

**City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for May 6, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 21 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Updates**

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.	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance amendments do not require any immediate closure of businesses within the affected area. Should individual business owners and property owners elect to modify business operations, cease operations, or redevelop properties with new uses, financial factors would be evaluated on a per- application basis. Therefore, estimating any financial or economic impacts of the proposed ordinance would be speculative.</p>
2	Rice Drywall Inc. – Business owner provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) with a change to remove the M-2 overlay. No questions were provided.	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance amendments do not require any immediate closure of businesses within the affected area. Should individual business owners and property owners elect to modify business operations, cease operations, or redevelop properties with new uses, financial factors would be evaluated on a per- application basis. Therefore, estimating any financial or economic impacts of the proposed ordinance would be speculative.</p> <p>A subsequent EIR is not required here, where the proposed ordinance amendments will not result in new significant impacts, or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts in the Transit Zoning Code EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, §21166; State CEQA Guidelines, §15162.) Thus, the City has prepared an Addendum to the Transit Zoning Code EIR.</p>

City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for May 6, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 21 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Updates

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
3	Tardif Sheet Metal – Business owner provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) with a change to remove the M-2 overlay and convert M-2 zoned properties to M-1, referencing LA County's Green Zones Program.	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance amendments do not require any immediate closure of businesses within the affected area. Should individual business owners and property owners elect to modify business operations, cease operations, or redevelop properties with new uses, financial factors would be evaluated on a per- application basis. Therefore, estimating any financial or economic impacts of the proposed ordinance would be speculative.</p> <p>A subsequent EIR is not required here, where the proposed ordinance amendments will not result in new significant impacts, or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts in the Transit Zoning Code EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, §21166; State CEQA Guidelines, §15162.) Thus, the City has prepared an Addendum to the Transit Zoning Code EIR.</p>
4	HPL Mechanical Inc.– Business owner and resident provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) with comment that the City has not produced a current environmental impact report.	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance amendments do not require any immediate closure of businesses within the affected area. Should individual business owners and property owners elect to modify business operations, cease operations, or redevelop properties with new uses, financial factors would be evaluated on a per- application basis. Therefore, estimating any financial or economic impacts of the proposed ordinance would be speculative.</p>

City of Santa Ana - Public Comment Response Matrix for May 6, 2025 City Council Meeting
Public Hearing Item No. 21 Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Updates

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
4 (continued)	HPL Mechanical Inc.– Business owner and resident provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) with a comment that the City has not produced a current environmental impact report.	<p>A subsequent EIR is not required here, where the proposed ordinance amendments will not result in new significant impacts, or substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant impacts in the Transit Zoning Code EIR. (Pub. Resources Code, §21166; State CEQA Guidelines, §15162.) Thus, the City has prepared an Addendum to the Transit Zoning Code EIR.</p> <p>The commenter can refer the parking and traffic safety concerns to the Public Works Agency and the Santa Ana Police Department.</p>
5	Kelly 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.
6	FLP Investments LLC / Motion & Flow Control Products, Inc. – Business owner provided comments in opposition to the proposed amendments to the Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) with a change to remove the M-2 overlay and convert current M-2 zoned properties to M-1, referencing LA County's program.	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The proposed ordinance amendments do not require any immediate closure of businesses within the affected area. Should individual business owners and property owners elect to modify business operations, cease operations, or redevelop properties with new uses, financial factors would be evaluated on a per- application basis. Therefore, estimating any financial or economic impacts of the proposed ordinance would be speculative.</p>

Comment #1

Zuniga, Diana

From: W.Y. Manufacturing, Inc. <wymfginc@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 1:10 PM
To: eComment
Subject: City Council Public Hearing re. SD-84 Transit Zoning Code - Tuesday May 6, 5:30 pm
Attachments: Esteemed members of the City Council.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

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

To whom it may concern:

Please find the attached file to be presented at the City Council Public Hearing re. SD-84 Transit Zoning Code - Tuesday May 6, 5:30 pm.

Thank you,
Walter W. Yaeger
President
W.Y. Manufacturing, Inc.
1037 Fuller Street
Santa Ana, CA. 92701

"Esteemed members of the City Council, thank you for allowing me to address you today regarding the moratorium and proposed re-zoning 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, and 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: Kim Riker <kriker@ricedw.com>
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2025 10:53 AM
To: Bacerra, Phil; Vazquez, Benjamin; Lopez, Jorge (SAPD); Penaloza, David; Hernandez, Johnathan; Amezcua, Valerie; Phan, Thai
Cc: eComment
Subject: Comments re: SD-84 Industrial Rezoning for 5/6/25 Meeting

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

To the Honorable Mayor Amezcua and Santa Ana City Council,

As a business owner affected daily by the “bad actors” we can all agree need to be dealt with, I implore you to not destroy the businesses like mine who support the City and its residents with job opportunities and tax revenue. The meetings of residents and businesses show that neither group supports devastating good businesses, and their employees, for the benefit of gentrifying developers who will build high density, **unaffordable**, luxury, multi-story units and thousands of additional residents - and traffic - right between 2 historic single-family neighborhoods. This is exactly what the proposed rezoning does – it shuts down clean industrial businesses and eliminates jobs.

