

**City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
1	W.Y. Manufacturing - Property owner and Industrial manufacturing company owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
2	<p>David Elliott, President and CEO, Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce - provided comments in opposition with the following concerns. No questions were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Impact on Small Businesses 2) Economic Stability 3) Lack of Transition or Support 4) Community Character 	<p>The City acknowledges the comment and is providing the following clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adoption of this ordinance would not disrupt small businesses. The ordinance does not force businesses to close or relocate; rather, would make them legal non-conforming and allow them to continue operating provided they comply with the operating standards. 2) The proposed ordinance would not force any business closures or relocations. Existing industrial businesses, classified as legal non-conforming, may continue operating until they voluntarily cease or close due to natural business decisions. 3) Businesses can maintain their operations or adapt to permitted uses under the TZC (SD-84) district. A voluntary compliance agreement is a tool included in the proposed ordinance for developing a transition strategy. The tool could be used to formulate an agreement/plan by which the City and business owner have a mutual understanding of compliance timelines.

City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
2 continued	<p>David Elliott, President and CEO, Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce - provided comments in opposition with the following concerns. No questions were provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5) Impact on Small Businesses 6) Economic Stability 7) Lack of Transition or Support 8) Community Character 	<p>4) The proposed ordinance does not force the closure or relocation of any businesses nor proposes any changes to zoning that allows for a mix of uses. The City Council established the vision for the TZC (SD-84) in 2010 and reaffirmed that vision with adoption of General Plan in 2022. This ordinance does not propose any changes to existing underlying zones or General Plan land use designations.</p>
3	<p>Kim Riker – Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p>
4	<p>Nathan Paladino – Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p>
5	<p>Kelly Kraus Lee- Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p>
6	<p>Ryan Madden- Resident- provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p>

**City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
7	Ryan Friesen- Property Owner - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
8	Garrett Gee- Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
9	Sarah Rinelli- Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
10	Liberty Dickinson- Resident- provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
11	Barney Richer- Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
12	Rachel Kraus-Lee- Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
13	Jenna Zech- Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
14	Jamie Glazer- Business Owner- provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
15	Martha Gonzalez- Resident- provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
16	Jenna Zech- Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
17	Mark Law- Property Owner- provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
18	Jenna Zech- Business Owner- provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
19	Jenna Zech- Business Owner- provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
20	Jenna Zech- Business Owner- provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
21	Jenna Zech- Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided..	The City acknowledges the comment.
22	Mike Tardiff - Business Owner - shared letter that provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
23	Harvey Beigle - Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
24	Ian MacMillan - Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.

City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
25	<p>Roger Simon- Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) amendments with the following claims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Claims that the ordinance will reduce air pollution are misleading, as the primary pollution sources are automobiles and trains, not industrial businesses. - The claim that the ordinance will reduce traffic is false, as converting industrial areas to high-density residential use will increase construction traffic and automobile congestion. 	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>CEQA requires the City to analyze the Project impacts against the existing environmental setting. As analyzed in the Addendum, the Project is not introducing any new land uses that would have air quality impacts. It is instead introducing new regulations for nonconforming industrial use that would discontinue nonconforming noxious uses, and establish screening walls. These regulations would reduce dust and lessen air quality emissions from the existing environmental setting. Further, any future development within the TZC area requiring discretionary action would continue to be subject to a project-level CEQA review and comply with existing regulations that will ensure potential impacts are not exacerbated. There will be no new or more severe significant impacts to air quality than were previously analyzed in the TZC EIR, and therefore a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not required.</p>

City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for April 1, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 22 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84)

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
25 continued	<p>Roger Simon- Business Owner - provided comments in opposition to the proposed Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) amendments with the following claims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Claims that the ordinance will reduce air pollution are misleading, as the primary pollution sources are automobiles and trains, not industrial businesses. - The claim that the ordinance will reduce traffic is false, as converting industrial areas to high-density residential use will increase construction traffic and automobile congestion. 	<p>Specific development projects are not being proposed under this Project. Instead, this Project modifies the list of land uses and permit types, including the deletion of industrial land uses, amends nonconforming regulations including the addition of an amortization process, amends and adds operational standards for allowed uses and nonconforming uses, and deletes the Industrial Overlay zone from text and maps, and deletes the M1 (Light Industrial) and M2 (Heavy Industrial) suffixes from certain properties within the TZC area. Thus, there are no new land uses being introduced or different development standards that would have significant transportation impacts.</p> <p>As discussed in the Addendum, any specific development projects that require discretionary action would continue to be subject to a project-level CEQA review and the mitigation measures set forth in the TZC EIR, as well as existing regulations, would still apply. Thus, potential transportation impacts will not be exacerbated, and will not result in any new or different impacts than analyzed in the TZC EIR.</p>
26	Lauren Hale - Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) with no questions provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
27	John Hale - Resident - provided comments in support of the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84). No questions were provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.

Comment #1

Flores, Dora

From: W.Y. Manufacturing, Inc. [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2025 12:31 PM
To: eComment
Subject: April 1, 2025 Meeting ZOA #2024-02, Removal of M1 & M2 properties from SD-84 Zoning District

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To whom it may concern:

"Esteemed members of the City Council, thank you for allowing me to address you today regarding the moratorium and proposed rezoning of our industrial areas.

My name is Walter Yaeger, I purchased the industrial building at 1037 Fuller Street in 1987, since then it is the location of the manufacturing company I founded in 1978. My daughter just celebrated her 35th year with me, my son-in-law is in his 30th year and my grandson is also currently working at this location. I come from a long line of tool and die makers and machinists, including my grandfather, my father and three of my uncles.

I stand before you as a concerned business owner and resident, deeply troubled by the implications of this proposed zoning change.

We all understand the fundamental pillars upon which any nation's prosperity rests: mining, agriculture, and manufacturing. While our city, admittedly, doesn't engage in mining or large-scale agriculture, it does possess a vital, albeit small, manufacturing sector. This sector is not a relic of the past; it is the cornerstone of our future.

Let's be clear: modern manufacturing is not the smokestack industry of yesteryear. It's a high-tech, innovative field that provides high-paying jobs and drives technological advancement. It's the engine that produces the tools and equipment necessary for mining and agriculture – the very foundations of our society. Without manufacturing, our ability to sustain ourselves and innovate diminishes.

