

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
1	Oddallis Osornio- resident - -comments in support with no question	The City acknowledges the comment.
2	Ryan Friesen - resident - comments in support with no question	The City acknowledges the comment.
3	Adam Toogood - resident - comments in support with a change to remove CUP exemption for expansion of existing self-storage industrial business - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
4	Mayra Rangel - resident - comments in support and complaints of foul odor from nearby operators	The City acknowledges the comment. The commenter can refer the foul odor concern to Code Enforcement.
5	Kevin Tranter and Judy Lomax - Austin Hardwoods business - confirmation that the hardwood retail business would be a permitted use under Urban Center Zone	The City acknowledges the comment. No changes to the 2010 TZC provisions are proposed regarding allowed retail uses in the UN-2 district. Retail use is permitted either by right or with a CUP, depending on size.
6	John and Besty Lewis - residents - comments in support with no questions	The City acknowledges the comment.
7	Todd Schweer - Boyce Industries business - comments in opposition with no questions	The City acknowledges the comment.
8	Kelly Kraus-Lee - resident - comments in support and commentary question - This is one of the most densely populated neighborhoods in the city, why should us residents unduly bear the negative impacts on our city by industrial businesses?	The City acknowledges the comment. The ordinance amendments respond to concerns regarding the presence of industrial businesses in close proximity to residential neighborhoods.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
9	Christy Taylor - business building owner since 2016 - comments in opposition and request for a phone call to understand how business is affected with proposed zoning changes.	The City acknowledges the comment. City staff has contacted property owners directly in response to requests for phone calls.
10	Gabriella Orozco - resident - comments about business operations early & late on weekdays & on weekends - with no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
11	Sean Aguinaga - resident - comments in support with change to remove CUP exemption for expansion of existing self-storage industrial business - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
12	Stephanie Wells - resident and small business owner - resident - comments in support with change to remove CUP exemption for expansion of existing self-storage industrial business - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
13	Leonel Flores (GREEN-MPNA), Samantha Guerrero (OCEJ) letter and comments in support with request to extend the moratorium to Southeast Santa Ana - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
14	Bob Adams - business owner - provided marked up changes to the City's proposed zoning amendments for the administrative record	These suggested changes have been provided to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
15	<p>Jade Chiarini - business - comments in opposition - written questions include: What will happen to long-standing businesses? Will they be forced out due to unclear or impractical regulations? How will these changes impact our ability to grow and adapt in an evolving economy?</p>	<p>Nonconforming businesses will be allowed to continue in operation subject to the operational standards and limits on expansion in the ordinance.</p> <p>Those businesses deemed to be noxious uses may be subject to amortization (elimination by a time specific) through a proposed amortization hearing process.</p>
16	<p>Christy Taylor - business building owner - comments in opposition with the following questions.</p> <p>Re: decreased property value and limited scope for leasing...</p> <p>Why is it that those businesses are not being addressed versus attacking all of the businesses in this area?</p> <p>This constitutes unlawful seizure property, the Amortization plan is a liability and where is the compensation for our losses? Re: economic study, loss of employment, devaluation of property, and legal fees, why haven't these actions been taken (by City staff)?</p> <p>If there is a concern about environmental issues, why was the low-income housing built behind Fuller right next to a freeway where fumes and toxins are present 24/7?</p>	<p>Nonconforming businesses will be allowed to continue to operate subject to the ordinance provisions. The nonconforming status is associated with the specific business on the property; thus, the business may be sold and the use continue subject to the ordinance provisions.</p> <p>Any new use seeking to lease the building will need to conform to the SD-84 land use regulations.</p> <p>The ordinance amendments are proposed to implement General Plan policy within the SD-84 area, with specific policies directed to eliminate land use conflicts.</p> <p>For those uses deemed to be noxious uses and potentially subject to amortization, the amortization process will consider many factors, including business investments.</p>

