

February 2021

From: [Conder, Chuck](#)
To: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Cc: [Arreola, Frank](#); [Murray, David](#); [Kopaskie-Brown, Mary](#)
Subject: Interesting Letters
Date: Thursday, February 25, 2021 1:25:14 PM
Attachments: [External High Density - Low Income Tenants in Riverside.msg](#)
[External Dont Crowd Us Please!.msg](#)
[External Dont Crowd Us Please!.msg](#)
[External Dont Crowd Us Please!.msg](#)
[External Dont Crowd Us Please!.msg](#)

Here are the letters for your records. Thanks

Stay safer at home: Slow the spread of COVID-19 by wearing a face covering, maintaining physical distance, washing hands, and getting tested.

RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19

Kopaskie-Brown, Mary

From: Joe Gil <gil_joe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 10:38 AM
To: Conder, Chuck; info@responsiblegovernmentriverside.com
Subject: [External] Don't Crowd Us, Please!

Mr. Conder: I'm very concerned about proposed growth in Riverside. If you could please respond with your plan to limit the proposed HUGE growth, I would sincerely appreciate it. Grateful Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

Kopaskie-Brown, Mary

From: Carmen <sweetcr2004@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 10:46 AM
To: Conder, Chuck; info@responsiblegovernmentriverside.com
Subject: [External] Don't Crowd Us, Please!

Mr. Conder: I'm very concerned about proposed growth in Riverside. If you could please respond with your plan to limit the proposed HUGE growth, I would sincerely appreciate it. Grateful Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

Kopaskie-Brown, Mary

From: nowwhitefenders@yahoo.com
Sent: Sunday, February 21, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Conder, Chuck; info@responsiblegovernmentriverside.com
Subject: [External] Don't Crowd Us, Please!

Mr. Conder: I'm very concerned about proposed growth in Riverside. If you could please respond with your plan to limit the proposed HUGE growth, I would sincerely appreciate it.

Grateful Thanks.

Robert

Sent from my iPhone XI Plus

Kopaskie-Brown, Mary

From: tracy barnes <t_adamson@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2021 8:48 AM
To: Conder, Chuck; info@responsiblegovernmentriverside.com
Subject: [External] Don't Crowd Us, Please!

Mr. Conder: I'm very concerned about proposed growth in Riverside. If you could please respond with your plan to limit the proposed HUGE growth, I would sincerely appreciate it. Grateful Thanks.

Tracy Barnes

Kopaskie-Brown, Mary

From: Kerry Smith <Kerry.Smith@sce.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2021 9:59 AM
To: Conder, Chuck
Cc: Rosemarie Smith
Subject: [External] High Density - Low Income Tenants in Riverside

Mr. Conder,

Please do not let the politicians at our State Capita force the City of Riverside to permit developers to place between 18,000 to 22,000 high-density low income tenants. This problem should have been resolved years ago. It is not good for our city to create housing that will increase crime rates and allow these tenants to use drugs and alcohol unabated. It will also cause overcrowding, traffic congestion, diminish local jobs, and also damage our Riverside neighborhoods and our Riverside quality of life.

Thank You,
Kerry and Rose

Kerry L. Smith
SCE Incident and Problem Management
IT Outsourcing Mgmt, Sr Advisor
Service Management Office & Operations
Office: 626-543-8976
Cell: 626-260-2859



March 2021



City of Arts & Innovation

**Public Comment for March 18, 2021
Planning Commission Meeting**

Prepared by the Planning Division at 8:30 a.m. on March 18, 2021

Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>4. PLANNING CASE PR-2020-00067 (CUP, VR, VR): Proposal by David Goodwin of Goodwin's Organic Food & Drinks to consider the following entitlements: 1) Conditional Use Permit to permit the off-sale of alcoholic beverages (Type 20 - Off-Sale of Beer and Wine); 2) Variance to allow for the off-sale of alcohol within 600 feet of an assemblies of people non-entertainment and a public park (Islander Park); and 3) Variance to allow for the off-sale of alcohol within 1,000 feet of a business licensed by the State of California for the off-sale general alcoholic beverage sales with less than 15,000 square feet of gross floor area. The site consists of 0.91 acres and is developed with an existing market (Goodwin's Organic Food & Drinks), located at 191 Big Springs Road, situated on the north side of Big Springs Road between Watkins Drive and Mt. Vernon Avenue, in the CR-NC - Commercial Retail and Neighborhood Commercial Overlay Zones, in Ward 2. The Community and Economic Development Department recommends that the City Planning Commission determine that this project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities), as this project will not have a significant effect on the environment. Contact Planner: Candice Assadzadeh, Senior Planner, 951-826 5667, cassadzadeh@riversideca.gov</p>	<p>Kevin Dawson</p>	<p>University</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>I am concerned and object to approving new liquor sales at Goodwin's. We already have University Village Market and Liquor right next door to Goodwin, and it is already a problem. Every time we do trash pickup along Watkins, we find empty liquor bottles. I have personally observe customers, on a regular basis, buying single serving alcohol in paper bags, and then either consuming it in the parking lot, or driving off, looking like they would be consuming it while driving. This is not just beer/wine, but hard liquor. I toured the store today. They wall to the west as you walk in is solid hard liquor, with a large stock of small single serving hard liquor bottles. The refrigerated cases are about 2/3 liquor is various types. Over all, the stock is about 2/3 volume liquor. If we looked at dollar value, it's probably 90% liquor and 10% grocery.</p> <p>Our neighborhood is residential. There is a church on the other side of Goodwin, two UCR Child Development (day care) schools north on Watkins and RUSD has their STEM academy south off Watkins and Mt. Vernon.</p> <p>We have had numerous car accidents along Watkins, involving drivers veering off the road and into residents homes.</p> <p>I would like a review of University Village Market & Liquor, for any CUP or Variance with which they were granted as condition of their operation. I believe they were suppose to be mainly a market, but are now a full on liquor store. The signage around the building features liquor. The monument sign on the corner, had said University Liquor until a few years ago, when I had made an inquiry to the city about this same issue. Within a few weeks, the sign was changed to University Market. The signs in the parking lot, still say Parking for University Liquor.</p>
<p>5. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP - A workshop to update and inform the City Planning Commission about the Phase I General Plan Update - Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Environmental Justice Policies project</p>	<p>Alan Taxpayer</p>		<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Define environmental justice and what that has to with public safety</p>

Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>5. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP - A workshop to update and inform the City Planning Commission about the Phase I General Plan Update - Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Environmental Justice Policies project</p>	<p>Allen Partono</p>			<p>Dear Riverside City Council,</p> <p>Hello, I hope you are doing well! My name is Allen, and I wanted to list several recommendations with regards to the Housing Element that should be considered to make housing equitable to all residents in Riverside. They are:</p> <p>Stop Redlining Have 15-minute bus service on all major arterials Alessandro, van buren, Trautwein, Arlington, La Sierra, 3rd, MLK/14th, Iowa Avenue, Central Avenue, etc We want increase the # RHNA on Ward 4 What is the affordable housing RHNA breakdown of the various Ward? Intergenerational housing Don't count the ADU's towards the RHNA numbers and add that to ward 4 There is commercial and transportation around Van Buren/Washington that could be a good viable location for R-3 zoning as well. It is in Ward 4 In Ward 4, around Martin Luther King it's a commercial spot (jobs and near schools) as well that could be a good place to add housing In Ward 4, Victoria and Washington it's a site not identified that can be zoned for housing In Ward 4, a lot of land is zoned as agricultural but where is the farmworkers housing? The Riverside General Plan stated, in 2017, "The Municipal Code has established the Residential Agricultural Zone (RA-5) to provide areas where general agricultural uses can occur independently or in conjunction with a single-family residence. Given the few remaining agricultural jobs in the community, the need for housing for farmworkers in Riverside is very limited. Moreover, should a need exist, the housing need would be limited to year-round affordable housing rather than dormitory housing typically required for migrant farmworkers." (General Plan H t r - 4 7) As there is still a large lack of affordable housing and no farmworker housing, would it be possible to make some space available for people to live there?</p>
<p>5. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP - A workshop to update and inform the City Planning Commission about the Phase I General Plan Update - Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Environmental Justice Policies project</p>	<p>Kyle Sweeney</p>		<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Any development must plan for the future of our city. It needs to be insulated from the speculation that drives up prices and homelessness. It must be shielded from the gentrification that destroys communities.</p>
<p>5. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP - A workshop to update and inform the City Planning Commission about the Phase I General Plan Update - Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Environmental Justice Policies project</p>	<p>Lynn Heatley</p>		<p>Neutral</p>	<p>I just want to share with this committee and also with our City Council and other departments that I believe we need to seriously look in to ADUs to increase in neighborhoods to increase our housing options. There are many different companies that are doing ADUs/Tiny Homes/etc and if a plan is developed well, it could be a very viable option for housing that is needed in our city.</p> <p>Thank you, Lynn Heatley Ward 3 Nonprofit Director</p>

Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>5. HOUSING ELEMENT WORKSHOP - A workshop to update and inform the City Planning Commission about the Phase I General Plan Update - Housing Element, Public Safety Element and Environmental Justice Policies project</p>	<p>Ashton Davis</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Dear planning commission, Per census data, Ward 4 has the highest concentration of white residents in the city (upwards of 90% racial density in certain census tracts), the highest concentration of wealth, and the most expensive housing. Ward 4 is also has more open space for building than most other wards. It is unacceptable that the ward with the whitest and richest neighborhoods in the city has the least amount of allocated housing (by a wide margin). This is exactly how segregation was accomplished and perpetuated in the 20th century - after the fact zoning and fears of declining housing values (which is a myth) drive cities to perpetuate segregated living conditions and environmental racism.</p> <p>This planning commission must push back on this distribution. Ward four must make room, including routing of transportation, to accept and house lower income peoples and to build affordable housing.</p>

From: rania safi <yayaranja@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 7:35 AM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Public comment

What type of incentives will be offered to developers to encourage mixed income housing?

March 22, 2021

Mr. Matthew Taylor
Senior Planner
City of Riverside
Community and Economic Development Department - Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522

Riverside Housing Element Update: Comments on Draft Preferred Alternative Opportunity Sites Inventory and Proposed Zoning

Dear Mr. Taylor:

We are the owners of the 14.4-acre property, located on the northeast corner of Kansas and Massachusetts Avenues (the "Property"). We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the City's draft Preferred Alternative Opportunity Sites Inventory and Proposed Zoning.

We support the City's efforts to update its Housing Element and provide housing for people of all income levels and needs. We are concerned, however, about the proposed action to designate our Property as a preferred alternative for future residential housing.

As you are aware, the Property is zoned General Industrial (I) and is surrounded by active industrial uses that will continue in the future. Introducing homes among industrial uses will generate both compatibility and environmental justice concerns.

Equally important, the Property is presently being investigated and remediated for hazardous materials contamination, primarily volatile organic compounds, in the soil, soil vapor and groundwater, under the oversight of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board). Notably other properties in the immediate area have also gone through similar investigations and remediations underscoring the heavy industrial uses associated with the area.

Since the site was purchased in 2013, the Property owners have been working with the Water Board to complete characterization and remediate existing contamination on the site. That work is focused on remediating the site to achieve commercial and industrial use standards, consistent with underlying zoning.

A critical component of the remediation plan is to restrict the site's future use to commercial and industrial uses to protect human health and the environment, consistent with California Civil Code Section 1471. Sensitive uses, such as residential, schools, hospitals and day care centers, will be restricted. For all these reasons, zoning

Mr. Matthew Taylor
March 22, 2021
Page 2

the site as residential will result in a zoning designation for uses that are incompatible with the property's current and anticipated future environmental condition.


Additionally, the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Element states that an important Citywide goal is to preserve industrial land and avoid encroachments of incompatible land uses within proximity of industrial land (e.g., see Land Use and Urban Design Element LU-24 and LU-25.) The contemplated action would conflict with this important goal, further reduce the City's limited supply of industrial land, and jeopardize the already delicate jobs-housing balance that requires industrial areas to generate local employment opportunities.

In summary, we request that the Property be removed from consideration for future residential housing. Such proposed zoning is not consistent with existing conditions and ongoing remedial efforts.

We are looking forward to developing a first-class industrial project that is consistent with the environmental condition of the site, provides a significant upgrade to the existing improvements and respects the in-place zoning for the property and the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you very much for your consideration, and please let us know if we can be of assistance in this request.

Sincerely,



Kevin J. Staley
Managing Partner

cc: Mary Kopaskie-Brown, Community & Economic Development Director



City of Arts & Innovation

**Public Comment for March 23, 2021
City Council Meeting**

Prepared by the City Clerk's Office at 11 a.m. on March 23, 2021

Agenda Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>1. You are invited to participate by phone at (669) 900-6833, and enter Meeting ID: 931 4944 3969 to comment on Closed Sessions and any matters within the jurisdiction of the City Council. Press *9 to be placed in the queue to speak when the agenda item is called. Individuals in the queue will be prompted to unmute by pressing *6 to speak - Individual audience participation is limited to 3 minutes.</p>	<p>Malissa Mckeith</p>		<p>Neutral</p>	<p>Last week, I commented that RPU had awarded a \$90K contract to WSA above the \$750K they already received in 2018. This was not accurate. WSA has a \$750K "ceiling" on tasks which apparently did not include the (90 urban water management plan. Thanks Todd Corbin for the clarification. But the primary comment was that the City needs to integrated its 30/30 strategic plan into the urban water management plan which is due in July, leaving little time for outreach to the EJ, environmental and academic community. The RPU Commission does not have a member dedicated to climate issues and maintaining green space, and the RPU Commission operates without a clear mission to effectuate Council's directives. This is no one's fault but has evolved over time. A way to fix it is to have planning meetings with RPU and Council to set a clearer agenda.</p>
<p>7. Mobility and Infrastructure Committee recommends median opening and traffic signal installation at intersection of Magnolia Avenue and Tyler Street for safety enhancements to serve Northgate Gonzalez Market - 10391 Magnolia Avenue (Public Works) (Ward 6) (10-minute presentation)</p>	<p>Cynthia Mendoza-Collins</p>	<p>Arlington South</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Honorable Mayor Patricia Lock Dawson and members of Riverside City Council City of Riverside 3900 Main Street Riverside, CA 92501</p> <p>Subject: Item 7- Discussion Calendar- Proposed Midblock Traffic Signal into Northgate Gonzalez Market</p> <p>Dear Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:</p> <p>I write to urge you all to support the proposed median opening, traffic signal, and safety enhancement installation project on Magnolia Avenue west of Tyler Street to serve Northgate Gonzalez Market which is located at 10391 Magnolia Avenue.</p> <p>As a nearby resident and customer of Northgate Gonzalez Market, it is important to have safe accessibility to this property. Northgate Gonzalez Market has been an asset to not only the La Sierra area but other nearby areas which customers would benefit from this median opening by allowing them to have the opportunity to turn left (coming east on Magnolia) into this property to do business at not only at Northgate, but other businesses in that area as well.</p> <p>The safety enhancements proposed by Northgate Gonzalez Market at Tyler and Magnolia would also benefit the safety issues currently taking place at this intersection, especially with increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>It is in the best interest of all involved to work together to provide accessibility and safety in order to maintain a positive relationship with this business.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Cindy Mendoza-Collins Ward 5</p>



