

Parsley, Jennifer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2026 4:32 PM
To: cityclerk
Subject: Yosemite Avenue Mini-Storage Project

RE: Yosemite Avenue Mini-Storage Project
DATE: June 1, 2026

Mayor Serratto, Council Members, and Mr. McBride:

I'm very concerned about the 500-unit mini-storage project planned on Yosemite Avenue near Parsons. Here's why:

First, it's just a bad fit for the neighborhood's aesthetic and use. The area between the Promenade and McKee is filled almost exclusively with attractive housing and beautiful churches (the only business is the surgery center.) A mini-storage project in the middle of this area will stand out like a sore thumb.

Second, area neighbors have expressed overwhelming opposition to the project as evidenced by the 200 individuals who attended the Planning Commission and City Council hearings and the 179 who signed a petition against the project.

Third, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend that this project be denied.

As a member of Shepherd of the Valley Lutheran Church, I am very concerned that the City Council might approve this project. I have served on the Church Council for six years and on May 18 I termed out as Council President. Our council - which includes new president Barbara Ward, former Merced Mayor Mary Jo Knudsen, Chris Tomford, Alan Arnold, Susan Gumm, Mona Kowalzyck and Chris Love - is firmly against the project which would be located directly across the street from our church. Like our neighbors, we would prefer to see housing built in this predominantly residential area. I signed up to speak at the last council meeting but, as you know, the city attorney said the lack of quorum prevented any business from taking place.

I had huge concerns about why the project was allowed to continue despite the overwhelming public outcry plus the unanimous recommendation by the Planning Commission to deny it. I have been given to understand that this push and pull between the Planning Commission and the City Council is de rigueur. It shouldn't be. This project should be denied.

Best,

Marc Medefind

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of City of Merced -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Parsley, Jennifer

From: McBride, Scott
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 9:00 AM
To: Parsley, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Concerns Regarding June 8 Meeting and Upcoming Wainwright Mini Storage Review

Can we please have this as a written comment for this agenda item.

Thank you,
Scott

From: Dr. Lee Boese [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 12:04 AM
To: McBride, Scott <mcbrides@cityofmerced.org>
Cc: Cornwell, Craig <CornwellC@cityofmerced.gov>; Quintero, Frank <QuinteroF@cityofmerced.gov>
Subject: Concerns Regarding June 8 Meeting and Upcoming Wainwright Mini Storage Review

Dear Scott,

I am writing to express my disappointment and concern regarding the direction of the Wainwright Mini Storage project and the meeting held with City staff on June 8.

Neighborhood representatives attended the meeting expecting meaningful revisions in response to concerns previously raised by the Planning Commission and surrounding residents. Instead, the changes presented appeared limited to additional landscaping and a modest reduction in wall height, leaving the broader land-use compatibility issues largely unaddressed.

I am also concerned about the apparent disconnect between what many residents understood to be the City Council's direction and what staff indicates will be considered at the upcoming hearing. We look forward to reviewing the staff report when it becomes available. However, if the review is limited to landscaping and minor modifications, it is difficult to understand the purpose of the additional neighborhood engagement and project review that has occurred over the past several months.

Many long-time residents now believe their participation no longer matters. Public confidence in the process depends on residents feeling that their input is genuinely heard and considered. Unfortunately, several attendees left the June 8 meeting with the impression that the broader concerns raised by both residents and the Planning Commission were no longer receiving meaningful consideration.

Having been involved in Merced civic affairs for more than three decades, I was particularly disappointed by the tone of the meeting. Several attendees left feeling that their concerns were being dismissed rather than seriously considered. The discussion at times became unnecessarily adversarial, increasing frustration among residents who had taken time away from work and family to participate in good faith.

What concerns me most is that the attendees represented different backgrounds, personalities, and perspectives, yet many left with the same conclusion: that meaningful discussion of the larger land-use compatibility issues was no longer being encouraged. That level of consistency among participants

should give the City pause.

Residents invest significant personal time to participate in these proceedings. We attend meetings, review documents, meet with staff, and attempt to engage constructively because we care deeply about our community. That commitment deserves respect and meaningful consideration.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the City conduct and present a substantive land-use review before moving the project forward. That review should address the key compatibility concerns raised by the Planning Commission and neighboring residents, including the appropriateness of the use at this location, its relationship to surrounding residential properties, operational impacts, and consistency with applicable planning policies.

The public also deserves a clear explanation of how the City Council's direction has been incorporated into the City's analysis. At present, many residents are struggling to understand how the limited modifications presented thus far address the concerns that have been repeatedly raised throughout this process.

I remain hopeful that the City can restore confidence in the process by ensuring that the upcoming hearing fully addresses the broader land-use compatibility issues identified by both the Planning Commission and neighboring residents.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Dr. Lee Boese
Oakmont Estates Resident

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Parsley, Jennifer

From: ramiro macias [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2026 9:53 AM
To: Renteria, Valeria; cityclerk
Subject: Site Plan Review Permit #SP26-0018 and environmental review #26-0050

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Site Plan Review Permit #26-0018 and environmental review #26-0050

My name is Ramiro Macias, owner of [REDACTED] Merced, CA.

I am oppose with the continuation of this project. This project will cause homes to devaluate. It will also cause environmental hazard to the neighborhood. The facility owner will have no control of what type of infestation people will bring to the storage units.

I ask the City Council to please consider the repercussions of what this Self-Storage Facility will bring not only to the neighborhood, but the city. We can not allow the Self-Storage Facility to be build in a residential neighborhood.

Please reach out to me via email at [REDACTED] or by phone [REDACTED] if you have questions or would like more details.

Thank you for considering my opposition to building the Self-Storage Facility.

Sincerely,
Ramiro Macias

[REDACTED]
Merced, CA
Owner

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of City of Merced -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]