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
17	<p>Richard Chiarini - business owner - comments in opposition with the following question:</p> <p>How can we work together to find balanced, sustainable solutions that respect both the city's growth, the businesses and residents who call Santa Ana home?</p>	Through the public hearing process, the Planning Commission and City Council will consider all comments.
18	<p>Garrett Greiwe, business owner Super Abrasives, comments in opposition - question: If a company that has been a part of this community for years can be forced out due to policy changes, what does that say to other businesses considering Santa Ana as their home?</p>	The proposed amendment to TZC implements the General Plan vision and land use policy adopted by the City Council in 2022. The updated code will clearly establish land use regulations consistent with those policies, which will allow diverse businesses in in the different zoning districts in the City.
19	<p>Nate Paladino - resident - comments in support with the change to not allow storage unit industrial business- no question provided</p>	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
20	<p>Christy Taylor - business building owner - comments in opposition with the following questions:</p> <p>While I understand there are concerns from the residents, wouldn't it be better to find a solution that deals with these businesses rather than destroying businesses who contribute tax dollars and dollars into the local economy?</p> <p>Is there a reason why we can't work on a solution that focuses on the offenders and not disrupt businesses that don't pollute?</p> <p>The following legal issues referenced:</p> <p>Violation of California's Amortization Doctrine</p> <p>Potential violation of CEQA</p> <p>Unconstitutional Regulatory Taking</p> <p>Violation of Equal Protection Clause</p> <p>Unfair Business Competition and Anti-Trust Violations</p>	<p>Through the public hearing process, the Planning Commission and City Council will consider all comments.</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 impacts of the proposed ordinance would be speculative.</p> <p>CEQA documentation has been completed consisting of an Addendum to the Transit Zoning Code EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2006071100). No specific environmental concerns have been raised by the commenter. The Addendum looked at the potential environmental impacts of the ordinance amendments and determined that, other than the existing mitigation measures from the Transit Zoning Code EIR which would continue to apply, no new mitigation is required. The Addendum concluded that there will be no new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects resulting from any substantial changes to the project or circumstances, or new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the prior EIR was certified. A subsequent EIR is therefore not required.</p>

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
21	Cedric Owens - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
22	Rachel Kraus-Lee - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
23	Christy Taylor - business building owner - comments in opposition and financial impacts of moratorium on current businesses - no question provided	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>Nonconforming businesses will be allowed to continue in operation subject to the operational standards and limits on expansion in the ordinance. Those businesses deemed to be noxious uses may be subject to amortization (elimination by a time specific) through a proposed amortization hearing process.</p>