The proposed rezoning threatens to eliminate this crucial element of our local economy. By converting M1 and M2 zones to residential, we are not simply changing land use; we are dismantling a vital component of our city's resilience and future prosperity. We are telling future generations that high-paying, technical jobs are not welcome here.

We must also consider the strategic implications. Our nation's current economic challenges, including our staggering national debt, are directly linked to the offshoring of manufacturing. We've learned the hard lesson that outsourcing critical production leaves us vulnerable and dependent. History reminds us that our manufacturing might was instrumental in winning World War II. In a rapidly changing global landscape, we cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the past and further erode our industrial base.

Furthermore, preserving manufacturing zones ensures that our residents have access to local employment opportunities, reducing commute times and fostering a stronger sense of community. This is not just about economics; it's about the quality of life for our citizens.

I urge you to reconsider this rezoning. Let us not sacrifice our industrial future for short-term residential gains. Instead, let us embrace the potential of modern manufacturing and build a resilient, prosperous community for generations to come. Let us not forget the three pillars of a nation, and let us not remove one of the most important pillars of our city. Thank you."

Regards,

Walter W. Yaeger

Comment #2

Zuniga, Diana

From: Susan Backer <SBacker@santaanachamber.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2025 9:25 AM
To: Amezcua, Valerie
Cc: Phan, Thai; Vazquez, Benjamin; Lopez, Jorge (SAPD); Bacerra, Phil; Hernandez, Johnathan; Penaloza, David; Nunez, Alvaro; !City Clerk; 'Tim Jemal (tim@jemalpublicaffairs.com)'; Mindy Andrews; bihrke@rutan.com; Dave Elliott
Subject: FW: Letter of Concern from Santa Ana Chamber -- RE: Transit Zoning Code ordinance Logan and Lacy neighborhoods
Attachments: Letter of Concern for Santa Ana Chamber -- Transit Zoning Code ordinance Logan and Lacy neighborhoods.docx.pdf

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Good morning Madam Mayor and City of Santa Ana Councilmembers,

Please see attached a Letter of Concern regarding Transit Zoning Code Ordinance in the Logan and Lacy neighborhoods.

Regards,



Susan Backer

Executive Assistant to Mr. David Elliott, President/CEO of The Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce
(714) 541-5353 ext. 116 www.santaanachamber.com

"Do not fear failure but please be terrified of regret" *Deshauna Barber*



March 24, 2025

The Honorable Valerie Amezcua
Mayor, City of Santa Ana - vamezcua@cityofsantaana.org
20 Civic Center Plaza
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Dear Mayor Amezcua,

Re: Opposition to proposed Specific Development No. 84 Transit Zoning Code rezoning (Logan and Lacy neighborhoods)

On behalf of the Board and Members of the Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to express our strong opposition to the City of Santa Ana's proposed Transit Zoning Code, Specific Development Number 84 ordinance in its Logan and Lacy neighborhoods. Specifically, we are concerned about the proposed removal of the existing light (M-1) and heavy (M-2) industrial overlays in these neighborhoods, which we believe would have a profoundly adverse impact on long-established businesses — many of which are owner/operator small and medium-sized enterprises vital to our local economy.

The removal of the industrial overlays would disrupt a vital part of our community that has supported a wide range of downstream businesses for decades. Many of the impacted enterprises serve as key employers, providing jobs and contributing to the diverse character and history of the Logan and Lacy neighborhoods. By removing these industrial designations, the City risks displacing these businesses and undermining the livelihoods and retirement plans of owner/operators who have invested time, effort and resources in both neighborhoods.

Instead of effectively punishing existing businesses in the two industrial overlay zones, the City should strictly target “bad actors” in the M-2 heavy industrial zone that are producing noxious emissions.

Here are a few specific concerns that we would like to highlight for your attention:

- 1.) **Impact on Small Businesses:** Many of the businesses in the affected areas rely on industrial zoning and its inherent industrial uses to operate effectively. The removal of the two industrial overlays could force these businesses to either close or relocate, disrupting long-standing operations and the local economy. This will disproportionately affect owner/operator businesses that have become an integral part of the community. In addition, because the ordinance restricts the expansion or modification of existing industrial facilities, growing businesses that require greater space will not be able to expand the physical size of their buildings.

- 2.) **Economic Stability:** These businesses contribute significantly to the local economy through employment, services and tax revenues. The potential displacement of these businesses could lead to job losses and create a ripple effect in other industrial zones across Santa Ana, which harms the overall economic health of the area, especially for those who rely on these businesses for employment and services.
- 3.) **Lack of Transition or Support:** The City's proposed rezoning lacks a clear plan for providing support or transition for enterprises affected by the removal of the industrial overlays. Businesses in the Logan and Lacy neighborhoods should be given a reasonable period to adjust, or be offered incentives or exemptions that would allow them to continue operating in the neighborhood.
- 4.) **Community Character:** The Logan and Lacy neighborhoods have a unique character that is shaped, in part, by businesses that have been operating for several decades. The proposed rezoning, if enacted without proper consideration, will erode the existing community fabric and replace long-standing enterprises with multifamily or mixed-use residential development, which is already prevalent in both neighborhoods.

On behalf of the Santa Ana Chamber, I urge you and City Councilmembers to reconsider the removal of the two industrial overlays and engage in a more thoughtful and collaborative process that includes the voices of industrial property owners, enterprise owner/operators and employees who will be directly affected. A more balanced approach that considers both the goals of transit-oriented development and the preservation of local businesses is essential for the long-term well-being of the Logan and Lacy neighborhoods.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope you will take our concerns into account and work towards a solution that supports both the development goals of the City and the interests of its residents and business owner/operators.

