applications up for review Monday come from one operator, RAW Recovery LLC. RAW — which stands for Recovery and Wellness — is seeking city permits to continue operating its sober-living home with up to 37 residents at 321 and 327 Cabrillo St., as well as another at 329 Rochester St., which houses as many as eight people.

In both cases, planning documents state, existing state-licensed treatment facilities are well within the 650-foot buffer. As a result, staff recommends the commission deny the permit requests.

City officials have said the goal of the distance requirement is to prevent sober-living facilities from clustering in residential areas.

There's no separation issue with another RAW sober-living facility at 268 Knox St., according to planning documents. Staff recommends approval of the permit request for that property, which would house up to 10 people.

A permit request for a Pacific Shores Recovery facility with up to 46 residents at 200, 202, 204 and 206 Cabrillo St. also is on Monday's agenda, but staff is asking the commission to continue that matter to a future date.

The issue of sober-living homes has become increasingly contentious in recent years as more have sprung up throughout the city.

Critics say such facilities are harmful to the character of local neighborhoods and create or contribute to problems with noise, parking, litter and secondhand cigarette smoke.

Supporters say the facilities are an important step on the road to recovery from addiction and that quality operators provide vital services while being good neighbors.

Monday's commission meeting starts at 6 p.m. at City Hall, 77 Fair Drive.

luke.money@latimes.com

Twitter @LukeMMoney

From:

Nicte Flores < nkflores@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 11, 2018 6:21 PM PLANNING COMMISSION

To: Subject:

Cups

To whom it may concern,

For all the reasons mentioned by others (who are non SLH affiliated community residents or property owners), I would like to state that I am against the Planning Commission approving the following CUPs granting the SLH use in our residential neighborhoods.

I own property in Newport Heights. My children attend all three schools in the Newport Heights community. We are in close proximity to 16-33 on Knox Street and the approval of this CUP would directly affect my property value. Furthermore, as a current NHES Parent I am vehemently against another SLF so close to an elementary school.

16-30 and 16-31 (321 and 327 Cabrillo Street); 16-36 (329 Rochester Street) should also not be approved especially since they are asking for a proximity exception to existing facilities.

These are monetary driven businesses that should not be allowed in residential areas. The law is flawed and as such, limits need to be made and respected.

I am unable to attend the meeting but wanted to state my opposition for the record.

N Flores

PH-2 and PH-4

From:

Janet Friedrich < jfriedrich@burnhamusa.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 12, 2018 11:16 AM PLANNING COMMISSION; LE, JENNIFER

To:

Therese Hotvedt

Subject:

Letter to the Costa Mesa Planning Commission re 2/12/18 hearing

Attachments:

Letter to CM Planning Commission.PDF

Please find attached a letter from Therese Hotvedt, President of Burnham USA, re PA-16-36, PA-16-30 and PA-16-31.

BURNHAM USA
Janet Friedrich, Administrative Manager
BURNHAM USA EQUITIES, INC.
1100 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200
Newport Beach, California 92660
Phone (949) 760-9150
Fax (949) 760-0430
ifriedrich@burnhamusa.com
www.burnhamusa.com

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 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.

It is understood that this email and any response hereto or any oral or written communication or any document which may be sent by or on behalf of either party to the other shall not have any binding effect on either party. Further, such understanding shall nullify any claim that either party or its representatives or agents is obligated to perform any act or expend time, money or effort based on this communication.



1100 Newport Center Dr., Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660-6254 949-760-9150

February 12, 2018

To: Planning Commissioners

City of Costa Mesa

Re: February 12, 2018 Planning Commission Hearing

PA-16-36 (329 Rochester Street, Costa Mesa, CA)

PA-16-30 and PA-16-31 (321 and 327 Cabrillo Street, Costa Mesa, CA)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

This letter is intended to voice our opposition to the referenced requests for Conditional Use Permits (CUP's), as the owners of the affected properties described below. The very transient nature of these recovery homes will increases the problem that already exists on our properties with the Costa Mesa homeless situation. The volume of residents in these facilities is exorbitant, and we feel it's unreasonable to expect the neighborhood to accommodate this influx of individuals.

The transient nature that comes along with recovery homes is extremely problematic. There is a recovery facility in the neighboring commercial property to our property at 234 E. 17th Street (Plaza Sereno). Its residents are constantly walking through our parking lot in loud and disrupting groups. The people are often smoking or vaping and extremely unprofessional (or even presentable) in how they dress and carry themselves. This impacts our customers and tenants.

We have also had issues with syringes being found in our parking lot, courtyard and planters. Our property generates many visitors, including young children who visit the restaurant and walk around the property. We fear that one day a child will pick up or step on a needle for lack of understanding that they are dangerous. We do not need a facility that will bring more drug use to this area. Unfortunately statistics show that many people who enter recovery facilities often relapse.

While the vast majority of the problems we've had with recovery home residents have been at our 234 E. 17th Street property, our Starbucks at 450 E. 17th Street has also been a gathering place for the recovery home residents. We own several other properties in the area and are frankly concerned that allowing this to continue will ultimately have a major long-term negative impact on all of the commercial properties on 17th Street.

Sincerely,

Plaza Sereno, LLC (234 E. 17th Street)
Costa Mesa Retail Center, LLC (241 E. 17th Street)
Burnham 17th Street Corner, LLC (299 E. 17th Street)
450 E. 17th Street, LLC (450 and 462 E. 17th Street)

BSB Investments II, LLC (1731 Santa Ana Ave.)