There have not been any environmental studies in this area and the pollution from the 5 freeway, constant trains and congested city streets seem to be completely ignored.

Instead of destroying the businesses you lured here with the Enterprise Zone and other tax advantages, any proposals should focus on those who are actually “noxious” in nature. At the Train Station meeting and at the Planning Commission -- **residents recommended that the M-1 zone remain and that the M-2 zone designation be eliminated.**

Please consider amending the proposal to remove just the M-2 overlay -- allowing the M-1 Light Industrial to remain - and converting current M-2 properties to M-1. I understand this approach was taken in Los Angeles County in its “Green” rezoning. Something similar here would at least preserve some of the long-standing, multi-generational businesses that have supported this City’s infrastructure and revenue for over 70 years.

Thank you,

Kim Riker
Rice Drywall, Inc.
919 E. 6th Street
Santa Ana, CA 92701
Ph: (714) 543-5400

Comment #3

Zuniga, Diana

From: mike@tardifsheetmetal.com
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2025 10:17 AM
To: Bacerra, Phil; Vazquez, Benjamin; Lopez, Jorge (SAPD); Penaloza, David; Hernandez, Johnathan; Amezcua, Valerie; Phan, Thai
Cc: eComment; Abby Hashemi; Al Saia; Andy Schmitt; Bob Adams; Bryan Zatica; Carl Tobin; Charlie Winn; Christy Taylor; Cindy Greiwe; Congressman Lou Correa; Darrell Garland; Dave Elliott; David Firestone; David Roche; David Zech; dianef8923@twc.com; Dick Stewart; Dylan Shershenovich; Elvis Arellano; Eoin Kreditor; F R Stewart; Fernando Mora; Francisco Gonzalez; George Hansen; George Toubbeh; Graydon Greiwe; Harold Seaton; Harvey Beigle; Henry Bedolla; Herb Niermann; Jack Haley; Jack Hogan; jadec@ctatravel.com; Jeff Cosby; Jeff Potter; Jenna Zech; Jim Tobin; Jimmy Villaverde; Jodie; Joe Castro; Joe Kunz; Joe Pfeiffer; John Moore; John Nettel; Joseph Lomax; Judith Lomax; Judy & Dave Wislocki; Julie Carmody; kenhsu714@gmail.com; Kevin Tranter; Kim Riker; Kyle Snailum; Lee Jakobs; legacyteinc@gmail.com; LianeH@austinhardwoods.net; Linda Tobin; Marc Saltzer; Mario Gutierrez; Mark & Diana Forsyth; Mark Force; Mark Law; Mark McCandless; Matt@pacific-strategies.com; Matthew Nichols; Mayra Ruiz; Mike Feeley; Mike Freedman; Mike Saia; Mike Tardif; Mo Sanchez; Nathan Hittle; Neil Buttermoore; Omar Reynaga; Peter Lomakin; R. Chiarini; Rachel Freedman; Ray Hashemi; Richard Chiarini; Rick Kagasoff; Robert Thatcher; Roger Simon; Ron Jakobs; Russell Johnson; Ryan Moore; Sammy Montoya; Scott Connelly; Sean Connelly; Shawna Smith; Stacy Stell; Steven Greenhut; Susan Shelley; Rush, Tim GMAIL; Toan Nguyen; Tony Richard; Travis Beigle; Walt Yaeger; Will Paul Akrawi
Subject: May 6th Council Meeting Public Hearing SD-84 Industrial Rezoning

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

Honorable Mayor Amezcua and City Council,

The March Train Station meeting brought together residents and businesses and made clear that residents do not support an unjustified **land grab** which will devastate good businesses, and their employees, for the benefit of gentrifying developers.

Developers will bring high density luxury multi-story units and thousands of additional residents - and traffic - right between 2 historic single-family neighborhoods.

Residents don't want to unnecessarily shut down clean industrial businesses and eliminate jobs.

The City hasn't done any environmental studies in this area – yet they put forward claims of pollution – seemingly blaming this little business area as responsible for pollution which incurs throughout Southern California - and without considering nearby significant pollution contributors, like the 5 freeway, busy city streets and the train tracks.