Sincerely,



David Elliott
President & CEO
Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce

CC: Mayor Pro Tem, Thai Phan - tphan@santa-ana.org
Councilmember Benjamin Vazquez - bvazquez@santa-ana.org
Councilmember Jessie Lopez - jlopez@santa-ana.org
Councilmember Phil Bacerra - pbacerra@santa-ana.org
Councilmember Johnathan Hernandez - jryanhernandez@santa-ana.org
Councilmember David Penaloza - dpenaloza@santa-ana.org
City Manager Alvaro Nuñez - ANunez@santa-ana.org
City Clerk - cityclerk@santa-ana.org

Comment #3

Zuniga, Diana

From: Kim Riker <kriker@ricedw.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2025 10:29 AM
To: eComment
Subject: SD-84 TZC Rezoning

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Members of the Santa Ana City Council,

I appreciate your taking time to read my concerns about completely zoning out M-1 & M-2 Industrial uses from SD-84 Transit Zoning Code area. I am a 3rd generation business owner who moved our office to Santa Ana in 2010 at the encouragement of the then-in-place City Council and its making our area an "Enterprise Zone" to better enable businesses to relocate here. Now we are being phased out due to the gentrification of this area, **despite our proximity to a massive transit station and major freeway, both of which are contrary to healthful residential living.**

My concerns:

1. The **draft regulations treat similar activities differently in various sections.** For example, my property is to be zoned "Urban Center." We are an administrative office of 5 people that operates from 8 am to 5 pm and we sit inside all day and type on computers. I believe this should put us in the "Business Support Service" Land Use Type (page 19), and we would simply need a "P" Permit (meaning we could simply carry on our business as we are now). However, because we provide business support service to a construction company, our administrative services may put us in to the "Professional" category (page 20), thereby requiring a "P(1)" Permit type. This means we could only perform our administrative services "only on second or upper floors, or behind retail or service ground floor use." So, **though we perform the exact same type of administrative work as Business Support Service, but service a construction company, we would then be required to add a retail space in front of our office?** Or build a second story and allow a retailer to move in downstairs? This would increase vehicle and foot traffic, make more noise, and increase our business footprint in what seems to be contrary to the purpose of these regulations. **The categorization of services in these Land Use Type charts is arbitrary and illogical in many cases,** and this specific one makes no sense in our case. We make zero noise and only have 5 people in our office, but your regulations may require that we increase this, impacting the community.
2. The **result of these regulations would be a taking of our property by the government.** My mother owns the property next door, at Brown and Poinsettia, which is zoned UN-2. It is a building purpose-built in reliance on the location being made an "Enterprise Zone" by the City of Santa Ana years ago when it wanted to encourage businesses to move to this area. These **regulations would render this property useless,** as building "mixed use" residences would be required. The property is not large enough to do this. Therefore, as mentioned by a speaker last night, this would constitute a taking under the 5th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. There are many instances of California case law that support this.
3. I understand the need to make changes to improve the area we are in, but forcing businesses out of the city and taking away local jobs from the 100 employees affected by my business and the one next door is not the way. My building is at the corner of 6th and Poinsettia, a corner the police and code enforcement know well, as we are across from Bruce Metals and I report on graffiti to our building and trash dumped on our sidewalk almost daily. **I would love to have Bruce Metals and the recycling center gone as well – why don't you just focus on phasing out heavy industry instead of also capturing small, non-harmful businesses also?**

Thank you,
Kim

Kim Riker

Rice Drywall, Inc.

919 E. 6th Street

Santa Ana, CA 92701

Ph: (714) 543-5400

Comment #4

Zuniga, Diana

From: Nate Paladino <natepaladino@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2025 12:17 PM
To: eComment; depenalosa@santa-ana.org; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhood.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Nathan Paladino
Ward 6

Comment #5

Zuniga, Diana

From: Kelly Kraus-Lee <kellyakraus@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2025 12:46 PM
To: Amezcua, Valerie; depenaloza@santa-ana.org; eComment
Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for responsible business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Kelly Kraus-Lee
Ward 6

Comment #6

Zuniga, Diana

From: Ryan Madden <ryanpmadden@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2025 12:13 AM
To: eComment
Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of Santa Ana to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhood.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Ryan Madden
Ward 3 Resident

Comment #7

Zuniga, Diana

From: Ryan Friesen <rykfri@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2025 12:04 PM
To: eComment; depenalosa@santa-ana.org; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a property owner in the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhood.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,

Ryan Friesen
703 N. Poinsettia St. (owner of rental property)
657-888-2958
Ward 6

Comment #8

Zuniga, Diana

From: Garrett Gee <garrett@garrettgee.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2025 12:54 PM
To: eComment
Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhood.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas.

Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Garrett Gee
Ward 6

Comment #9

Zuniga, Diana

From: Sarah Rinelli <sarah@rinellilawgroup.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2025 3:19 PM
To: eComment; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of Santa Ana to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhood.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Sarah Rinelli
Resident of 92701

Sarah M. Rinelli, Esq.
Rinelli Law Group, P.C.
P.O. Box 10298
Santa Ana, CA 92711-0298
(949) 674-6591
sarah@rinellilawgroup.com

CONFIDENTIALITY:

The information contained in this e-Mail message, including any accompanying documents or attachments, is from the Rinelli Law Group, P.C. and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above, and is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying or use of the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us by telephoning Sarah M. Rinelli at (949) 674-6591, return the e-Mail message, and destroy (delete) the original.

Comment #10

Zuniga, Diana

From: Liberty Dickinson <liberty@liberty-finearts.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2025 4:18 AM
To: eComment
Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for responsible business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Liberty Dickinson
Ward 6

Liberty Fine Arts
921 E.Santa Ana Blvd.
Santa Ana, CA 92701
714-507-6330

Inspiration exists but it has to find you working.

[Instagram.com/libertydickinsonart](https://www.instagram.com/libertydickinsonart)

Comment #11

Zuniga, Diana

From: Barney Richer <bricher@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 10:54 AM
To: eComment; depenalosa@santa-ana.org; Amezcua, Valerie; Ramirez, Frida
Subject: Support for Item 22 - Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Amendments
Attachments: 20250226_112608.heic; 20250226_112620.heic; 20250226_134334.heic; 6171766880068526500 (1).heic; -6464989058942883764 (1).heic; -6648894922711158278 (1).heic

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhood.

I am especially concerned with Madison Disposal next door to the Train Station as they are in my opinion the largest of the offenders. They are in constant **violation of the AQMD requirements** by allowing dust and debris to leave their facility on a daily basis blanketing the area for miles. This disposal center is no longer a community dump for local contractors and landscapers but rather a shortcut for Waste Disposals full sized trash trucks. Madison Waste has been abusing this neighborhood for over 20 years and has done nothing to improve the infrastructure of the site that could mitigate the bad air quality as proven by a recent UCI study putting the area in the top 90% of bad air quality. Madison Waste has had their opportunities to add professional misting systems and undercarriage wash systems to control the dust and particulate matter but the time for those upgrades has long passed. Worse than the dust is the long term health issues that local long time residents have expressed everytime this topic comes up. Our hope is that this amendment will help force out this facility before the costly (for all parties including taxpayers) process of having to get Attorneys and Law Firms involved to expedite their removal.