City of Arts & Innovation

Public Comment for March 23, 2021

City Council Meeting

Prepared by the City Clerk's Office at 11 a.m. on March 23, 2021

Agenda Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>7. Mobility and Infrastructure Committee recommends median opening and traffic signal installation at intersection of Magnolia Avenue and Tyler Street for safety enhancements to serve Northgate Gonzalez Market - 10391 Magnolia Avenue (Public Works) (Ward 6) (10-minute presentation)</p>	<p>Norma Barles</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>March 23, 2021</p> <p>Mayor Patricia Lock Dawson and Members of the Riverside City Council: Request Council Support: Northgate Gonzalez Market Midblock Traffic Signal Dear Honorable Mayor and Members of the Riverside City Council:</p> <p>The Board of Directors of the Riverside LULAC of Riverside Chapter unanimously approved to request your support of Item 7 in today's Riverside City Council agenda. Item 7 is a recommendation from our city Mobility and Infrastructure Committee to construct a median opening and traffic signal installation on Magnolia Avenue west of Tyler Street with safety enhancements at intersection of Magnolia Avenue and Tyler Street to serve Northgate Gonzalez Market. LULAC of Riverside recognizes this recommendation as a benefit to the residents and customers of the area and that it will bring the proper safety precautions and enhance the accessibility of the area. We also recognize these traffic enhancements will improve access to the Northgate Gonzales Market which has been a success in our city collaborating with community organizations and providing a valuable service to all in the short time they have been in Riverside.</p> <p>We encourage your yes vote to item 7.</p> <p>LULAC Riverside 3190 is a charter council of National LULAC, the largest and oldest Hispanic organization in the United States. LULAC advances the economic condition, educational attainment, political influence, housing, health and civil rights of Hispanic Americans through community-based programs operating at more than 1,000 LULAC councils nationwide.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,</p> <p>Norma Barles, President LULAC Council 3190 951-897-8670</p> <p>Francisco SolÃ¡ Public Information Officer LULAC Council 3190 951-236-0951</p>
<p>9. General Plan 2025 implementation Annual Progress Report for submittal to Governor's Office of Planning and Research and California Department of Housing and Community Development (Community and Economic Development) (All Wards) (15-minute presentation)</p>	<p>Malissa Mckeith</p>		<p>Neutral</p>	<p>The general plan is being developed piece meal with the housing component developed without regard to other competing goals. I appreciate that this is the result of State mandates on housing, but those mandates are not realistic given the lack of jobs to support 18000 new units. Unless these plans are meaningless, they signal a commitment toward growth beyond what may not be economically sustainable or environmentally wise. for example, building homes at the intersection of the 91 and 60 puts families in the unhealthiest air quality in the country given the diesel trucks. Analyzing these issues in isolation is confusing and costly. Looking forward to staff providing better context.</p>

April 2021

From: Janice Rooths <antiracistriverside@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 9:45 AM
To: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>
Cc: Maribel Nunez <maribel@inlandequitypartnership.org>; Jeff Green <jeffgreen.cap@gmail.com>; Elizabeth.m@ccaej.org; Damien O'Farrell <damien@parkviewlegacy.org>; Ashton Davis <ashton@adavis.me>; Freya Foley <ffoley7955@aol.com>; Rose mayes <rosemayes@fairhousing.net>; Tanya Humphery <tanya.farmgirl@gmail.com>; janet.b@ccaej.org; Ana Gonzalez <ana.g@ccaej.org>
Subject: Re: [External] Re: 4/22/21 Workshop - Request

Thanks Matt! We know it's a good deal of work but would certainly bring significant value to the table for us all. I have Human Relations Commission tomorrow but looking forward to a good workshop no less!!!



Our Mission is to Empower Individuals, Organizations, & Communities to Eliminate Racism

On Wed, Apr 21, 2021 at 9:36 AM Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov> wrote:

Hi Janice and Maribel

We are looking into some options for this. Thank you for the suggestion!

Matthew Taylor | Senior Planner

951.826.5944 | mtaylor@riversideca.gov

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street | 3rd Floor | Riverside 92522

From: Maribel Nunez <maribel@inlandequitypartnership.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 7:35 PM
To: Janice Rooths <antiracistriverside@gmail.com>
Cc: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>; Jeff Green <jeffgreen.cap@gmail.com>; Elizabeth.m@ccaej.org; Damien O'Farrell <damien@parkviewlegacy.org>; Ashton Davis <ashton@adavis.me>; Freya Foley

<ffoley7955@aol.com>; Rose mayes <rosemayes@fairhousing.net>; Tanya Humphery <tanya.farmgirl@gmail.com>; janet.b@ccaaj.org; Ana Gonzalez <ana.g@ccaaj.org>
Subject: [External] Re: 4/22/21 Workshop - Request

I want to include CCAEJ in the email thread

Maribel

On Tue, Apr 20, 2021, 7:22 PM Janice Rooths <antiracistriverside@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Matt,

I don't know if you're doing this already but we were wondering if you will have the <https://oag.ca.gov/environment/sb1000> CalEnviroScreen Pollution Indicator Maps overlaid on our current RHNA map for the workshop on 4/22. It would certainly be helpful for us. Thanks so much!

Thrive!

Janice



Our Mission is to Empower Individuals, Organizations, & Communities to Eliminate Racism

Keep Riverside healthy: Wear a face covering, maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19

From: [Elizabeth Pinney Muglia](#)
To: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Cc: [Janice Rooths](#); [Maribel Nunez](#); [Jeff Green](#); [Damien O'Farrell](#); [Ashton Davis](#); [Freya Foley](#); [Tanya Humphery](#); [janet.b@ccaaj.org](#); [Ana Gonzalez](#); [Murray, David](#); [Kopaskie-Brown, Mary](#)
Subject: Re: [External] Re: 4/22/21 Workshop - Request
Date: Thursday, April 22, 2021 3:42:21 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Matt,

Thanks for all your work!

Maribel asked me to give you a heads up on some of the EJ questions or comments that may come up tonight. I know some are sensitive, especially around the voter approved initiatives.

- What policies currently exist that address environmental justice (EJ), particularly related to air and water quality in disadvantaged communities?
- What tools are used to identify EJ disadvantaged communities?
- How are existing policies compared to advocacy group recommendations or similar policies in other jurisdictions?
- What mechanism or department is in place to enforce EJ policies?
- Are there plans to have a public meeting with a review of EJ efforts in the city?
- Recommendation: Mark on a map any sites in the city that are contaminated and ensure the proposed sites are not in proximity/have proper buffer
- Recommendation: Use CalEnviroScreen to map EJ communities and consider zoning overlays to prevent future industrial uses in these communities and protect the residents from further degradation of air quality and built environment.
- Question: In order to address limitations in broad swaths of Ward 4, consider reviewing Prop R and Measure C - are these truly being used agriculturally or protecting wealthy communities by protecting the practice of exclusionary zoning? Could SB 330 be used as an opportunity to open up some areas for multifamily zoning in these voter approved "moratoriums" on multifamily housing uses?
- Recommendation: More city engagement/initiative to fund (bring state funds and appropriate city funds) additional public transit and expansion of transit corridors so that spreading housing doesn't lead to isolated low income communities for those without cars and also doesn't continue to have a sprawl effect that creates more vehicle traffic and air pollution.

We look forward to the workshop!

--

Liz Pinney-Muglia (she/her)

Policy Director


Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice

C: (951) 543-1740 | E: elizabeth.m@ccaaj.org | W: <https://www.ccaaj.org>

On Thu, Apr 22, 2021 at 10:29 AM Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov> wrote:

| Good morning Janice

We have updated the [3D WebMap](#) of our Housing Opportunity Sites to include some of the additional information as you suggested:



For this evening's meeting, we will be focused on discussing the Environmental Impact Report process and topics of analysis; however, if time allows, we may be able to pull these maps up to share for discussion purposes. If not, we will be announcing a series of events in the coming months where we can focus on these maps and related themes more intently.

I hope this is helpful – please let me know if you have any further questions. Thank you!

Matthew Taylor | Senior Planner

951.826.5944 | mtaylor@riversideca.gov

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street | 3rd Floor | Riverside 92522

May 2021

From: Jonny Miller <jonnymillerjr@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 1, 2021 7:22:52 PM
To: Arseo, Eva <EArsseo@riversideca.gov>; Edwards, Erin <EEwards@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Plascencia, Gaby <GPlascencia@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Housing & Homelessness Committee Meeting, Mon., 5/1

City council members, I demand that you serve the interests of the people of Riverside, not the greedy developers. Along with the Riverside community and local activist groups, I propose the following:

-
- Explore recent legislation that would provide zoning flexibility like SB 330
- “Housing Crisis Act” to address limitations in broad swaths of Ward 4
-
- Need to move past density being equated to affordable housing. This is using
- the state's density descriptor of affordability. After the opportunity sites zoning, the city creates policies and selects priority projects that lead to permanent affordability housing like co ops,
- community land trust.
-
- Look for funding (including from city budget) to go to RTA for as many lines
- as possible at 15 minute service or better. Additional stops would be the secondary ask.
- Create frequent service on more transportation corridors throughout the city that can open for more RHNA zoning
- throughout the city
-
- Eliminate single family zoning, we are running out of space as our population
- grows!
-
- Strengthen a rent control ordinance far beyond Costa-Hawkins:
-
- We need the city to play an active role for its residents to build community
- wealth that translates to permanent affordability housing projects (co-ops, community land trust, condos and etc).
-
- The city needs to incentivize and remove barriers for housing zoning and development.
-
-
- To make sure houses get built, incentivize developers by lowering fees for on
- site construction and increasing fees for off site construction.

