

From: [Bill Lam](#)
To: [MPClerk](#)
Subject: Public Communications(General public comment) for the 10/2/2024 regular city council meeting
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 5:53:10 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

(Note: Please send all of my comments to all councilmembers)

So, I want to talk about the upcoming November 2024 election, will there be a candidate forum before this upcoming election? The last time that there was a candidate forum for the Monterey Park city election was on 2/10/2020 before the 3/3/2020 city election hosted by the League of Women Voters Pasadena Area at the city council chambers for people to attend the debate and meeting and interact with all of the candidates running for office. When the city moved the election date to November even-numbered years starting with the 11/8/2022 city election, I was hoping that there could be at least one candidate forum before the election so that people could attend to watch the debate as well as meet and interact with all of the candidates running for local office before the election. However, there hasn't been a single candidate forum before the 11/8/2022 city election which is disappointing to not have a candidate forum before the election as well as missing the chance to meet and interact with candidates running for local offices. For the upcoming 11/5/2024 city election, I hope you guys consider holding at least one candidate forum before the election because people want to watch and attend the debate as well as meet and interact with almost all of the candidates running for local offices before the election. That way people can understand who the candidates are and what are they about. In closing, you should consider hosting at least one candidate forum before the Nov. 2024 election so that there's an opportunity for people to attend and watch the debate as well as meet and interact with candidates running for office.

Thank you very much for your time

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: [Cindy](#)
To: [MPClerk](#)
Subject: Oral Communications - DRAFT
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 4:52:58 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Mayor Wong and Members of the City Council,

As a concerned resident, I attended all four SPARC meetings announced on the city's website. It's important to remember that these meetings involve the entire city despite our division into five districts.

Since the mood of the SPARC committee appears to be focused on the redevelopment of a chunk of this area and the urgent need for housing in CA, I find it amusing since our city's redevelopment website shows two more hotels planned for properties on North Atlantic. We are unlike the hotels stretched along Valley Blvd in San Gabriel, where the multitude of quality shopping and restaurants support the hotels; we have nothing to offer guests but a sprinkling of restaurants. One small empty lot between Bank of America and 99 Ranch market is undesirable. The other location is Garvey and Atlantic, known as the old pumpkin patch and Christmas tree lot. These properties could easily blend into the community with retail on the first floor and affordable housing above. The pumpkin patch could easily accommodate Home Goods, Marshall's, TJX, and Trader Joe's, just like the pristine corner of 3rd and La Cienega in Los Angeles. We, residents, have been desperate for decades because we need quality shopping and are tired of driving out of our city. This type of development will generate more revenue and excitement than empty hotel rooms! Affordable housing can blend into the rest of the surrounding communities because the transportation infrastructure is already in place along the Garvey and Atlantic corridors. The blight on the other two corners is an embarrassment to the city as a whole!

With the problems throughout this city, maybe we should place a moratorium in City Hall and establish a CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE to redesign and implement a plan to improve our quality of life within our city borders, eliminate our blighted intersections at Garfield and Garvey and Atlantic and Garvey, revitalize downtown Monterey Park, and enrich our reserves to support badly needed infrastructure for our community. I would love to propose an actual International Food Court that includes Mediterranean and a Jewish Delicatessen.

Yours truly,

Cindy Yee

Written Communication
Agenda Item No. 2A

From: [Cindy](#)
To: [MPClerk](#)
Subject: Agenda 2-A
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 10:47:59 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Mayor Wong and Members of the City Council,

I want to reiterate my strong support for the data center project Mr. Bryan Marsh presented to the SPARC committee at the first meeting. With the zoning we voters approved in Measure JJ, his company purchased the property close to the SCE Power Plant. Mr. Marsh clearly outlined his vision by sharing his architect's drawings of their facility, which show a single-story structure with extremely high-end security and only 60 parking stalls. Throughout the four meetings, there was not one word of objection to the data center. Only a general comment regarding it being a natural buffer between the rest of the property and the homes above.