Elimination of Madison/Waste would also greatly decrease the traffic in the area. This would allow easier access to the Train Station for all, allowing it to become the Urban Transportation Hub that many people believe it could be. Currently there is a constant line of trucks blocking the roadway and new bike paths for anyone entering the area from the 4th street side. What other businesses are allowed to cue their customers on city streets?

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the other bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we

can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,

Barney Richer
bricher@gmail.com
Ward 6







Comment #12

Zuniga, Diana

From: Rachel Kraus-Lee <rkrauslee@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 3:22 PM
To: Amezcua, Valerie; depenaloza@santa-ana.org; eComment
Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for responsible business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Rachel Kraus-Lee
Ward 6

Comment #13

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jenna Zech <Jennaz@ppsocal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 6:40 PM
To: Phan, Thai
Cc: eComment
Subject: Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 2024-02 - Agenda item no. 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Councilmember Phan,

I'm writing to you today regarding the SD-84 TZC Rezoning proposal. I recognize that you've heard from many stakeholders—both residents and business owners—and while the discussion has grown somewhat tense, I remain hopeful that tomorrow's meeting will be guided by level-headed deliberation and a shared desire for a mutually beneficial outcome.

I am a fourth-generation owner of Pacific Plumbing of Santa Ana. Our company has proudly served this community since 1929, and with a deep appreciation for our long-standing relationship with Santa Ana, I am fully committed to building a prosperous and sustainable future here. That said, some of the vague language in the rezoning proposal being brought forward puts my future in jeopardy. Many of the current proposed compromises seem tailored to long-time business owners nearing retirement. While I deeply respect their contributions, these short-term allowances simply do not work for a younger businesswoman with a bright vision for the future. The truth is that if the initiative were to be approved, it would directly impact property values to the point where I could not reinvest in Santa Ana. Relocating to an industrial area would not be financially feasible, nor would I be able to improve the building or grow the business to better serve our community. I understand why some short-term concessions have leaned towards their concerns—they have been the most vocal—but I am speaking up now to ask for a broader, future-focused perspective.

I am asking you to vote no tomorrow on SD-84. I am asking for the chance to collaborate with the city on a path forward – one that supports economic vitality, honors our history, and empowers the next generation of Santa Ana's business community.

I appreciate your time and the work you do. I look forward to seeing you at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Jenna Zech



Jenna Zech

Pacific Plumbing of Southern California

P 714-547-6967 x210

E jennaz@ppsocal.com

W www.pacificplumbingsocal.com

Comment #14

Becerra, Alexis

From: Jamie Glazer <jamie.b.glazer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 10:24 AM
To: eComment
Subject: Agenda Item #22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear City of Santa Ana,

My family has owned the industrial property at **1101 E. 6th Street** for years, and I am demanding that you **halt** your reckless rezoning plans. Stripping our property of its current zoning is nothing short of an attack on our livelihood. This property generates income that supports my family—your proposed changes would **literally take food off our table**.

Beyond devastating us personally, your decision would be a financial disaster for the City of Santa Ana. The business on our site contributes **over \$2,000,000 annually** in sales tax. Choking out businesses like ours will erode the city's financial foundation, making your decision not just unethical but also **economically reckless**.

If you strip our zoning rights and prevent new permits, you will **intentionally** devalue our property, making it impossible to rent, which seems to be your goal. This is **government-sanctioned theft**, plain and simple. If you're so determined to take our property, then **pay us full market value upfront**—don't bleed us dry until we're forced to sell for pennies on the dollar.

Your actions are unjust, and we will not stand by while you destroy what we've worked for. **Do the right thing—leave our zoning alone.**

Jamie Glazer
(714) 240-4783

Comment #15

Becerra, Alexis

From: LMFTGonzalez <LMFTGonzalez@proton.me>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 9:46 PM
To: eComment; Penaloza, David; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Support For Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Support for Item 22

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for responsible business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,

Martha Gonzalez

Ward 6

Comment #16

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jenna Zech <Jennaz@ppsocal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 6:41 PM
To: Vazquez, Benjamin
Cc: eComment
Subject: Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 2024-02 - Agenda item no. 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Councilmember Vazquez,

I'm writing to you today regarding the SD-84 TZC Rezoning proposal. I recognize that you've heard from many stakeholders—both residents and business owners—and while the discussion has grown somewhat tense, I remain hopeful that tomorrow's meeting will be guided by level-headed deliberation and a shared desire for a mutually beneficial outcome.

I am a fourth-generation owner of Pacific Plumbing of Santa Ana. Our company has proudly served this community since 1929, and with a deep appreciation for our long-standing relationship with Santa Ana, I am fully committed to building a prosperous and sustainable future here. That said, some of the vague language in the rezoning proposal being brought forward puts my future in jeopardy. Many of the current proposed compromises seem tailored to long-time business owners nearing retirement. While I deeply respect their contributions, these short-term allowances simply do not work for a younger businesswoman with a bright vision for the future. The truth is that if the initiative were to be approved, it would directly impact property values to the point where I could not reinvest in Santa Ana. Relocating to an industrial area would not be financially feasible, nor would I be able to improve the building or grow the business to better serve our community. I understand why some short-term concessions have leaned towards their concerns—they have been the most vocal—but I am speaking up now to ask for a broader, future-focused perspective.

I am asking you to vote no tomorrow on SD-84. I am asking for the chance to collaborate with the city on a path forward – one that supports economic vitality, honors our history, and empowers the next generation of Santa Ana's business community.