Therese Hotvedt President

-225-

PA 16-30 +PA 16-31 32/4327 Calvillo 0 2-07-18 329 Archester My name is anne Hoening and I have been a resident of Esta Mesa Since 1970. My side of the block is mostly single family dwellings. Upere is a sober living facility across the street (on the Corner). Lately, it has been noisy and when my daughter leaves for work at 5:30 A.M.
Some residents are already outside walking There is another facility just to the left of your proposed applications; and another on Cabrilla and Orange. Ikhen is enough-enough? Loith Scrits Customers already parking on the block, group fromes fromsing is Ind. w. bad years (The residents favo resitors) be Owo neighborhood would go longer values. Safe. and this is lad for property values. Alease - please - says "yrs". COSTA MESA, CA 2

Dam, also, concerned because the properties at 302 & 314 have recently been sold. Das pot forow if the new home owners are aware of these proposals.

Aprank you

Received
City of Costa Mesa

Development Services Department

FEB 0 8 2018

February 4, 2018

Costa Mesa City Hall Planning Division 77 Fair Drive Costa Mesa, CA, 92626

RE: Planning Commission Hearing

PA-16-30 & PA-16-31, 321 & 327 Cabrillo

Dear Commissioners:

I own 3 buildings on Cabrillo St. This is a very desirable and nice street. This is not the right use or place to put this type of facility. I have had this type of facility close to other properties I own. There are cigarette butts all over, additional trash, paper left on the ground, people loitering all hours of the day and night and automobile break-ins. These 2 apartments were intended for 6 families to live in. The fact that they are trying to place 37 people in these 6 units speaks for its self and is rather absurd. This use should be restricted to light commercial or another type of zoning. This is a business trying to hide under the vail of residential.

In closing I ask this question. How would you like this use allowed next to your house and in your neighborhood?

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. KALISH, JR. AND DAVID KALISH

Received
City of Costa Mesa
Development Services Department

FEB 0 7 2018

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Costa Mesa Planning Commission will hold a public hearing as follows to consider:

HEARING February 12, 2018 HEARING DATE:

6:00 P.M. or soon thereafter City Hall Council Chambers TIME & LOCATION:

77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA

RAW Recovery, LLC

R3, Multiple-Family Residential Applicant/Agent:

PlanningCommission@costamesaca.gov

Email:

Planning Division (714) 754-5245

Contact:

Street

Zone:

321 and 327 Cabrillo

PA-16-30 & PA-16-31

Application No. Site Address:

from another property that contains a state-licensed treatment facility; and for relief from other land use easonable accommodation to allow these two facilities to be located within 195 feet and 206 feet, respectively, Description: Conditional Use Permits (CUP) PA-16-30 and PA-16-31 are requests to operate a sober living facility housing up to 37 gender-specific adults in six units on two parcels. The applicant also submitted a request for requirements of the Zoning Code. The application for accommodation was denied. The applicant has appealed that decision to the Planning Commission.

Environmental Determination: The project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Class 1), Existing Facilities.

challenge this project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you, or someone else raised, at the Additional Information: All interested parties may appear and present testimony in regard to this application. If you public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the City, at or prior to, the public hearing. Any written correspondence or other materials for distribution to the Planning Commission must be received by Planning Division staff prior to 3:00 p.m. on the day of the hearing. See reverse for more information.



Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1200 City of Costa Mesa P.O. Box 1200

Drive, Costa Mesa, California. The For more information, call (714) 754-5245, or visit the Planning Division on Planning Division is open 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, the Second Floor of City Hall, 77 Fair except specified holidays.

viewed on the City's webpage A copy of the staff report can be www.costamesaca.gov 72 hours prior to the hearing date (see reverse for more information).

OFFICIAL PUBLIC NOTICE

US POSTAGE 01/31/2018 Masici

011D11638932 ZIP 92626

\$00.479

425 461 11

2933 Foothill Blvd #A Kalish & Bateman

La Crescenta CA 91214

9121433469 COZ1

From:

Driscoll, Cameron < Cameron. Driscoll@am.jll.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 12, 2018 3:06 PM

To:

PLANNING COMMISSION

Subject:

321 & 327 Cabrillo St

To whom it may concern-

I am the property owner next door at 329 Cabrillo St. I do not reside at the property but wanted to contact you on behalf of my tenants.

This neighborhood has changed over the past several years as a result of the sobriety residences. This street was designed for single family residences and low density multi-family. The 2 fourplexs next door are designed to accommodate 37 people. By comparison my 4-unit property has 8 residents. Additionally, these are transient residents that come in and out every few weeks. Furthermore, they are running a "for profit commercial business", not a typical apartment building. This is no different than a hotel or motel located in a residential neighborhood. Quite frankly these facilities make a mockery out of zoning laws in Costa Mesa.

Lastly, does anyone think it makes logical sense to have a revolving door of 37 recovering addicts located right next door to families with small children? One of my tenants has 2 small kids and has lived in my property for 4 years. They did not have the knowledge this type of business would be operating next door when they moved into the property.

Let's please use some common sense and deny this CUP application. Thank you.

Cameron Driscoll
Executive Vice President
Jones Lang LaSalle
tel +1 949 885 2976 fax +1 949 885 2901
mobile +1 714 330 2196
lic #01224141
cameron.driscoll@am.jll.com

This email is for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete it. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not keep, use, disclose, copy or distribute this email without the author's prior permission. We have taken precautions to minimize the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks on any attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses. The information contained in this communication may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege. If you are the intended recipient and you do not wish to receive similar electronic messages from us in the future then please respond to the sender to this effect.