-
- Stop concentration of poverty—mixed-income housing/inclusionary zoning is the best approach, 75% market rate and 25% affordable requirement should be the standard.
-
- Existing warehousing and logistics regulation to protect residential and public spaces from negative effects of industrial uses don't go far enough - the setback standards for warehouses and logistics abutting residential zones and public facilities aren't even 300 feet - a good standard would be 1,000 feet.
-
- Use CalEnviroScreen to map Environmental Justice communities and consider zoning overlays to prevent future industrial uses in these communities and
- protect the residents from further degradation of air quality and built environment.

--

Thank you for your time.

-

Jonny Miller



“Rise free from care before the dawn and seek new adventures.

Let noon find you at other lakes,

And night find you everywhere at home...

Grow wild according to thy nature.”

– **Henry David Thoreau, *Walden***

cc Mayor
 City Council
 City Manager
 City Attorney
 ACMs
 DCM
 C&ED Director



City of Arts & Innovation

**Public Comment for May 3, 2021
Housing and Homelessness Committee Special Meeting
Prepared by the City Clerk's Office at 2:37 p.m. on May 3, 2021**

Agenda Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>2. City's Phase 1 General Plan, Housing, Public Safety, and Environmental Justice policies updates - Housing Element policies and actions (All Wards)</p> <p>Mary Kopaskie-Brown, City Planner Matthew Taylor, Senior Planner</p>	<p>Janice Rooths</p>		<p>Support</p>	<p>From: Antiracist Riverside in solidarity with Inland Equity Partnership, Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice, and Other Community Members To: Housing & Homelessness Committee Members:</p> <p>We are concerned about racial and economic segregation in the City of Riverside particularly the concentration of whites and wealth in Ward 4, how current zoning, policies, & designated transportation corridors in the Housing Element perpetuate the racial and economic segregation while ensuring density does not increase in Ward 4, and how the focus of this housing element should be developing the types of housing options that build wealth for those who will live in the housing especially very low through middle income residents.</p> <p>You will also be receiving an email with more detail that could not be included here due to space limitations.</p> <p>Thank you for your dedication to quality of life in the City of Riverside. We hope you can also appreciate ours!</p> <p>In Solidarity towards a Better Riverside!</p> <p>Antiracist Riverside</p>

Date: HHC 5-3-2021
Item No.: 1

From: Janice Rooths <antiracistriverside@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 6:09 AM

To: Edwards, Erin <EEwards@riversideca.gov>; Melendrez, Andy <ASMelendrez@riversideca.gov>; Plascencia, Gaby <GPlascencia@riversideca.gov>

Cc: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Housing Element Change Requests for Consideration in Committee 5/3/21

From: Antiracist Riverside in solidarity with Inland Equity Partnership, Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice, and Other Community Members

To: Housing & Homelessness Committee Members:

We are concerned about racial and economic segregation in the City of Riverside particularly the concentration of whites and wealth in Ward 4, how current zoning, policies, & designated transportation corridors in the Housing Element perpetuate the racial and economic segregation while ensuring density does not increase in Ward 4, and how the focus of this housing element should be developing the types of housing options that build wealth for those who will live in the housing especially very low through middle income residents.

The following are requested changes that we believe should be included in the Housing Element plans as well as the Inclusionary Housing policy:

=Explore recent legislation that would provide zoning flexibility like SB 330 "Housing Crisis Act" to address limitations in broad swaths of Ward 4 - if so, consider reviewing Prop R and Measure C - are these truly being used agriculturally or protecting wealthy communities by protecting the practice of through exclusionary zoning.

=Need to move past density being equated to affordable housing. This is using the state's density descriptor of affordability. When projects are being considered, Density bonuses are used for incentives. In seeing higher density housing projects, will not always translate as a marker for affordability. After the opportunity sites zoning, the city creates policies and selects priority projects that lead to permanent affordability housing like co ops, community land trust.

=Look for funding (including from city budget) to go to RTA for as many lines as possible at 15 minute service or better. Additional stops would be the secondary ask.

=Goal is to create frequent service on more transportation corridors throughout the city that can open for more RHNA zoning throughout the city (including Ward 4)

=Eliminate single family zoning, we are running out of space as our population grows!

=Strengthen a rent control ordinance far beyond Costa-Hawkins.

=We need the city to play an active role for its residents to build community wealth that translates to permanent affordability housing projects (co-ops, community land trust, condos and etc).

cc Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
DCM
C&ED Director

=The city needs to incentivize and remove barriers for housing zoning and development. Existing in-leiu and density bonus incentives are optional and ineffective. Affordable set asides should be mandatory at least 25% and any fees collected should be directed to subsidizing affordable housing and neighborhood improvements in areas with existing affordable housing that is concentrated or segregated from higher income neighborhoods.

=To make sure houses get built, incentivize developers by lowering fees for on site construction and increasing fees for off site construction. Fees that come from off site construction should be restricted funds to build affordable housing.

=Stop concentration of poverty—mixed-income housing/inclusionary zoning is the best approach, 75% market rate and 25% affordable requirement should be the standard

=Existing warehousing and logistics regulation to protect residential and public spaces from negative effects of industrial uses don't go far enough - the setback standards for warehouses and logistics abutting residential zones and public facilities aren't even 300 feet - a good standard would be 1,000 feet

=Use CalEnviroScreen to map Environmental Justice communities and consider zoning overlays to prevent future industrial uses in these communities and protect the residents from further degradation of air quality and built environment.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

In Solidarity for a Better Riverside!



Our Mission is to Empower Individuals, Organizations, & Communities to Eliminate Racism


White

Black

Race and Ethnicity





Percentage of the total population.
Scope: population of California and Riverside

■ Riverside ■ California



Count number of members in ethno-racial group
¹ non-Hispanic ² excluding black and Asian Hispanics

#1



Hispanic


Asian

Map of Food Stamps by Tract in Riverside

Food Stamps Food Stamps by Tract

#6

Percentage of households (%):



Map of Household Income by Tract in Riverside

Median

20th Percentile



Mean of the Top 5%

Gini Index


Median Household Income by Tract

#16

Median household income (\$):



Riverside Poverty by Race



Average

Show Source

13.93%

Overall Poverty Rate

12.94%

Male Poverty Rate

14.92%

Female Poverty Rate

Name	Total	In Poverty ▼	Poverty Rate
Hispanic	169,965	26,262	15.45%
Other	69,450	12,077	17.39%
White	93,493	8,663	9.27%
Black	19,088	4,045	21.19%
Asian	21,302	3,414	16.03%
Multiple	15,041	2,209	14.69%
Native	2,617	314	12.00%
Islander	825	125	15.15%

From: [Marven Norman](#)
To: [Janice Rooths](#)
Cc: [Edwards, Erin](#); [Melendrez, Andy](#); [Plascencia, Gaby](#); [Taylor, Matthew](#); [Zelinka, Al](#)
Subject: [External] Re: Housing Element Change Requests for Consideration in Committee 5/3/21
Date: Monday, May 3, 2021 11:52:27 AM

I think it might be worth drawing more attention to the fact that the only group that's below the average poverty rate is white (and native, but that's a much smaller portion of the Riverside population), adding another dimension and urgency to the fact that Ward 4 is whiter than the city overall while getting the smallest allotment for housing.

Cheers,

Marven E. Norman (he/him), Policy Specialist

Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice

| C: (951) 543-1743 | E: marven.n@ccaaj.org | W: <https://www.ccaaj.org>

On Mon, May 3, 2021 at 6:08 AM Janice Rooths <antiracistriverside@gmail.com> wrote:

From: Antiracist Riverside in solidarity with Inland Equity Partnership, Center for Community Action & Environmental Justice, and Other Community Members

To: Housing & Homelessness Committee Members:

We are concerned about racial and economic segregation in the City of Riverside particularly the concentration of whites and wealth in Ward 4, how current zoning, policies, & designated transportation corridors in the Housing Element perpetuate the racial and economic segregation while ensuring density does not increase in Ward 4, and how the focus of this housing element should be developing the types of housing options that build wealth for those who will live in the housing especially very low through middle income residents.

The following are requested changes that we believe should be included in the Housing Element plans as well as the Inclusionary Housing policy:

=Explore recent legislation that would provide zoning flexibility like SB 330 "Housing Crisis Act" to address limitations in broad swaths of Ward 4 - if so, consider reviewing Prop R and Measure C - are these truly being used agriculturally or protecting wealthy communities by protecting the practice of through exclusionary zoning.