I appreciate your time and the work you do. I look forward to seeing you at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Jenna Zech



Jenna Zech

Pacific Plumbing of Southern California

P 714-547-6967 x210

E jennaz@ppsocal.com

W www.pacificplumbingsocal.com

Comment #17

Becerra, Alexis

From: Mark Law <mlaw92626@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 9:22 PM
To: eComment
Cc: mlaw92626@gmail.com
Subject: Written comments regarding Agenda Item 22, April 1, 2025 Santa Ana City Council Meeting

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

March 31, 2025

My name is Mark Law. I am one of 3 members of FLP Investments LLC, the owner of the building and property at 911 N. Poinsettia St. We bought the building in 2001 after a year-long search and were pleased with the location and architecture that Burke developed for the 8 buildings they built in the project, working closely with the city of Santa Ana. Imagine our surprise in 2010, 8 short years after our building was first occupied, when the City of Santa Ana presented the Renaissance Plan in which they would take away our entitled zoning and rezone our property residential and open space with no compensation to us, the existing property owner. There was outrage among the property and business owners, many meetings, and the result was the industrial overlay on the underlying residential zoning. While not satisfied, the property and business owners finally concluded they could live with this zoning structure.

Fast forward 15 years, now the city feels, in the words of the executive director of the city planning committee, that change has not happened fast enough. Their solution is to remove the overlay and subject the business and property owners to a steep devaluation of their property and huge financial and human cost to the existing businesses to relocate. The rationale was presented to us at the train station by Margarita saying that this decision was based on 'environmental justice'. If 'environmental justice' is driving this effort why hasn't the city gone after the handful of businesses who the entire community knows are the bad actors? Instead, this effort to remove the overlay in the transit district is targeting all 120+ industrial property owners/business owners in the district. A number of the local residents agree that the bad actors must go, not all the industrial businesses that have been good neighbors over the years.

The business which has occupied our building at 911 Poinsettia is an industrial distributor, selling hose, fittings, valves, and the like to customers who are repairing their hydraulic and pneumatic equipment. The business gets one UPS and FEDEX delivery in the morning, and one

pickup in the late afternoon. That is less UPS, FEDEX, and Amazon traffic than any Orange County residential neighborhood these days. The business is quiet and clean and has never had a complaint from the surrounding neighborhoods. I know that many of the businesses in the Transit District are just as quiet and clean.

We feel that the city is acting in bad faith here, threatening our constitutional rights as property owners. The reason change has not occurred in the last 15 years since the Renaissance Plan is that buying up property in the transit district for a residential project does not pencil at current market values for the property. If the city thinks that artificially driving down the value of the existing properties so that residential developers may consider developments in the transit district is fair to the existing property owners, they are missing current realities. One glaring example of this transpired in Irvine recently when the city council was considering a large warehouse taking up a city block in the Irvine Business Center (IBC). The city denied approval but negotiated with the owners that if they built a residential project, they could keep their industrial zoning for the property. The city did this to avoid litigation for devaluing the property. The City of Santa Ana may want to consider things from this perspective as well.

The city has an opportunity here to extend the moratorium and table any action on the zoning changes until a solution acceptable to all stakeholders can be found and implemented. The compressed window of time given to the stakeholders was not adequate for them to digest the proposed changes and research potential solutions in partnership with the city.

Mark Law

FLP Investments LLC

714-812-2014

mlaw92626@gmail.com

Comment #18

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jenna Zech <Jennaz@ppsocal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 6:42 PM
To: Lopez, Jessie
Cc: eComment
Subject: Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 2024-02 - Agenda item no. 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Councilmember Lopez,

I'm writing to you today regarding the SD-84 TZC Rezoning proposal. I recognize that you've heard from many stakeholders—both residents and business owners—and while the discussion has grown somewhat tense, I remain hopeful that tomorrow's meeting will be guided by level-headed deliberation and a shared desire for a mutually beneficial outcome.

I am a fourth-generation owner of Pacific Plumbing of Santa Ana. Our company has proudly served this community since 1929, and with a deep appreciation for our long-standing relationship with Santa Ana, I am fully committed to building a prosperous and sustainable future here. That said, some of the vague language in the rezoning proposal being brought forward puts my future in jeopardy. Many of the current proposed compromises seem tailored to long-time business owners nearing retirement. While I deeply respect their contributions, these short-term allowances simply do not work for a younger businesswoman with a bright vision for the future. The truth is that if the initiative were to be approved, it would directly impact property values to the point where I could not reinvest in Santa Ana. Relocating to an industrial area would not be financially feasible, nor would I be able to improve the building or grow the business to better serve our community. I understand why some short-term concessions have leaned towards their concerns—they have been the most vocal—but I am speaking up now to ask for a broader, future-focused perspective.

I am asking you to vote no tomorrow on SD-84. I am asking for the chance to collaborate with the city on a path forward – one that supports economic vitality, honors our history, and empowers the next generation of Santa Ana's business community.

I appreciate your time and the work you do. I look forward to seeing you at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Jenna Zech



Jenna Zech

Pacific Plumbing of Southern California

P 714-547-6967 x210

E jennaz@ppsocal.com

W www.pacificplumbingsocal.com

Comment #19

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jenna Zech <Jennaz@ppsocal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 6:45 PM
To: Bacerra, Phil
Cc: eComment
Subject: Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 2024-02 - Agenda item no. 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Councilmember Bacerra,

It was great to meet you last week at the meeting with the planning commission regarding the SD-84 rezoning proposal. I really appreciate the time you took speaking with us afterwards.

With that on the mind, I'm writing to you today regarding the SD-84 TZC Rezoning proposal. I recognize that you've heard from many stakeholders—both residents and business owners—and while the discussion has grown somewhat tense, I remain hopeful that tomorrow's meeting will be guided by level-headed deliberation and a shared desire for a mutually beneficial outcome.

I am a fourth-generation owner of Pacific Plumbing of Santa Ana. Our company has proudly served this community since 1929, and with a deep appreciation for our long-standing relationship with Santa Ana, I am fully committed to building a prosperous and sustainable future here. That said, some of the vague language in the rezoning proposal being brought forward puts my future in jeopardy. Many of the current proposed compromises seem tailored to long-time business owners nearing retirement. While I deeply respect their contributions, these short-term allowances simply do not work for a younger businesswoman with a bright vision for the future. The truth is that if the initiative were to be approved, it would directly impact property values to the point where I could not reinvest in Santa Ana. Relocating to an industrial area would not be financially feasible, nor would I be able to improve the building or grow the business to better serve our community. I understand why some short-term concessions have leaned towards their concerns—they have been the most vocal—but I am speaking up now to ask for a broader, future-focused perspective.