Rumor has it that our city turned away other potential data centers that would benefit from SCE's massive power plant. Why? Our city will significantly benefit from the tax base that this project will generate, and it's like a shot in the arm for this city, as it is with the Marketplace. If this is not approved, our chances of winning a lawsuit by Mr. Marsh's company will definitely sting our taxpayers' pockets.

Sincerely,

Cindy Yee

Written Communication
Agenda Item No. 2A

From: [Alvarez, Inez](#)
To: [MPClerk](#)
Cc: [Wong, Thomas](#); [Garcia, Diana](#)
Subject: FW: Request for Compliance with CEQA and General Plan in Saturn Park Zoning Change
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 1:36:02 PM
Attachments: [SaturnPark_Council_3.1.docx](#)

Referencing item 2-A

From: Luci Corona <lucicorona@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 1:28 PM
To: CMO <CMO@MontereyPark.ca.gov>; Wong, Thomas <twong@MontereyPark.ca.gov>;
planningpermitcounter <planningpermitcounter@MontereyPark.ca.gov>
Cc: Eric Roybal <ericjroybal@icloud.com>
Subject: Request for Compliance with CEQA and General Plan in Saturn Park Zoning Change

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed zoning change for Saturn Park, currently designated as "Innovation Technology." While I understand the city's interest in modifying the zoning to align with future development goals, it is crucial that the legal process is followed properly to comply with California law and local regulations.

First and foremost, Saturn Park was not studied for land use changes in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), any proposed zoning change must be supported by an environmental review. Since Saturn Park was not evaluated for potential land use changes in the original EIR, the city needs to amend the report—either through a supplemental EIR or another CEQA process—to fully assess the potential effects of such changes. The Monterey Park General Plan clearly emphasizes the need to preserve neighborhoods and areas surrounding Saturn Park, ensuring any development aligns with the community's vision. Goal 25 of the General Plan highlights the importance of maintaining Saturn Park as a destination business park for high-quality service industries and emerging jobs. The plan also stresses integrating the site with surrounding residential neighborhoods and protecting the community's character by avoiding disruptions or uses that would negatively impact the area.

The Land Use Element specifies that any zoning changes must be consistent with this goal, ensuring that development does not conflict with broader objectives of neighborhood preservation and enhancement. This includes avoiding overdevelopment that could increase traffic, noise levels, or diminish the residential feel of adjacent areas.

Furthermore, while Measure JJ—the voter-approved initiative that amended the General Plan and designated Saturn Park as "Innovation/Technology"—allowed for certain updates, it does not grant the city blanket authority to make major zoning changes without public input. By using Measure JJ to justify the proposed zoning changes, the city could be taking away our voice in the future of our

neighborhood. We, the community, voted for Measure JJ based on a specific vision for the area, and this zoning change would go against that vision without proper community involvement and environmental review.

If the city proceeds with this zoning change under the guise of Measure JJ, it would set a precedent where we no longer have a say in the future development of our neighborhood. This would undermine the democratic process and diminish the rights of the residents to influence the growth and character of the community.

Additionally, I am concerned that the proposed zoning change is based on the assumption that office work has diminished due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the city has not provided any data or factual evidence to support this claim. It appears that the decision is being driven by assumptions about reduced office demand rather than by concrete facts or research. If this assumption is incorrect, it could lead to unnecessary rezoning with long-term consequences for the community. Moreover, the city claims there is an 82% vacancy rate based on the amount of unoccupied building square footage, yet they are proposing to rezone 65 acres of land. The total land use area being discussed is 64.59 acres, consisting of 19 parcels, of which only 7 are vacant. While the 82% vacancy rate may accurately reflect unoccupied building space, it is misleading if the city is using this figure to justify changes in land use. This discrepancy raises significant questions about the accuracy of the data being presented to the public.