=Need to move past density being equated to affordable housing. This is using the state's density descriptor of affordability. When projects are being considered, Density bonuses are used for incentives. In seeing higher density housing projects, will not always translate as a marker for affordability. After the opportunity sites zoning, the city creates policies and selects priority projects that lead to permanent affordability housing like co ops, community land trust.

=Look for funding (including from city budget) to go to RTA for as many lines as possible at 15 minute service or better. Additional stops would be the secondary ask.

=Goal is to create frequent service on more transportation corridors throughout the city that can open for more RHNA zoning throughout the city (including Ward 4)

=Eliminate single family zoning, we are running out of space as our population grows!

=Strengthen a rent control ordinance far beyond Costa-Hawkins.

=We need the city to play an active role for its residents to build community wealth that translates to permanent affordability housing projects (co-ops, community land trust, condos and etc).

=The city needs to incentivize and remove barriers for housing zoning and development. Existing in-leiu and density bonus incentives are optional and ineffective. Affordable set asides should be mandatory at least 25% and any fees collected should be directed to subsidizing affordable housing and neighborhood improvements in areas with existing affordable housing that is concentrated or segregated from higher income neighborhoods.

=To make sure houses get built, incentivize developers by lowering fees for on site construction and increasing fees for off site construction. Fees that come from off site construction should be restricted funds to build affordable housing.

=Stop concentration of poverty—mixed-income housing/inclusionary zoning is the best approach, 75% market rate and 25% affordable requirement should be the standard

=Existing warehousing and logistics regulation to protect residential and public spaces from negative effects of industrial uses don't go far enough - the setback standards for warehouses and logistics abutting residential zones and public facilities aren't even 300 feet - a good standard would be 1,000 feet

=Use CalEnviroScreen to map Environmental Justice communities and consider zoning overlays to prevent future industrial uses in these communities and protect the residents from further degradation of air quality and built environment.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

In Solidarity for a Better Riverside!



Our Mission is to Empower Individuals, Organizations, & Communities to Eliminate Racism

From: Allen Partono <apart003@ucr.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 3, 2021 3:10 PM
To: Arseo, Eva <EARseo@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Housing and Homelessness committee meeting comments

To whom it may concern,

Hello, I hope you are doing well! My name is Allen, and I wanted to submit some recommendations for the committee meeting:

- First, the city needs to incentivize and remove barriers to housing zoning and development. Existing in-lieu and density bonus incentives are optional and ineffective. Affordable set-asides should be mandatory at least 25% and any fees collected should be directed to subsidizing affordable housing and neighborhood improvements in areas with existing affordable housing that is concentrated or segregated from higher-income neighborhoods.
- Second, to make sure houses get built, incentivize developers by lowering fees for on-site construction and increasing fees for off-site construction. Fees that come from off-site construction should be restricted funds to build affordable housing.
- Finally, stop concentration of poverty—mixed-income housing/inclusionary zoning is the best approach, 75% market rate, and 25% affordable requirement should be the standard.

Thank you so much for having these meetings to consider these points. I hope you all will take these recommendations so we can improve the quality of life here in the city of Riverside.

Best Regards,

Allen Partono (He, Him, His)
MPH Candidate | UC Berkeley
BS Bioengineering | Magna Cum Laude | UCR Class of 2019

cc Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
DCM
C&ED Director

From: Connie Decker <conniedecker08@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 11:48 AM
To: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>
Subject: Re: [External] HOUSING & HOMELESS Committee

Yes, please Matt!!

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On May 6, 2021, at 11:09 AM, Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov> wrote:

Hi Connie,

Thank you for your comments – I noticed that I was the only recipient of this email. Would you like me to forward this to the City Clerk so that it can be distributed to the Council Housing & Homelessness Committee Members as well?

Thanks!

Matthew Taylor | Senior Planner
951.826.5944 | mtaylor@riversideca.gov

City of Riverside
Community & Economic Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street | 3rd Floor | Riverside 92522

From: Connie Decker <conniedecker08@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 9:13 PM
To: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] HOUSING & HOMELESS COMMITTEEhich

May 5, 2021

Matt Taylor
City of Riverside
Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

As a community member of the Housing and Homeless Committee, I have been asked by Matt Taylor to submit my thoughts so far.

I have talked to City Council members for years about our homeless and the problems that come with them. Like so much of our community, I don't want drugs, danger, vagrants, crime, and all the rest in my community. I also don't want any project that will decrease the property values for which we have worked so hard. This doesn't make me a heartless individual; I am raising a family and protecting my investment.

I am opposed to changing the zoning regulations in residential communities. They were put there for a reason. In my Victoria Woods neighborhood, I am engaged in the opposition to the building of 44 condos on the corner of Fairview and Central. Now I am told that the developer was granted various concessions by making it a "senior affordable community". The developer, on a video discussion with neighbors, indicated that this **44 Condos** project is one of the identified parcels for the HOUSING & HOMELESS! We have been told by the Baptist Church across the street from this project that they have 8 acres on which a developer will build hundreds of apartment units. The traffic impact in and out of Victoria Woods will be considerable. We shouldn't have to fight for our community! I could spend several pages explaining the issues we have with these projects, but I'm going to try to not wander.

As I join these zoom meetings with the committee, I understand that I am supposed to supply concerns of residents. While I understand the transportation concerns, why can't we build transportation routes farther out of the city, where more residential communities could be built?

I am happy to discuss this with any of you.

Connie Decker
5323 Cornwall Ave.

Riverside, CA 92506 we have worked so hard for. This doesn't make me a heartless individual; I am raising a family and protecting my investment.

I am opposed to changing the zoning regulations in residential communities. They were put there for a reason. In my Victoria Woods neighborhood, I am engaged in the opposition to the building of 44 condos on the corner of Fairview and Central. Now I am told that the developer was granted various concession by making it a "senior affordable community. The developer, on a video discussion with neighbors, indicated that this **44 Condos** is one of the identified parcels for the HOUSING & HOMELESS! We have been told by the Baptist Church across the street from this project they have 8 acres on which a developer will build hundreds of apartment units. The traffic impact in and out of Victoria Woods will be considerable. We shouldn't have to fight for our community! I could spend several pages explaining the issues we have with this project, but I'm going to try to the topic.

As I join these zoom meetings with the committee, I understand that I am supposed to provide community input. I see that Matt is trying to meet the obligation that the state has given. I just don't accept that you can put the homeless problem on the backs of residents. While I

understand the transportation concerns, why can't we build transportation routes farther out of the city, where more residential communities could be built?

I am happy to discuss this with any of you.

Connie Decker
5323 Cornwall Ave.
Riverside, CA 92506
conniedecker08@gmail.com

cc Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
DCM
C&ED Director



LAW OFFICE OF
MICHAEL V. HESSE
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

May 27, 2021

Matthew Taylor
Riverside City Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522

~E-Mail & U.S. Mail ~

RECEIVED

JUN - 3 2021

Re: Phase 1 General Plan Update: 6th Cycle Housing Element

Community & Economic
Development Department

Dear Mr. Taylor:

We own and occupy the office located at 4515 Tyler Street, Riverside, California. Our property includes .86 acre and a 70-year-old office building. We have owned and occupied the office since 1989.

We received your May 21, 2021, Notice of Proposed Rezoning—City of Riverside 6th Cycle Housing Element Update. The proposal includes a change of zone to Mixed Use-Village (“MU-V”) for several parcels on Tyler Street, including ours. The proposed rezoning is outstanding—and long overdue. The properties along Tyler Street north of Hole Avenue have deteriorated in the last decade for a variety of reasons. The proposed rezoning will encourage and make it economically feasible to redevelop this area. This will result in more desirable residential units, upgraded commercial structures and an increased tax base for the city.

Thank you very much for your thoughtful and well-designed land use plan.

Please contact us if we can be of any assistance in moving your proposed rezoning forward.

MICHAEL V. HESSE,
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

By: 
Michael V. Hesse

MVH/mp

June 2021

Date: 6-8-21

Item No. 1

From: Paul Mueller <pablopo@charter.net>
Sent: Friday, June 4, 2021 5:06 PM
To: Arseo, Eva <EArseo@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] To All Council Members

My wife and I wish to express, in the strongest possible terms, our opposition to the creation of "Opportunity Sites" within our city. The resultant congestion, additional traffic and negative impact upon residential neighborhoods is not in the best interests of your constituents. While we are specifically opposed to the "44 Condos" project, we consider all new "high density" housing to be detrimental. Please act on behalf of those who have elected you and vote no on this terrible proposal.