I am asking you to vote no tomorrow on SD-84. I am asking for the chance to collaborate with the city on a path forward – one that supports economic vitality, honors our history, and empowers the next generation of Santa Ana's business community.

I appreciate your time and the work you do. I look forward to seeing you at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Jenna Zech



Jenna Zech

Pacific Plumbing of Southern California

P 714-547-6967 x210

E jennaz@ppsocal.com

W www.pacificplumbingsocal.com

Comment #20

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jenna Zech <Jennaz@ppsocal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 6:46 PM
To: Hernandez, Johnathan
Cc: eComment
Subject: Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 2024-02 - Agenda item no. 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Councilmember Hernandez,

I'm writing to you today regarding the SD-84 TZC Rezoning proposal. I recognize that you've heard from many stakeholders—both residents and business owners—and while the discussion has grown somewhat tense, I remain hopeful that tomorrow's meeting will be guided by level-headed deliberation and a shared desire for a mutually beneficial outcome.

I am a fourth-generation owner of Pacific Plumbing of Santa Ana. Our company has proudly served this community since 1929, and with a deep appreciation for our long-standing relationship with Santa Ana, I am fully committed to building a prosperous and sustainable future here. That said, some of the vague language in the rezoning proposal being brought forward puts my future in jeopardy. Many of the current proposed compromises seem tailored to long-time business owners nearing retirement. While I deeply respect their contributions, these short-term allowances simply do not work for a younger businesswoman with a bright vision for the future. The truth is that if the initiative were to be approved, it would directly impact property values to the point where I could not reinvest in Santa Ana. Relocating to an industrial area would not be financially feasible, nor would I be able to improve the building or grow the business to better serve our community. I understand why some short-term concessions have leaned towards their concerns—they have been the most vocal—but I am speaking up now to ask for a broader, future-focused perspective.

I am asking you to vote no tomorrow on SD-84. I am asking for the chance to collaborate with the city on a path forward – one that supports economic vitality, honors our history, and empowers the next generation of Santa Ana's business community.

I appreciate your time and the work you do. I look forward to seeing you at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Jenna Zech



Jenna Zech

Pacific Plumbing of Southern California

P 714-547-6967 x210

E jennaz@ppsocal.com

W www.pacificplumbingsocal.com

Comment #21

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jenna Zech <Jennaz@ppsocal.com>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 6:47 PM
To: Penaloza, David
Cc: eComment
Subject: Re: Zoning Ordinance Amendment No. 2024-02 - Agenda item no. 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Councilmember Penaloza,

I'm writing to you today regarding the SD-84 TZC Rezoning proposal. I recognize that you've heard from many stakeholders—both residents and business owners—and while the discussion has grown somewhat tense, I remain hopeful that tomorrow's meeting will be guided by level-headed deliberation and a shared desire for a mutually beneficial outcome.

I am a fourth-generation owner of Pacific Plumbing of Santa Ana. Our company has proudly served this community since 1929, and with a deep appreciation for our long-standing relationship with Santa Ana, I am fully committed to building a prosperous and sustainable future here. That said, some of the vague language in the rezoning proposal being brought forward puts my future in jeopardy. Many of the current proposed compromises seem tailored to long-time business owners nearing retirement. While I deeply respect their contributions, these short-term allowances simply do not work for a younger businesswoman with a bright vision for the future. The truth is that if the initiative were to be approved, it would directly impact property values to the point where I could not reinvest in Santa Ana. Relocating to an industrial area would not be financially feasible, nor would I be able to improve the building or grow the business to better serve our community. I understand why some short-term concessions have leaned towards their concerns—they have been the most vocal—but I am speaking up now to ask for a broader, future-focused perspective.

I am asking you to vote no tomorrow on SD-84. I am asking for the chance to collaborate with the city on a path forward – one that supports economic vitality, honors our history, and empowers the next generation of Santa Ana's business community.

I appreciate your time and the work you do. I look forward to seeing you at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Jenna Zech



Jenna Zech

Pacific Plumbing of Southern California

P 714-547-6967 x210

E jennaz@ppsocal.com

W www.pacificplumbingsocal.com

Comment #22

Zuniga, Diana

From: mike@tardifsheetmetal.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2025 11:02 AM
To: Harvey Beigle
Cc: Bob Adams; eComment
Subject: FW: Santa Ana Council SD-84 Public Hearing...4-1-2025;; Reed Thoams Company
Attachments: Letter 4.01.25 city of sanra ana.pdf

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

GREAT letter Harvey!

Also send your letter here before the meeting: eComment@santa-ana.org

From: Harvey Beigle <harveyb@reedthomas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 10:53 AM
To: Councilmember Benjamin Vazquez <b vazquez@santa-ana.org>; Councilmember Bacerra <pbacerra@santa-ana.org>; Mayor Amezcua <vamezcua@santa-ana.org>; Mayor Pro Tem Phan <tphan@santa-ana.org>; Councilmember Jessie Lopez <jlopez@santa-ana.org>; jryanhernandez@santa-ana.org
Cc: Councilmember Penaloza <dpenaloza@santa-ana.org>
Subject: Santa Ana Council SD-84 Public Hearing...4-1-2025;; Reed Thoams Company

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Council members,

Attached please find a letter about Reed Thomas Company and the impacts the proposal would have in unfairly punishing our business.

You are all invited to reach out to me.

Kind Regards,

Harvey Beigle
Reed Thomas company
Cell 714 325-2808

To: City of Santa Ana Mayor and Council members

Date: March 25, 2025

Re: SD-84 Transit Zoning Code

Dear City of Santa Ana Mayor and Council members:

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the proposed regulation, which would significantly hinder our ability to continue operating in a sustainable manner.

Reed Thomas Company, is located at **1025 N. Santiago Street** in Santa Ana. We are a **general engineering contractor** performing work across four counties on various construction projects. Our facility is situated within an **M2-zoned** industrial area and serves as a critical service center for our field operations. Our business operates approximately **12 to 16 hours per day**, with service trucks, material trucks, and mechanics departing the yard normally around **5:30 AM** and returning between **6:00 PM and 8:00 PM**, up to six days a week. It is important to note that during the day, our yard and shop remain relatively quiet since the majority of our work takes place off-site at construction projects throughout the region.