Critical details need to be addressed - such as the inaccurate and subjective classification of “noxious” businesses. There are devastating consequences in the regulations for labeling a business as “noxious” – as the City has already done without justification to many businesses. These regulations would deny continued use of a clean business property for a small box of hoses or a pail of machine lubricant - while not requiring the same

of a “noxious” gas station property with many thousands of gallons of hazardous fuel. That is simply not equitable or fair.

We need a balanced approach that targets “bad actor” businesses. You know who they are - they degrade **both** business and residential neighborhoods.

The City should focus on:

Addressing the primary nuisance and “noxious” businesses -- 90% of the businesses do not cause any problems for the City or neighborhoods – yet they are being lumped in with the problem causing operators.

Clarification of regulations -- This re-zoning is every bit as significant to this area as the re-zoning is in the ongoing General Plan Update -- but it has not received equivalent outreach, community input, and collaboration.

At the Train Station meeting and at the Planning Commission -- residents recommended that the M-1 zone remain and that the M-2 zone designation be eliminated.

Consider removing the M-2 overlay -- allowing the M-1 Light Industrial to remain - and converting current M-2 properties to M-1 ... **as was done in the County of Los Angeles “Green” rezoning.**

Thank you,

Mike Tardif

Comment #4

Zuniga, Diana

From: notify=proudcity.com@getproudcity.com on behalf of Peter Loamkin
<notify@proudcity.com>
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2025 11:35 AM
To: !City Clerk
Subject: New submission from City Clerk's Office

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

Name

Peter Loamkin

Email

hplmechanical@hotmail.com

Message

Please see the attached letter below regarding the proposed SD-84 Area - Transit Zoning Code Rezoning that is coming before the city council at the May 6th meeting. I have already sent this to each of the council members and the Mayor using the document up load feature located on the "Contact" city council webpage.

I am sending this to you so that it would be entered/recorded as received in the meeting minutes. Since there is no document upload feature on this page, I pasted the letter below.

Thank you.

5/5/25

City of Santa Ana

Re: Proposed SD-84 Area - Transit Zoning Code Rezoning

Dear Council Member,

I am opposed to and ask that you vote against the approval of the proposed SD-84 Area - Transit Zoning Code Rezoning that is to come up before the city council on May 6th.

Having both a residence and an industrial zoned property in the Logan district, I am opposed to the rezoning effort being made in the area. After discussing the rezoning changes the city intends to make with numerous neighbors around my home and industrial property, it has become clear to me that there is no desire let alone push for these changes by most of the Logan Street residence owners. It is clear that there is a push for this only by a few outspoken, well-connected and rewarded neighborhood activists who reside in and outside of the neighborhood. These activists have spoken to my neighbors and made it known that they hate the existence of the industrial properties located in the neighborhood and intend to rid "their" neighborhood of all the businesses. As I mentioned, most neighbors around me are quite content living and interacting with the presence of business properties near them and have done so for many decades. My family and I have spent 50 years of our lives living and working in the Logan neighborhood. As I stated at the Planning Commission meetings in the past, I consider my neighbors on Logan Street near my home and business as good friends, many as part of our extended family.

This rezoning change being made by the city is simply a means of accomplishing a city desire/goal of changing the neighborhood into something in line with the long-term beautification of the train station to downtown areas. I understand that desire to beautify the area. However, forcing a change to the zoning will only negatively harm the property values and businesses of all industrial properties located within the proposed zone. Properties that have been owned by families for generations. Further, passage of this rezoning code will also cause great damage to the finances and resource capital of the ongoing businesses, impacting the livelihoods of many people who live in Santa Ana and are dependent on those businesses. This kind of financial damage brought on by the taking of property, property value, and or limiting the property's use after that property has been established and in use as previously determined and agreed upon by the City of Santa Ana, directly or indirectly, is unconstitutional.

The City Planning Dept. has told the public that the rezoning effort as being required due to some California legislative regulation demanding it to be done. That the city has no choice but to conform to it. As convenient of an excuse as this may be, none the less, an area re-zoning change of this monumental scope and size has been rushed for approval at an alarming rate. Because of this haste, there has been an inadequate amount of time for the affected parties to study and provide input on the proposed code changes. Further, the city has not produced a current environmental impact, air quality, traffic impact or similar normally required reports for review.

One of the main causes of concern by the many residences I have spoken with is the amount of traffic and parking issues that this zoning change will bring with it when all the business are coerced/forced to vacate the area and the population thereby inevitably increases. At the city/resident meeting in February, when asked by a resident about the additional traffic and parking the additional population will bring, (which is an overcrowded problem now), the city official said, that this has not been reviewed as part of the planning departments concern at that time and that the main focus was to remove the businesses from the area first.