Yours truly,

Paul and Christine Mueller

2337 Elsinore Rd.

Riverside

From: [Jonathan Shardlow](#)
To: [Kopaskie-Brown, Mary](#); [Brenes, Patricia](#)
Cc: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Subject: [External] 3315 Rezoning Proposal
Date: Thursday, June 10, 2021 1:58:50 PM

Mary and Patricia,

Our office represents the owners of 3315 Van Buren. I understand the site is being considered for rezoning to MU-V – Mixed Use Village. The owners are fourth generation business owners who have operated since 1945 and they have been in recent discussions in connection with lessees who plan to operate the property with updated uses and uses the City may deem more favorable. Rezoning the property would have the opposite impact by requiring the property to continue the existing use to preserve their non-conforming status. (if the rezone occurs). The site is adjacent to a freeway and a railway, and in a location the environmental justice community has fought against commercial/residential uses. The site is also surrounded by existing industrial uses. As with the Northside, and those industrial property owners, I believe the City acknowledged a zoning designation, such as Mixed-Use Village would be a *slow* transition. Our office is currently processing high density residential mixed use with the downtown specific plan and believe there are better sites to designate for RHNA purposes.

The City has not also formally made a determination as to the current use being legally non-conforming which would be a good first step. It is also my understanding the City has taken a broad interpretation of a new use as potential lessees appear to be able to continue the new use without the need of a MCUP. (If the owner is required to file for a MCUP, time would be of the essence). For example, in my opinion, the current operation of a retail, sales, and manufacturing business is like for like with an equipment rental business. Nevertheless, there are several creative ways to obtain resolution, with our preferred resolution of keeping the current zoning. Are you available for a quick call/meeting to talk about resolutions?

Jon

Jonathan Shardlow
Shareholder

Gresham Savage Nolan & Tilden, PC
550 East Hospitality Lane, Suite 300
San Bernardino, CA 92408
Office: (909) 890-4499 Ext. 1770
Fax: (909) 890-9877
www.GreshamSavage.com
jonathan.shardlow@greshamsavage.com

1. Privileged and Confidential Communication. The information contained in this email and any attachments may be confidential or subject to the attorney client privilege or attorney work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, you may not use, disclose, print, copy or disseminate the same. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender and destroy all copies of this message.

2. Notice re Tax Advice. Any tax advice contained in this email, including any attachments, is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, by you or any other recipient for the purpose of (a) avoiding penalties that may otherwise be imposed by the IRS, or (b) supporting, promoting, marketing, or recommending any transaction or matter to any third party.

3. Transmission of Viruses. Although this communication, and any attached documents or files, are believed to be free of any virus or other defect, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free, and the sender does not accept any responsibility for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use.

4. Security of Email. Electronic mail is sent over the public internet and may not be secure. Thus, we cannot guarantee the privacy or confidentiality of such information.



City of Arts & Innovation

**Public Comment for June 15, 2021
City Council Meeting
Prepared by the City Clerk's Office at 11 a.m. on June 15, 2021**

Agenda Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>20. You are invited to participate by phone at (669) 900-6833, and enter Meeting ID: 926 9699 1265 to comment on Consent Calendar items and any matters within the jurisdiction of the City Council. Press *9 to be placed in the queue to speak when the agenda item is called. Individuals in the queue will be prompted to unmute by pressing *6 to speak - Individual audience participation is limited to 3 minutes.</p>	Nancy Magi		Oppose	<p>I remain concerned that the addresses of the Opportunity Sites are not provided to citizens in a user-friendly way. We need a list of these sites by address. When will these lists be available? .01% of our fellow residents watched the Planning Division's presentations. Most citizens are unaware of the drastic, mass zoning changes proposed that are to be voted on in October. Transparency and communication, please. Mailed info to all homes. Many of our citizens are not tech-savvy, and they are being left out of the major planning decisions. Surely the City wants citizens to be aware of this matter.</p>

June 17, 2021

Gianna Marasovich
Housing Policy Analyst, Housing Policy Division
2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833

RE: City of Riverside Draft Housing Element

Dear Ms. Marasovich,

This letter is to provide comments on the City of Riverside’s draft General Plan Housing Element for the Fifth Cycle (2021-2029). Inland Counties Legal Services is the largest non-profit legal services provider in the Inland Empire Region. One of our areas of focus is to preserve affordable housing for low-income persons living in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

The Draft Housing Element (“Draft”) contains numerous deficiencies and does not comply with Housing Element law as described below.

TECHNICAL BACKGROUND REPORT

Special Housing Needs

Gov. Code § 65583(a)(7) outlines an analysis of the housing needs of farmworkers, listed as “Agricultural Workers” on Page 19 of the Technical Background Report, but the analysis is not complete – it does not include any description of the City’s role in working cooperatively with local growers or farmworker advocates to determine available resources and shortfalls, or with agricultural employers to identify sites and pursue funding from HCD or the US Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, the Draft’s conclusion that “promoting affordable housing for extremely low and very low-income households would address the housing needs of agricultural workers in Riverside, if any” minimizes the unique and significant housing needs of farmworkers in that, even while acknowledging a limited need for agricultural worker housing, it presupposes that none such workers live in or near Riverside. Lastly, Program HE 5-4 (“Employee and Farmworker Housing”) acknowledges that the Zoning Code does not address the requirements of the Employee Housing Act, specifically as it pertains to farmworker housing but does not provide a date as to when the Code will be amended to address those requirements.

The City's analysis of the housing needs of seniors, also prescribed under Gov. Code § 65583(a)(7), does not include any listings of available resources or services addressing senior housing needs in the City, such as existing senior housing complexes retirement communities' food banks and second-harvest programs, or volunteer operators of meals-on-wheels programs. It also does not directly identify any potential housing challenges faced by the elderly or any assessment of unmet needs other than tangentially in Program H-38, which refers to the Seniors Housing Task Force Report of October 26, 2004. Similarly, the City's analysis of the housing needs of persons with disabilities (as also prescribed under Gov. Code § 65583(a)(7)) does not discuss resources in the area for persons with disabilities.

Assessment of Fair Housing

AB 686, passed in 2018 and applicable to all housing elements due for revision on or after January 1, 2021, requires all state and local public agencies to facilitate deliberate action to address and relieve disparities from past patterns of discrimination to further inclusiveness in their jurisdictions' communities. To ensure that jurisdictions properly adhered to AB 686, HCD released a memo providing "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Guidance for All Public Entities and for Housing Elements" (April 2021), available at https://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/affh/docs/affh_document_final_4-27-2021.pdf. This memo noted that housing elements must describe "meaningful, frequent and ongoing community participation, consultation, and coordination that is integrated with the broader stakeholder outreach and community participation process for the overall housing element." Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Guidance for All Public Entities and for Housing Elements (AFFH Guidance), pg. 21, citing Gov. Code §§ 65583(c)(9). Key stakeholders must include public housing authorities, housing and community development providers, advocacy groups, lower-income community members, fair housing agencies, and homeless service agencies, among others. The element must also describe the jurisdiction's outreach activities intended to reach a broad audience, a list of organizations contacted and consulted in the process and for what purpose, a summary of comments and how the comments are considered and incorporated, and a summary of issues that contributed to a lack of participation in the housing element process, if that proves to be the case. AFFH Guidance, pg. 21-22.

When the City originally submitted their draft Sixth Cycle Housing Element to HCD on May 10, 2021, it did not include an Assessment of Fair Housing. See Draft, 3, 10. The City submitted an AFFH Analysis on or around June 10, but the AFFH Analysis does not describe any community participation efforts as noted above. The Technical Background Report describes community participation, including engaging with stakeholders and a schedule of public meetings, workshops, and hearings on Pages 148-150. However, it does not include a full list of stakeholders engaged outside of organizations that conducted one-on-one meetings, nor does it include a summary of comments and how they are considered and incorporated, nor any analysis

on what contributed to a lack of participation in the housing element process beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.

ACTION PLAN


The City's Action Plan does not provide any definite time frames for implementation of any of the actions listed therein. Instead, the City provides timeframes of "ongoing", "short term", "mid-term", without any dates or meaningful benchmarks as to when they might be completed. Furthermore, there are no descriptions of the local government's specific role in program implementation, any specific steps to implement the program, proposed measurable outcomes, or demonstration of firm commitments to implement these programs. This runs counter to Gov. Code § 65583(c)'s guidelines for outlining the City's program for setting for a schedule of actions during the planning period.