The proposed ordinance includes the following regulations that will severely disrupt our operations:

- **The proposed hours of operation:** Restricting activities to **7:00 AM to 8:00 PM** on weekdays and **10:00 AM to 8:00 PM** on Saturdays—are incompatible with the operational realities of our industry. Adherence to these proposed hours is not possible, as it would severely impair our ability to meet contractual obligations and maintain project schedules.
- **All work to be done indoors:** The proposed regulation would require **all work to be done indoors**. We perform routine maintenance and moderate repairs on our large Trucks, trailers and some tractors outside, as many of them do not fit inside our building. Also, the proposed regulation prohibits us from increasing the size of our building under this proposed regulation.
- **Noise levels:** The proposed regulation limits of noise level to 60 decibels. A normal conversation between two people is about 65 decibels. The ambient noise level in our yard, at 5am, before we operate, is between 67 and 73 decibels. This noise is from the 5 freeway and Santiago Street.
- **Noxious use:** We are concerned that the proposed regulation could classify a business as a **noxious use**. Once classified as noxious, this proposed regulation would eliminate legal nonconforming status on that property, and does not allow a less intensified industrial business to occupy that building or property.

It is important to highlight that **for the past 36 years, Reed Thomas Company has operated at this location without a single complaint** from neighboring businesses or residents. While we fully support the City's efforts to address businesses that are truly creating nuisances, it is both

unfair and unjust to apply such **sweeping regulations** to responsible operators like ourselves, who are compliant and have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to operating in a lawful and respectful manner.

In conclusion, I urge the Council to extend the moratorium. We believe it requires substantial revision before being brought forward for approval. Most importantly, the City should **conduct site-specific assessments** to gain a clear understanding of the nature of businesses affected and their essential role in supporting the region's economy and infrastructure.

I respectfully ask the Council to recognize that **one-size-fits-all regulations** are neither fair nor effective and that responsible operators should not be penalized for the actions of a small number of bad actors.

We invite you all to visit our site and learn more about our business. Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Harvey Beigle
Reed Thomas Company, Inc.
714-325-2808

Comment #23
Becerra, Alexis

From: Harvey Beigle <harveyb@reedthomas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 11:22 AM
To: eComment
Subject: FW: Santa Ana Council SD-84 Public Hearing...4-1-2025;; Reed Thoams Company
Attachments: Letter 4.01.25 city of sanra ana.pdf

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

??

??

From: Harvey Beigle <harveyb@reedthomas.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 10:53 AM
To: 'Councilmember Benjamin Vazquez' <bvazquez@santa-ana.org>; 'Councilmember Bacerra' <pbacerra@santa-ana.org>; 'Mayor Amezcua' <vamezcua@santa-ana.org>; 'Mayor Pro Tem Phan' <tphan@santa-ana.org>; 'Councilmember Jessie Lopez' <jlopez@santa-ana.org>; 'jryanhernandez@santa-ana.org' <jryanhernandez@santa-ana.org>
Cc: 'Councilmember Penaloza' <dpenaloza@santa-ana.org>
Subject: Santa Ana Council SD-84 Public Hearing...4-1-2025;; Reed Thoams Company
??

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Council members,

Attached please find a letter about Reed Thomas Company and the impacts the proposal would have in unfairly punishing our business.

??

You are all invited to reach out to me.

??

Kind Regards,

??

Harvey Beigle

Reed Thomas company

Cell 714 325-2808

To: City of Santa Ana Mayor and Council members
Date: March 25, 2025
Re: SD-84 Transit Zoning Code
Dear City of Santa Ana Mayor and Council members:

I am writing to express serious concerns regarding the proposed regulation, which would significantly hinder our ability to continue operating in a sustainable manner.

Reed Thomas Company, is located at **1025 N. Santiago Street** in Santa Ana. We are a **general engineering contractor** performing work across four counties on various construction projects. Our facility is situated within an **M2-zoned** industrial area and serves as a critical service center for our field operations. Our business operates approximately **12 to 16 hours per day**, with service trucks, material trucks, and mechanics departing the yard normally around **5:30 AM** and returning between **6:00 PM and 8:00 PM**, up to six days a week. It is important to note that during the day, our yard and shop remain relatively quiet since the majority of our work takes place off-site at construction projects throughout the region.

The proposed ordinance includes the following regulations that will severely disrupt our operations:

- **The proposed hours of operation:** Restricting activities to **7:00 AM to 8:00 PM** on weekdays and **10:00 AM to 8:00 PM** on Saturdays—are incompatible with the operational realities of our industry. Adherence to these proposed hours is not possible, as it would severely impair our ability to meet contractual obligations and maintain project schedules.
- **All work to be done indoors:** The proposed regulation would require **all work to be done indoors**. We perform routine maintenance and moderate repairs on our large Trucks, trailers and some tractors outside, as many of them do not fit inside our building. Also, the proposed regulation prohibits us from increasing the size of our building under this proposed regulation.
- **Noise levels:** The proposed regulation limits of noise level to 60 decibels. A normal conversation between two people is about 65 decibels. The ambient noise level in our yard, at 5am, before we operate, is between 67 and 73 decibels. This noise is from the 5 freeway and Santiago Street.
- **Noxious use:** We are concerned that the proposed regulation could classify a business as a **noxious use**. Once classified as noxious, this proposed regulation would eliminate legal nonconforming status on that property, and does not allow a less intensified industrial business to occupy that building or property.

It is important to highlight that **for the past 36 years, Reed Thomas Company has operated at this location without a single complaint** from neighboring businesses or residents. While we fully support the City's efforts to address businesses that are truly creating nuisances, it is both

unfair and unjust to apply such **sweeping regulations** to responsible operators like ourselves, who are compliant and have demonstrated a longstanding commitment to operating in a lawful and respectful manner.

In conclusion, I urge the Council to extend the moratorium. We believe it requires substantial revision before being brought forward for approval. Most importantly, the City should **conduct site-specific assessments** to gain a clear understanding of the nature of businesses affected and their essential role in supporting the region's economy and infrastructure.

I respectfully ask the Council to recognize that **one-size-fits-all regulations** are neither fair nor effective and that responsible operators should not be penalized for the actions of a small number of bad actors.