Additionally, failure to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)—specifically Section 21166 of the Public Resources Code, which mandates a supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) if there are substantial changes to a project that could lead to significant environmental effects—could result in legal challenges. Non-adherence to the Monterey Park General Plan, as well as violations of local zoning regulations under California Government Code Section 65860, may expose the city to lawsuits aimed at ensuring compliance. These legal proceedings may include injunctive relief, attorney's fees, and other remedies to safeguard the integrity of the process and the community's rights. I strongly urge the Council to take the necessary legal steps to avoid any such conflicts and ensure transparency and adherence to state and local laws.

In conclusion, I respectfully ask that the City Council follow the necessary guidelines before making any zoning changes to Saturn Park. I look forward to being involved in this process and hope the city will take the necessary steps to ensure a smooth, transparent transition while preserving the integrity of the surrounding neighborhood and upholding the community's right to shape its future. Thank you for your time and attention to these concerns.

Lucia & Eric Roybal

Please see attached letter

October 1, 2024

To: City of Monterey Park
City Council
320 W. Newmark Avenue
Monterey Park, CA 91754

From: Lucia and Eric Roybal
Homeowners/Residents

Re: Request for Compliance with CEQA and General Plan in Saturn Park Zoning Change

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed zoning change for Saturn Park, currently designated as "Innovation Technology." While I understand the city's interest in modifying the zoning to align with future development goals, it is crucial that the legal process is followed properly to comply with **California law** and **local regulations**.

First and foremost, **Saturn Park was not studied for land use changes in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**. According to the **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**, any proposed zoning change must be supported by an environmental review. Since Saturn Park was not evaluated for potential land use changes in the original EIR, the city needs to amend the report—either through a supplemental EIR or another CEQA process—to fully assess the potential effects of such changes.

The **Monterey Park General Plan** clearly emphasizes the need to **preserve neighborhoods** and areas surrounding Saturn Park, ensuring any development aligns with the community's vision. **Goal 25** of the General Plan highlights the importance of maintaining Saturn Park as a destination business park for high-quality service industries and emerging jobs. The plan also stresses integrating the site with surrounding residential neighborhoods and protecting the community's character by avoiding disruptions or uses that would negatively impact the area.

The **Land Use Element** specifies that any zoning changes must be consistent with this goal, ensuring that development does not conflict with broader objectives of **neighborhood preservation** and **enhancement**. This includes avoiding overdevelopment that could increase traffic, noise levels, or diminish the residential feel of adjacent areas.

Furthermore, while **Measure JJ**—the voter-approved initiative that amended the General Plan and designated Saturn Park as "Innovation/Technology"—allowed for certain updates, it **does not grant the city blanket authority to make major zoning changes without public input**. By using Measure JJ to justify the proposed zoning changes, the city could be taking away **our voice in the future of our neighborhood**. We, the community, voted for Measure JJ based on a specific vision

for the area, and this zoning change would go against that vision without proper community involvement and environmental review.

If the city proceeds with this zoning change under the guise of Measure JJ, it would set a precedent where **we no longer have a say in the future development of our neighborhood**. This would undermine the democratic process and diminish the rights of the residents to influence the growth and character of the community.

Additionally, I am concerned that the proposed zoning change is based on the assumption that office work has diminished due to the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the city has not provided any data or factual evidence to support this claim. It appears that the decision is being driven by assumptions about reduced office demand rather than by **concrete facts or research**. If this assumption is incorrect, it could lead to unnecessary rezoning with long-term consequences for the community.

Moreover, the city claims there is an **82% vacancy rate** based on the amount of unoccupied building square footage, yet they are proposing to rezone **65 acres of land**. The total land use area being discussed is **64.59 acres**, consisting of **19 parcels**, of which only **7 are vacant**. While the 82% vacancy rate may accurately reflect unoccupied building space, it is **misleading** if the city is using this figure to justify changes in **land use**. This discrepancy raises significant questions about the accuracy of the data being presented to the public.

Additionally, **failure to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**—specifically **Section 21166** of the **Public Resources Code**, which mandates a supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) if there are substantial changes to a project that could lead to significant environmental effects—could result in **legal challenges**. Non-adherence to the **Monterey Park General Plan**, as well as violations of local zoning regulations under **California Government Code Section 65860**, may expose the city to lawsuits aimed at ensuring compliance. These legal proceedings may include injunctive relief, attorney's fees, and other remedies to safeguard the integrity of the process and the community's rights. I strongly urge the Council to take the necessary legal steps to avoid any such conflicts and ensure transparency and adherence to state and local laws.