Some programs that the City has included that need more detail and concrete deadlines include: preparing an Inclusionary Housing Program (Action Number HE-1.1), preparing a Zoning Code update to further facilitate development of emergency shelters, low-barrier navigation centers, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, residential care facilities, and community care facilities (Action Program HE-2.3), and adopting a policy that encourages the development or adaptation of residential units accessible to people with physical disabilities (Action Program HE-3.3).

CONCLUSION

Riverside's Draft Housing Element does not substantially comply with the requirements of Housing Element Law, and we urge HCD not to approve it. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments, please contact Anthony Kim at 951-248-4725 or akim@icls.org.

Sincerely,



Anthony Kim, Staff Attorney
INLAND COUNTIES LEGAL SERVICES

CC: Matthew Taylor, City Planner; Robin Huntley, HCD



June 17, 2021

Gianna Marasovich
Housing Policy Analyst, Housing Policy Division
2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95833

RE: City of Riverside Draft Housing Element

Dear Ms. Marasovich,

This letter is to provide comments on the City of Riverside’s draft General Plan Housing Element for the Sixth Cycle (2021-2029). Inland Equity Partnership is an anti-poverty advocacy coalition who has identified health care and housing as the two primary drivers of poverty. One of our areas of focus is to preserve affordable housing for low income persons living in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The Draft Housing Element (“Draft”) contains numerous deficiencies and does not comply with Housing Element law as described below

We have some further questions and considerations we wish the city of Riverside would address.

The goals and outcomes are but they are very short general statements. The draft language for the policy recommendations do not include needed changes to city ordinances for the adoption of mentioned policy changes for HE-1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING, Policy HE-2 HOMELESSNESS and Policy HE-3 FAIR HOUSING and Policy HE-4 THRIVING NEIGHBORHOODS.

When will there be specific “updates to the Zoning Code that “could include urban design regulations, incentives for building the maximum number of homes allowed, allowance for the use of pre-approved construction plans and streamlined review and approval processes” mentioned that will bring the city into compliance with SB 330 and

Streamlined Approval of Qualifying Affordable Housing Projects per SB 35?

HCD draft Riverside Housing Element Feedback survey tool:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/GLY6JTH>

After reviewing the tool, it is just listing the general policy recommendations and lacks specific ordinances that need changing to accommodate the new policies. There is also no real way to comment other than a 1 - 5 star rating tool.

Additional Questions by our Partner Organizations

- Since Ward 4 had the lowest RHNA allocation in the city, we would appreciate the exclusion of ADU units as RHNA count for Ward 4 and include more affordable housing zoning is needed in Ward 4 in areas such as: 1) Around Martin Luther King high school 2) Washington/Alessandro
- Consider reviewing Prop R and Measure C - are these truly being used agriculturally or protecting wealthy communities by protecting the practice of through exclusionary zoning.
- Look for funding (including from the city budget) to support RTA for as many lines as possible at 15 minute service or better to increase the number of 'transit corridors throughout the city to create more affordable housing opportunities.
- Eliminate R1 single family zoning.
- Work with Fair Housing Council of Riverside County, Inc. in getting data related to fair housing needs”
- Strengthen rent control ordinances far beyond Costa-Hawkins:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1-t-hw7ZbSq7zet2QVpPQuhAbwxX-Bwm-sq34K0MX_6U/edit?usp=sharing
- Play an active role to create opportunities in the City of Riverside residents to build community wealth with permanently affordable homes projects (co-ops, community land trust, condos etc.)
- Create inclusionary zoning ordinances to incentivise the construction of affordable homes or subsidizing affordable homes with increasing fees for developments that do not include affordable housing.

- Existing warehousing and logistics regulation to protect residential and public spaces from negative effects of industrial uses don't go far enough - the setback standards for warehouses and logistics abutting residential zones and public facilities aren't even 300 feet - a good standard would be 1,000 feet
- Use CalEnviroScreen to map Environmental Justice communities and consider zoning overlays to prevent future industrial uses in these communities and protect the residents from further degradation of air quality and built environment

CONCLUSION

Without the specific ordinance language, we are not comfortable supporting the adoption of Riverside's Draft Housing Element. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments, please contact Maribel Nunez at (562) 569-4051 or maribel@inlandequitypartnership.org

Sincerely,
Maribel Nunez, Inland Equity Partnership, Executive Director

Hilda Cruz, Interfaith Movement for Human Integrity, Faith Organizer

Tanya Humphrey, LCSW
CEO
The North Star Project
northstarprojectinc@gmail.com

Lolofi Soakai
Founder/Executive Director
MALO
Motivating Action Leadership Opportunity
lolofi@malotongaie.org

Monrow Mabon
Member/Attorney at Law
monrowmabon@yahoo.com

Freya Foley
Community Member
ffoley7955@aol.com

Br. John Skrodinsky, ST, Esq.
Missionary Servants of the Most Holy Trinity
3325 13th St.
Riverside, CA 92501
skrodinsky@trinitymissions.org

Rabbi Suzanne Singer
Temple Beth El
2675 Central Avenue
Riverside, CA 92506
sznsinger@gmail.com

Gracie Torres
Vice President | Board of Directors
Western Municipal Water District
2344 Trafalgar Ave
Riverside CA 92506
c. 9519708692 e. GTorres@wmwd.com
w. www.gracietorres.com

Alma Marquez, Executive Director
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice (CCA EJ)
Alma.M@ccaej.org

Dr. Regina Patton Stell
NAACP Riverside Chapter, President
rpstell70@gmail.com

Norma Barles, President
LULAC of Riverside, Council 3190
barlesnorma@gmail.com

July 2021

From: [Watts, Michael](#)
To: [Andrade, Frances](#); [Fierro, Ronaldo](#); [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Cc: [troutquilt@sbcglobal.net](#); [triciahord@yahoo.com](#); [datkinson1@att.net](#); [frankbyrne1963@gmail.com](#)
Subject: [External] Proposed Fairview Avenue Senior Condo Proposal and the High Density Designation for 5500 Alessandro Blvd
Date: Thursday, July 1, 2021 10:13:35 AM

My wife and I are lifetime Riverside residents near the proposed 44 unit Condo project proposed on the 2 ½ acre site located at Fairview and Central Ave apparently referred to as the Fairview Avenue Senior Condominium Proposal. To better understand the issues surrounding this project, last evening, I attended a neighborhood meeting consisting of local residents and Todd Ridgeway, a newly appointed Planning Commissioner.

This proposed development is situated on a 2 ½ acre parcel, previously owned by the City of Riverside which under the former Master Plan was to become part of the Central Ave extension connecting to the existing Canyon Crest portion of Central Ave at Chicago Ave. This plan was abandoned after much debate with the residents in the area opposing the project as unsafe as well as the evidence that both Alessandro Blvd and Central Avenue could not safely handle any additional vehicular traffic.

I also learned that under ongoing mandates from the Regional Housing Needs Assessment guidelines our city was arbitrarily changing the zoning of faith-based organizations to build affordable housing on their parking lots thus eliminating current zoning regulations as well as eliminating any local parking restrictions or requirements. In reviewing the map of properties now designated as high-density, affordable housing sites under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment guidelines I noted that the Church property, located at 5500 Alessandro Ave had been re-designated as a high-density housing property.

I have recently began wondering why so many church properties had been sold or purchased by other tax exempt faith-based entities, but after reading more about AB1851 I believe I might have a better understanding of the economics behind these purchases. However, that is another issue and concern for a later time.

I also noticed that the proposed properties identified for compliance with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment guidelines in the City of Riverside apparently did not identify large, open, vacant, flat land in the areas south of Victoria Avenue in the Hawarden Hills and Green Belt areas. There must certainly be hundreds of acres in this area that would help the City of Riverside comply with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment guidelines. Again, another issue and concern for another time.

Now to the Fairview Avenue Senior Condominium Proposal. When the City of Riverside originally sold this property to an investor it was the understanding of the neighborhood it was to build 4-6 single family homes on the property. We had no problem with that proposal and felt that it would fit into the historical makeup of the neighborhood along with not adversely or significantly impacting the already excessive, unsafe traffic on Alessandro Blvd and Central Avenue.

My concern is with the current proposal of a 44 unit condo project with the significant number of new housing units, the limited parking and limited access. Without a doubt the amount of new cars being added to a poorly developed and designed roadway like Fairview will adversely and significantly impact the a traffic safety issues in this neighborhood.