We invite you all to visit our site and learn more about our business. Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

Harvey Beigle
Reed Thomas Company, Inc.
714-325-2808

Comment #24

Becerra, Alexis

From: Ian MacMillan <ian@ocisewing.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 11:31 AM
To: eComment
Subject: FW: ZOA No 2024-02, AA No 2024-3
Attachments: Letter to the City of Santa Ana 4-1-2025.docx

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

To whom it may concern

Enclosed are my comments in reference to the City Council hearing April 1st 2025

Have a great Day,

Ian MacMillan

Ian MacMillan
608 E 4TH Street
Santa Ana, CA 92701

April 1, 2025

City Council of Santa Ana
City of Santa Ana Planning Commission

Subject: Transit Zoning Ordinance Amendment

The considered Zoning changes in my opinion are going to create an extreme hardship to many local businesses in the area.

We've been in the Santa Ana community since 2081 and remain committed to servicing the community respectfully.

The importance of a healthy environment for the community is of our utmost concern, we do everything possible to be a good neighbor and have never had a complaint.

I feel that some changes being proposed will have a detrimental effect not only business but also the community, many local businesses have numerous employees that live in local community, their jobs may be in jeopardy if forced to move.

I believe the local business are very valuable of the city of Santa Ana and the economic support of the community.

There are a number of business that are causing a lot of issues in the community, which changes are understandably and necessary, the city has responsibility to address these issues, but to make the changes to the entire area creates a huge financial burden on a majority of the good operators.

For example, the proposed change, no loading or unloading and of trucks on the city streets, there's several family owned markets that will be adversely effected by this change including 711 on the corner of Grand and 4th, there's no way for the delivery trucks to park in the small parking lot.

Please reconsider some the zoning changes that are being proposed to take into consideration the financial and operating burdens on most business.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Respectfully,

Ian MacMillan

Comment #25

Flores, Dora

From: Roger Simon <roger@pioneertrailersales.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 1:32 PM
To: eComment
Subject: tonight's meeting and my email to the council

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

I grew up in Santa Ana, received a fine education in Santa Ana and worked at our family business in Santa Ana for almost 50 years. Our family still owns and leases industrial property in Santa Ana.

While our property is outside SD-84, I'd like to address the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) No. 2024-02 and Amendment Application (AA) No. 2024-03 Amending Certain Sections of Article XIX (The Transit Zoning Code, Specific Development No. 84) of Chapter 41 (Zoning) of the Santa Ana Municipal Code that will be looked at by the Council tonight.

This proposed ordinance is a bad idea for many reasons. The reasons these changes are claimed to be needed are contradictory to reality.

A claim is made that this will reduce air pollution. This claim is false because the largest polluters in SD-48 are the thousands of automobiles operating through the area on Interstate 5, 17th Street, Grand Avenue and other streets and the dozens of trains operating daily on the tracks running north and south.

A claim is made that this will reduce traffic. This claim is false because as industrial uses decline and residential conversions increase massive heavy vehicle traffic will occur for years as multistory high density housing is built out which will be followed by hundreds more automobiles on streets that are no wider than they are now.

A claim is made that this will reduce the area's drug and homeless problems. This claim is false because existing residential areas in SD-84 and the rest of Santa Ana have drug and homeless problems. Changing the demographics in SD-84 will not eliminate the drug and homeless problems.

Santa Ana's Vision as stated at the beginning of the agenda for tonight's meeting includes "Neighborhood pride • Thriving economic climate." Businesses, like residents, have pride in the SD-84 neighborhood and are an important part of the economic climate. This will be harmed if the proposed changes are enacted.

Santa Ana's Mission as stated at the beginning of the agenda for tonight's meeting includes "To deliver efficient public services in partnership with our community which ensures public safety, a prosperous economic environment, opportunities for our youth..." Eliminating businesses reduces the prosperous economic environment and eliminates opportunities (jobs) for youth.

Santa Ana's Guiding Principles as stated at the beginning of the agenda for tonight's meeting includes Collaboration, Equity, Fiscal Responsibility and Transparency. From a business person's point of view, there has not been much collaboration, equity to all parties, or transparency in this process. Fiscal responsibility will be overlooked. Instead of the City using resources and existing ordinances to pursue admitted issues in SD-84 it will be using those resources to combat the lawsuits you are assured will be filed opposing the amended ordinance.

It was stated in one of the meetings on this subject that about half of the neighborhoods in Santa Ana were mixed use like Logan and Lacey. This used to be a matter of pride. If it is now a matter of contention SD-84 will be a warning signal to businesses throughout the City of what will be coming to their neighborhoods. It will be a warning signal to businesses considering locating in Santa Ana to seek their opportunity elsewhere.

Thanks for listening. Instead of enacting this proposed amendment, please work collaboratively with businesses and residents to find satisfactory solutions for all parties.

Sincerely - Roger

Flores, Dora

From: Lauren Medina <laurenmedina2010@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 1:32 PM
To: eComment; Penaloza, David; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Support for Item

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods.

I appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for responsible business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,
Lauren Hale
Ward 6

Comment #27

Flores, Dora

From: john hale <johnhale82@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 1, 2025 1:36 PM
To: eComment; Penaloza, David; Amezcua, Valerie
Subject: Support for Item 22

Attention: This email originated from outside of City of Santa Ana. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear
Mayor Amezcua and Members of the City Council,

I
am writing as a resident of the Transit Zoning Code to express my strong support for the proposed amendments to the SD-84 zoning code, and specifically the removal of the M1 and M2 industrial use overlay. These amendments are a long-overdue fix to the decades of incompatible land uses in the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods.

I
appreciate that the proposed amendments will not force out any existing businesses currently operating within the affected areas. Rather, they will create flexibility for business owners to sell their business and for property owners to re-tenant their buildings with a broad range of businesses. This will allow for responsible business owners to continue to positively contribute to the neighborhood and prevent vacant buildings.

These
amendments also provide the city with an essential tool to address the bad actors who are negatively affecting the quality of life in the neighborhood, such as the dump and metal recycling facilities next to Garfield Elementary School. With these amendments, we can better encourage responsible business ownership, ultimately improving the quality of life for residents and business owners alike.

I
encourage the City Council to approve these amendments for the benefit of the 1,500 families in the historic Logan and Lacy neighborhoods, and the city as a whole.

Sincerely,

John
Hale

Ward

6