In conclusion, I respectfully ask that the City Council follow the necessary guidelines before making any zoning changes to Saturn Park. I look forward to being involved in this process and hope the city will take the necessary steps to ensure a smooth, transparent transition while preserving the integrity of the surrounding neighborhood and upholding the community's right to shape its future.

Thank you for your time and attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,
Lucia & Eric Roybal
Homeowners/Residents

Written Communication
Agenda Item No. 2A

From: [James Pugh](#)
To: [MPClerk](#)
Cc: [Berger, Karl H.](#); [Bryan Marsh](#); [Chris Flynn](#); [Scott Rynders](#)
Subject: Letter for City Council Meeting on October 2, 2024
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2024 2:15:39 PM
Attachments: [SPARC Recommendation - City Council Ltr - 10-1-24.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear City Clerk,

Please see the attached letter for the City Council hearing tomorrow. This is for Item 2A on the agenda – SPARC recommendation. Please add this letter to the administrative record.

Please kindly confirm receipt.

Thank you,

James E. Pugh | Partner
+1 213-617-4284 | direct
+1 949-877-4891 | mobile
JPugh@sheppardmullin.com | [Bio](#)

SheppardMullin

333 South Hope Street, 43rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1422
+1 213-620-1780 | main
www.sheppardmullin.com | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#)

Attention: This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

October 1, 2024

File Number: 89AF-371175

VIA E-MAIL

City Council
City of Monterey Park
320 W. Newmark Avenue
Monterey Park, CA 91754
Email: c/o City Clerk,
MPCLerk@montereypark.ca.gov

Re: SPARC Recommendation & Data Center Zoning in Saturn Park

Dear Honorable City Councilmembers,

We represent SDCF Monterey Park, LLC (“Applicant”) regarding its data center project (“Project”) located at 1977 Saturn Street (“Site”) in the City of Monterey Park (“City”). On October 2, 2024, we understand that the City Council will receive recommendations from the Saturn Park Advisory Review Committee (“SPARC”) about expanding the permitted land uses in the Saturn Park area. We generally concur with the SPARC recommendation to expand land uses for the Saturn Park area without eliminating any existing permitted land uses. Please consider our points below while deciding how to implement the SPARC recommendation.

Most importantly, SPARC concluded that the City should not eliminate any of the existing permitted uses in the Saturn Park area. Accordingly, any action that the City takes to update zoning in Saturn Park should maintain the permitted uses listed in Section 21.14 O-P—Office Professional of the Monterey Park Municipal Code (“MPMC”). The MPMC permits data center uses in Saturn Park, and the City has confirmed such uses are expressly permitted. Thus, the Applicant respectfully request that the City maintain the permitted uses currently allowed by the MPMC.

As a related issue, on August 12, 2024, the Applicant provided a suggested overlay zone for those portions of Saturn Park that are ideally situated (in close proximity to the Mesa Substation) for data center use. If the City chooses to update zoning in these areas, then we respectfully request that it consider implementing the overlay zone as a permissive zoning mechanism that is both consistent with the permitted uses allowed by MPMC Section 21.14 and can facilitate redevelopment of Saturn Park in a manner that materially strengthens the local economy.

In addition, the staff report notes that Urgency Ordinance 2246 allowed time for the SPARC to receive public input regarding recommended land uses for Saturn Park and implementation of the City’s land use element. The staff report also states that “[a]dditional extensions of the Urgency Ordinance 2246 may be desirable if the City were to pursue changes

October 1, 2024
Page 2

to the existing zoning regulations.” We disagree with that position. As you may recall, our position originally was that the City did not need to adopt an urgency ordinance because there was no current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, or welfare. We maintain our position that a moratorium is not necessary, especially now that SPARC has completed its process and found that community consensus prefers maintaining all currently permitted uses. Moreover, we see no legal or factual reason for the City to extend the moratorium as it relates to projects that are consistent with permitted uses in the MPMC. Therefore, we respectfully request that the City either allow the moratorium to expire naturally on October 31, 2024 or terminate it earlier. We intend to supplement our position at future hearings if the City Council does not act on the moratorium on October 2, 2024.