Page 1 of 2

The city produced the first draft to the public in the middle of January and the council is set to vote to approve it on May 6th. This amount of time for inquiry and review is inadequate. Given this, how can the city objectively say that this has been a thorough, fair and equitable outcome for all parties that this zoning change will affect. As I understand it, subsequent to the last Planning Commission meeting where the code changes were approved, there have been additional or new changes and or additions made to the proposed new rezoning code. This is not an example of fairness or transparency.

It should be noted that this current Planning Commission approved zoning change is simply nothing more than fundamentally, a regulatory takeover. It should also be noted that the two dissenting votes on the Planning Commission rightly were concerned that this was an illegal taking of uncompensated value from the owners of these properties and businesses. Without fair and just compensation for the industrial zoned property owners and the businesses represented, this zoning change will subvert the Constitutional eminent domain laws and protections. It would be reasonable to understand that the city could expect the industrial property owners to seek a legal remedy to return and protect their property rights provided in the constitution under the eminent domain provision if the city council votes to approve the rezoning change in its current form.

I strongly urge the City Council to vote against the passage of the Proposed SD-84 Area - Transit Zoning Code Rezoning so that we all can engage in a more collaborative process that protects the concerns and interests of the residents, the industrial property owners and businesses.

Thank you,

Peter Lomakin

Cc: All Santa Ana City council members.

Comment #5

Zuniga, Diana

From: Kelly Kraus-Lee <kellyakraus@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2025 5:27 PM
To: Amezcua, Valerie; Penaloza, David; Hernandez, Johnathan; Bacerra, Phil; Lopez, Jessie; Vazquez, Benjamin; Phan, Thai
Cc: eComment
Subject: Item 21 - TZC amendments

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 Santa Ana City Council,

I am writing to urge the City Council to adopt a balanced and thoughtful approach to the Transit Zoning Code (TZC) amendments in order to resolve the longstanding issue of incompatible land uses, while honoring the code's original vision for transit-oriented development.

The purpose of the TZC is to foster a walkable, mixed-use, and transit-connected urban environment that encourages public transportation, biking, and a higher quality of life. However, in its current state, the southern portion of the zone falls far short of this vision. Heavy industrial uses—many of which are incompatible with a residential, transit-oriented framework—have effectively walled off residents on 4th St such as Lacy Crossing from the nearby train station and newly constructed bike lanes. These uses generate noise, pollution, traffic, and safety hazards, and they discourage the use of active transportation, undermining the very goals the TZC was meant to achieve.

Furthermore, industrial uses have been especially harmful to the Logan neighborhood, one of Santa Ana's most historic and culturally significant communities. Logan residents deserve the same environmental protections, connectivity, and investment in livability as those in other parts of the city. Instead, they bear the burden of nearby industrial operations that degrade their health, property values, and overall quality of life.

I respectfully advocate for a compromise approach which I believe the proposed amendments mostly achieve:

- Provide the city with the necessary legal and regulatory tools to remove bad actors—those businesses whose operations significantly impact public health, safety, or the environment, including the crematorium, the dump, and metal recyclers open to the public.
- Ensure that responsible, low-impact businesses that contribute positively to the community, like Austin Hardwood and McCandless Tile, are not unfairly penalized or displaced.
- Establish clear zoning restrictions that prevent future incompatible uses—such as metal recyclers, crematoriums, or waste transfer stations—from opening within the TZC.
- Prioritize pedestrian infrastructure, green spaces, and clean air for the Lacy and Logan neighborhoods and ensure it benefits from the full promise of transit-oriented development.

It is frustrating to see some business owners claim they care about the community, while at the same time demonstrating a striking ignorance of the city's planning efforts—many have admitted they were unaware that this zoning code update has been in progress for over a year and also did not even know the name of the council members making these decisions. Genuine community-mindedness requires active engagement, not just lip

service. The residents of Santa Ana—especially those in impacted areas like Logan and Lacy—deserve more than indifference wrapped in platitudes.

Santa Ana has a real opportunity to lead with equity, vision, and responsibility. A compromise that removes harmful industrial uses while supporting community-centered growth will not only uphold the spirit of the Transit Zoning Code, but will also protect the integrity of the Logan and Lacy neighborhoods and elevate the quality of life for all nearby residents.

Thank you for your time and your commitment to making Santa Ana a more livable city.