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
24	<p>Kim Riker - business owner - comments in opposition with the following questions:</p> <p>Re: Urban Center zone and permits required in the Business-Financial-Professional-Technology Use standard and subtypes of businesses in that category, the question is: 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?</p> <p>Reference to the project being a taking under the 5th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.</p> <p>Comments regarding metal recycling business, graffiti on building and trash dumped on sidewalk daily, question is: Perhaps we can just focus on heavy industry in our area? Or work with the community to clean up the space related to the two recycling yards on 6th Street?</p>	<p>Regarding the specific business type referenced, the City would consider it to be a Business Support Service, permitted by right.</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 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> <p>The commenter can refer the graffiti, illegal dumping, and other nuisance concerns to Code Enforcement.</p>
25	Macro-Z-Technology Company - business - comments in opposition, no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
26	<p>Mayra Ruiz - Knight Towing business owner - comment in opposition - provided the following questions:</p> <p>What makes this even worse is the lack of clarity on whether the City of Santa Ana intends to provide relocation assistance or compensate businesses like mine for the revenue we will lose due to these changes. Are we expected to absorb these devastating financial losses on our own?</p>	<p>The nonconforming provisions allow businesses to continue operating and to sell an existing business to a new owner, provided that the operators comply with all operational standards in the ordinance.</p> <p>As the ordinance does not force relocation, except for those businesses identified as subject to amortization, relocation assistance is not anticipated to be needed. If any business is interested in a larger site in Santa Ana, the City's Economic Development Department is available to assist.</p> <p>Those businesses deemed to be noxious uses may be subject to amortization (elimination by a time specific) through a proposed amortization hearing process.</p>
27	Martha E. Gonzalez, LMFT - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
28	Liberty Dickenson - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
29	Cedric Volk - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
30	<p>Mike Tardif - business owner – comments in opposition with additional comments regarding City’s providing insufficient notice for posting public information documents; City’s decision to use amortization and evaluate a business that factors “recouping investments” or “equitable return;“ comment on staff’s response to a Commissioner’s question regarding moratorium in place and activity paused and or allowed. Commented on legal attorney costs to assist business on a permit to install equipment and denial of a Certificate of Occupancy to son’s name to the business.</p> <p>Additional comment about insufficient time for draft regulations to be made available to the public (5 weeks ago).</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The Planning Commission Agenda for today was published in compliance with the Brown Act last Friday and consistent with past practice. The community have had access to the draft regulations since they were made publicly available on January 15, 2025.</p> <p>Staff have met with interested parties and business owners on numerous occasions prior to, and since January 15th, to receive their input on the draft regulations. Additionally, the Commission conducted a study session on February 10th where all interested parties publicly provided their input on the draft regulations.</p>
31	Kelly Kraus-Lee - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
32	Sarah Rinelli - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
33	Jason Nguyen - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
34	Ryan Madden - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
35	Roger Simon – business property owner outside TZC - comments in opposition - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
36	Barney Richer - resident – comments in support with the following question: Regarding Madison Disposal, what other businesses are allowed to use public streets to form a line for their drive through business?	The City acknowledges the comment. Nonconforming businesses will be allowed to continue in operation subject to the operational standards and limits on expansion in the ordinance. Those businesses deemed to be noxious uses may be subject to amortization (elimination by a time specific) through a proposed amortization hearing process.
37	Jackie Michael - resident – comments in support - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.
38	Martha E. Gonzalez - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided	The City acknowledges the comment.

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
39	<p>Mike Tardif - business owner – comments in opposition with additional comments regarding City’s providing insufficient notice for posting public information documents; City’s decision to use amortization and evaluate a business that factors “recouping investments” or “equitable return;” comment on staff’s response to a Commissioner’s question regarding moratorium in place and activity paused and or allowed. Commented on legal attorney costs to assist business on a permit to install equipment and denial of a Certificate of Occupancy to son’s name to the business.</p> <p>Additional comment about insufficient time for draft regulations to be made available to the public (5 weeks ago).</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p> <p>The Planning Commission Agenda for today was published in compliance with the Brown Act last Friday and consistent with past practice. The community have had access to the draft regulations since they were made publicly available on January 15, 2025.</p> <p>Staff have met with interested parties and business owners on numerous occasions prior to, and since January 15th, to receive their input on the draft regulations. Additionally, the Commission conducted a study session on February 10th where all interested parties publicly provided their input on the draft regulations.</p>
40	<p>Roberta Flores - resident - comments in support with a change to not allow storage unit industrial use - no question provided</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p>
41	<p>Mark Law – business building owner – comments in opposition – no question provided.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges the comment.</p>

**City of Santa Ana Transit Zoning Code (SD-84) Public Comment Response Matrix for
February 24, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting - Public Hearing Item #1**

Comment #	Written Public Comment Received	Response
42	Hugo Ortega – comments with additional information on the issues with activity outside recycling centers, trucks and pollution concerns. No question provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
43	Tatiana Magdalena Flores – comments in support and request to extend to the southeastern portion of Santa Ana. No question provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.
44	Leonel Flores (GREEN-MPNA), Samantha Guerrero (OCEJ), and Tomas Castro (Climate Action Campaign) – letter and comments in support with request to extend the moratorium to Southeast Santa Ana. No question provided.	The City acknowledges the comment.