In closing, we thank the City for the opportunity to participate in the SPARC process. Likewise, the Applicant appreciates the City’s willingness to advance the Project and prepare it for City Council consideration. The Applicant is committed to improving the Site with a modern data center and thereby helping the City reactivate Saturn Park in a manner that delivers jobs, community benefits, and recurring tax revenues. We look forward to concluding the administrative review of the Project in a timely fashion.

Sincerely,



James E. Pugh
for SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

cc:

mpclerk@montereypark.ca.gov

kberger@bwslaw.com

Bryan Marsh, StratCap

Chris Flynn, StratCap

Scott Rynders, The Rynders Corporation

SMRH:4859-8156-9515.2

From: [Ngo, Vinh T.](#)
To: [caleb swyers](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Re: SPARC
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2024 11:09:18 AM

Thanks for the note Caleb. I have cc the City Clerk's office so that they can enter your below message re the SPARC agenda item.

Vinh
Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 2, 2024, at 10:51 AM, caleb swyers <caleb.swyers@gmail.com> wrote:

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hi Mr. Ngo,
I live in your district near La Loma Park, and I've been very happy with what you've accomplished as our City Council Member.

I'd like to be at the City Council meeting tonight for SPARC, but am unable to, so I'm emailing you what I emailed Jessica Serrano. In short, I agree with SPARC that the zoning should be updated to allow for diverse developments. Specific uses that I find persuasive are:

- Affordable Housing
- Parks/Playgrounds/Bike Park (similar to the Jeff Seymour Family Center in El Monte)
- Affordable Shopping
- I also have no problems with the original 2020 plan of an innovation/technology district.

At the very least, by updating the zoning, this huge plot of land has the potential to not only bring in revenue for Monterey Park, but also add to our quality of life.

Thanks so much!

--

Caleb Swyers
caleb.swyers@gmail.com
626.528.3404

August 27, 2024

To: City of Monterey Park Council Members
 320 Newmark Ave.
 Monterey Park, CA 91754

From: Lucia and Eric Roybal
 2020 Clover Dr.
 Monterey Park, CA 91755

Re: Opposition to Rezoning Saturn Park

Dear City of Monterey Park Council Members,

We are writing to express our concerns regarding the recent workshops, the summary presented, and the composition of the committee involved in the rezoning discussions for Saturn Park. As highlighted in our previous correspondence, the information disseminated during these sessions appears ambiguous and misleading. It is troubling that members of city council and the committee, who have a vested interest in advancing a specific agenda, were permitted to participate in these workshops. This inclusion not only skews public opinion but also directs the narrative towards a predetermined outcome.

To illustrate, the total land use area under discussion encompasses 64.59 acres, comprising 19 parcels, however only 8 of these parcels are genuinely vacant. Furthermore, if the data center (which is effectively approved) is excluded, the number of truly vacant parcels is reduced to 7, totaling 27.72 acres.