Sincerely,

Kelly Kraus-Lee

Ward 6

Comment #6

Zuniga, Diana

From: Jeff Potter <jpotter@comoso.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2025 6:08 AM
To: mike@tardifsheetmetal.com; Bacerra, Phil; Vazquez, Benjamin; Lopez, Jorge (SAPD); Penaloza, David; Hernandez, Johnathan; Amezcua, Valerie; Phan, Thai
Cc: eComment; Abby Hashemi; Al Saia; Andy Schmitt; Bob Adams; Bryan Zatica; Carl Tobin; Charlie Winn; Christy Taylor; Cindy Greiwe; Congressman Lou Correa; Darrell Garland; Dave Elliott; David Firestone; David Roche; David Zech; dianef8923@twc.com; Dick Stewart; Dylan Shershenovich; Elvis Arellano; Eoin Kreditor; F R Stewart; Fernando Mora; Francisco Gonzalez; George Hansen; George Toubbeh; Graydon Greiwe; Harold Seaton; Harvey Beigle; Henry Bedolla; Herb Niermann; Jack Haley; Jack Hogan; jadec@ctatravel.com; Jeff Cosby; Jenna Zech; Jim Tobin; Jimmy Villaverde; Jodie; Joe Castro; Joe Kunz; Joe Pfeiffer; John Moore; John Nettel; Joseph Lomax; Judith Lomax; Judy & Dave Wislocki; Julie Carmody; kenhsu714@gmail.com; Kevin Tranter; Kim Riker; Kyle Snailum; Lee Jakobs; legacyteinc@gmail.com; LianeH@austinhardwoods.net; Linda Tobin; Marc Saltzer; Mario Gutierrez; Mark & Diana Forsyth; MForce1; mlaw92626; Mark McCandless; Matt@pacific-strategies.com; Matthew Nichols; Mayra Ruiz; Mike Feeley; Mike Freedman; Mike Saia; Mo Sanchez; Nathan Hittle; Neil Buttermoore; Omar Reynaga; Peter Lomakin; R. Chiarini; Rachel Freedman; Ray Hashemi; Richard Chiarini; Rick Kagasoff; Robert Thatcher; Roger Simon; Ron Jakobs; Russell Johnson; Ryan Moore; Sammy Montoya; Scott Connelly; Sean Connelly; Shawna Smith; Stacy Stell; Steven Greenhut; Susan Shelley; Rush, Tim GMAIL; Toan Nguyen; Tony Richard; Travis Beigle; Walt Yaeger; Will Paul Akrawi
Subject: May 6th Council Meeting Public Hearing SD-84 Industrial Rezoning

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

Mayor Amezcua and City Council,

The SD-84 potential rezoning doesn't seem to be welcome to anyone other than gentrifying developers. From sitting in most of the meetings it appears the solution, if one is being strived for, is clear. Residents and long-standing businesses do not support the rezoning. The proposed "solution" is only going to make traffic and congestion issues worse, not improve the neighborhood. If industrial/commercial and residential cannot coexist, where does that leave the future of the city and Orange County in general?

If pollution is the issue there's going to be far more traffic as we are already surrounded by four major freeways (clogged at one part of the day or another), a train station and Civic and Santa Ana, which are raceways many mornings and afternoons. Noise is not going to improve either. Developers will bring high density luxury multi-story units and thousands of additional residents - and traffic - right between 2 historic single-family neighborhoods. Most of them will leave for the day for other jobs as the "work from home" era dies a slow death.

It would be best if the city managed the exceptions. Manage the bad actors and truly noxious businesses, like other cities do and have done. We ask that you remove the M-2 overlay -- allowing the M-1 Light Industrial to remain - and converting current M-2 properties to M-1. This was done successfully in LA County. Not doing so sets a bad precedent for potential future business investment in your city.

Shutting down long-standing businesses is not the popular answer. Hopefully you will consider your constituents over developers.

Regards,

Jeff Potter
FLP
911 Poinsettia Street



JEFF POTTER

Executive Vice President
911 N. Poinsettia Street, Santa Ana, CA 92701
o: (714) 743-2268 c: (714) 743-2268
jpotter@comoso.com | www.mfcp.com



[MFCP Technologies](http://www.mfcp.com)

Confidentiality Notice:

This email communication, along with any attachments, may contain confidential and privileged information that is intended only for the recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, please do not review, disclose, disseminate, distribute, or copy this email or its' contents. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by replying to this message and deleting this email from your computer. Recommendations on application design and material selection are based on available technical data and are offered as suggestions only. Each user should perform their own tests to determine the product suitability for a particular use. Motion & Flow Control Products, inc. offers no express or implied warranties concerning the form, fit, or function of a product in any application.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).