| TOTAL PARCELS | ACRES | VACANT PARCELS | ACRES | VACANT PARCELS NOT INCLUDING DATA CENTER | | VACANT PARCELS NOT INCLUDING DATA CENTER OR (TENANT IMPROVEMENT) | |
|---------------------------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|--|-------|--|-------|
| 5265025040 | 2.05 | | | | | | |
| 5265025041 | 0.24 | | | | | | |
| 5265025042 | 2.48 | | | | | | |
| 5265025043 | 2.04 | | | | | | |
| 5265025044 | 3.44 | | | | | | |
| 5265025045 | 0.62 | | | | | | |
| 5265025046 | 1.52 | | | | | | |
| 5265025047 | 1.19 | | | | | | |
| 5265025048 (Tenant improvement) | 3.5 | 5265025048 (Tenant improvement) | 3.5 | 5265025048 (Tenant improvement) | 3.5 | | |
| 5265025052 | 2.08 | | | | | | |
| 5265025056 | 1 | 5265025056 | 1 | 5265025056 | 1 | 5265025056 | 1 |
| 5265025058 | 5.55 | 5265025058 | 5.55 | 5265025058 | 5.55 | 5265025058 | 5.55 |
| 5265026054 (data center) | 15.83 | 5265026054 (data center) | 15.83 | | | | |
| 5265026055 | 1.38 | 5265026055 | 1.38 | 5265026055 | 1.38 | 5265026055 | 1.38 |
| 5265026058 | 2.64 | 5265026058 | 2.64 | 5265026058 | 2.64 | 5265026058 | 2.64 |
| 5265026059 | 2.89 | 5265026059 | 2.89 | 5265026059 | 2.89 | 5265026059 | 2.89 |
| 5265026060 | 7.97 | 5265026060 | 7.97 | 5265026060 | 7.97 | 5265026060 | 7.97 |
| 5265026061 | 6.29 | 5265026061 | 6.29 | 5265026061 | 6.29 | 5265026061 | 6.29 |
| 5265026064 | 1.88 | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 64.59 | | 47.05 | | 31.22 | | 27.72 |

Additionally, the workshop summary fails to accurately address the access routes to the proposed area. While it is correct that the site is directly accessible via Potrero Grande, Atlas Avenue, and Saturn Street, the assertion that there are "a series of three driveways from

Potrero Grande" providing direct access to the entire site is misleading. These driveways primarily serve the businesses located on the southern side of the site and offer only limited access to the rest of the area through parking lots. Moreover, Potrero Grande becomes a one-way street traveling west, just 700 feet from Atlas Avenue, significantly limiting access to the site from the east. Any alternative access routes would exacerbate the congestion on already overburdened neighborhood streets.



We also seek clarity on the data supporting the claims presented to the public. Has the city monitored the decline in occupancy at Saturn Park? Can the city provide studies or evidence demonstrating how the post-pandemic office market has evolved, particularly with the shift towards remote and hybrid work models as it pertains to Saturn Park? Is there evidence that supports the city's claim that changes have undoubtedly reduced the demand for office space and contributed to increased vacancy rates within Saturn Park?

The stated objective of the workshop is to "reimagine" Saturn Park, currently characterized by a lack of land use diversity, high vacancy rates, and underutilization. However, it appears that the city itself is contributing to the high vacancy rates by rejecting applications from prospective developers whose proposals do not align with the city's preferences.

City council intends to alter previously approved land uses based on a biased workshop, and disregards years of taxpayer-funded research that clearly indicate the city has sufficient space to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) under the current land use designations. The proposed changes to the Saturn Park Specific Plan and the corresponding zoning alterations seem to be driven by the interests of the city council rather than the needs and desires of the community. (Figure below, Housing Element 2023)

The City was allocated a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) of 5,257 units for the 2021-2029 Housing Element planning period. The sites inventory capacity analysis found that existing land use designations can accommodate the RHNA on vacant and underutilized land (see Chapter 4 Housing Resources for more information). There are adequate underutilized sites available to accommodate RHNA without requiring changes to the land use designations or zoning; however, an increase in density in the R-3 zone is necessary to accommodate lower income units and ensure



6-13

It is imperative to note that it is illegal for the City of Monterey Park to overturn the voter-approved General Plan. The city must adhere to the election results and maintain the General Plan as approved by the voters. The voices of the community must be respected, and no changes or deviations from the existing voter-approved General Plan should be permitted.

We urge the Monterey Park City Council to comply with the law and follow the proper legal procedures for updating the General Plan and related code requirements. Any proposed changes must be subject to review and approval by the voters, as required by law.

I also wish to request the workshops be recorded and made available to the public.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Lucia and Eric Roybal
Monterey Park Residents