I'm a retired Patrol/Traffic Sergeant with Riverside Police Department. I know too well the history and ongoing daily challenges of traffic safety in and around the area of Fairview/Alessandro/Central. Due to the State of California's ongoing refusal to build more connecting freeways across the southside of the City of Riverside, our city is forced to live with ever-increasing traffic issues at the 60/91/215 interchange. For motorists who commute from Moreno Valley/Perris/Menifee every day they know that driving through the City of Riverside on Alessandro to the 91 freeway eliminates having to deal with the chokepoint at the 60/91/215 interchange. Because Alessandro Blvd is "downhill" into our city, excessive/unsafe speeds are always a major issue. Unsafe speed and inattention lead to regular injury accidents on all of Alessandro Blvd but even more so in the "S" curves at Glenhaven/Royal

Hill/Gloucester/Royal Ridge/Fairview cross streets. Alessandro Blvd in this specific area is probably the most dangerous and unsafe street in the City of Riverside.

In addition to the unsafe traffic conditions on Alessandro at Glenhaven/Royal Hill/Gloucester/Royal Ridge cross streets, the city also has an unsafe issue with Fairview Ave particularly between Central Avenue and Glenhaven (where this project is proposed). On a daily basis, vehicles not familiar with this one-way road inadvertently drive the wrong way on Fairview. This has been regularly documented by residents living there with their security cameras.

There is no way that the City of Riverside can safely add an additional 50-70 cars to the daily driving needs on Fairview at Central Avenue where this project has been proposed. What could possibly be safer and acceptable is the original proposal of 4-6 single family homes that the neighborhood was told would be built there.

Finally, let's address the church property located at 5500 Alessandro Blvd. The same issue applies to this property. To designate this property as a high-density site to build 100's of housing units would also greatly add to the current existing unsafe traffic conditions on Alessandro Blvd and Central Avenue. The hundreds of new residents will also add hundreds of vehicles to this small location and these new residents would be forced to use Alessandro Blvd an already overused and unsafe roadway. It should also be noted that there are two "private" schools at the intersection of Gloucester/Royal Ridge and Alessandro (Church on the Hill and Emmanuel Lutheran) . There is a third private school at Central & Victoria (Temple Bethel). There is Alcott elementary school at Central and Falkirk and there is Poly High School at Central and Victoria. All of these schools add to the existing high traffic activity in the area along with the presence of children of all ages constantly walking to and from their schools. There is also a preponderance of youthful, inexperienced high school aged new drivers to also add to the mix in an already very busy and unsafe network of public streets.

In conclusion, the immediate area in and around the area bordered by

Alessandro/Glenhaven/Gloucester/Royal Ridge/Fairview/Central/Falkirk is already an unsafe, overused network of roadways. Adding potentially hundreds of additional vehicles to this already oversaturated and unsafe traffic network is irresponsible. A decision to allow these two actions will expose the current families living in this neighborhood to unnecessary and preventable risks. Restrict the development on the 2 ½ acre parcel to 4-6 single family homes as originally proposed and REMOVE the high-density housing designation from the church property located at 5500 Alessandro Blvd.

Your actions regarding both of these matters will either save lives or cost lives.

Please forward a copy of our concerns to all members of the Planning Commission, Planning Department and the City Council.

Thank you,

Michael & Madeline Watts
5636 Royal Ridge Drive
Riverside, CA 92506
951-347-2490
mike@sheepdogenterprises.org



City of Arts & Innovation

**Public Comment for July 22, 2021
 Planning Commission Meeting
 Prepared by the Planning Staff at 8:00 a.m. on July 22, 2021**

Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>1. Public Comments: This portion of the agenda will be limited to a cumulative total of 15 minutes, with individual speakers limited to a maximum time limit of 3 minutes. Further discussion of any matter beyond 15 minutes will be continued to following the public hearing calendar or scheduled for a later agenda. If there is no one from the audience wishing to speak, the Commission will move to the next order of business.</p>	<p>Kevin Pope</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Good Evening, My name is Kevin Pope. I'm here to oppose the rezoning of my family's property located at 3315 Van Buren, 92503.</p> <p>For the past several years I've worked at Brookhurst Mill, located on this site since 1959. In march of this year, we made the difficult decision to close the doors, as the demand for commercial animal feeds continues to decline in southern California. This is the reality of a declining industry. We've seen this trend for decades, and knew that it was coming, and knew that our time operating the Mill would eventually come to an end. And here we are.</p> <p>In March we began deconstructing Brookhurst Mill and preparing the site for 3 industrial use tenants, in accordance with our current Industrial zoning, which suites the area appropriately. We were well underway with this process and had already sunk thousands of dollars into this project when we received notice in late May that the city planned to rezone our property to allow for housing development.</p> <p>I'd like to point out why this site is not well suited for housing, and should be removed from the city's "opportunity site" list that is scheduled to be voted on in October by city council.</p> <p>The site shares a property line on all four sides by industrial uses. Automotive repair shops to the south. A business manufacturing park to the east. A new tilt-up warehouse to the west. And the best of all, two highly active rail lines, BNSF freight lines and Metro link within 15 feet of the property line to the north. The trains pass by several times an hour and are extremely loud. And don't get too excited about the site being close to the La Sierra metrolink station. It's over 2 miles away. Nobody will be walking from this site over 2 miles away to use the public transit, in the middle of summer when it's 100 degrees outside. That's not a reasonable expectation. That's not to mention the constant homeless and drug problem along the railroad tracks next to this property. Two encampments</p>

August 2021

-----Original Message-----

From: MELANIE MILLER <flygirlmel1@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 6:05 PM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Multi Unit Housing CEDD

I DO NOT want Multi Unit Housing to infiltrate the Riverside County or City area...it will increase traffic, lower the value of existing houses, over crowd neighborhoods and schools...this is a mandate by Sacramento that must be stopped...they don't live in or near any of the affected areas they are trying to re-zone...THIS MUST BE STOPPED NOW ususus

Sent from my iPhone

I also DO NOT want Municipal Code 5.38 to be amended...thank you for forwarding.

Sent from my iPhone



August 6, 2021

Mayor Patricia Lock Dawson
The City of Riverside
Delivered via email to 2mayor@riversideca.gov

Ms. Mary Kopaskie-Brown
Planning Manager
The City of Riverside
Delivered via email to MKopaskie-Brown@riversideca.gov

Re: Updated Housing Elements and Zoning Codes Must Meet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Targets **and Comply with Federal and State Housing Laws Including** Attainable Homeownership, Authorizing Housing That is Affordable by Design Without Reliance on Lottery Outcomes and Taxpayer Subsidies, Affirmatively Further Fair Housing, and Ending Residential Racial Segregation

Dear Mayor Dawson and Ms. Kopaskie-Brown,

The Two Hundred is a civil rights homeownership advocacy group that was founded and remains comprised of veteran civil rights leaders, former legislators and cabinet secretaries, retired judges, and other diverse housing advocacy leaders. Many of us worked for our entire careers to enact federal and state fair housing laws to end agency “redlining” practices such as denying communities of color access to insured home mortgages and veterans’ loans, and promoting residential racial segregation through razing historic minority neighborhoods through “redevelopment” and siting freeways to protect “public harmony” by dividing our communities.

California’s severe housing shortage, and astronomical (and still-rising) housing prices, have undone decades of civil rights progress. As confirmed by scholars at UC Berkeley, residential racial segregation is worse in the Bay Area than it was before the enactment of civil rights reforms in the 1960s – a pattern repeated in wealthier counties statewide. <https://belonging.berkeley.edu/segregationinthebay> As we explain in our *Redlining* video, minority homeownership rates, which in the early part of this century had finally started to attain parity with white families who had access to government programs like federally-insured low cost mortgages, plummeted during the Great Recession of 2009. With the full support of regulatory agencies, as of 2010 lenders engaged in more than a decade of predatory loans and foreclosures that wiped out trillions of dollars of the multi-generational wealth that our communities had finally accumulated through homeownership. Our communities now stagger from housing costs that are so high the US Census Bureau has confirmed that our state has the highest poverty rate in the country! When added to the other high costs of living in California, including the highest electricity and gasoline prices of any state other than California, almost

40% of our residents cannot reliably pay routine monthly expenses even after receiving public assistance to help buy food and medical care. [United Ways of California - The Real Cost Measure in California 2019 \(unitedwaysca.org\)](#) California leaders should not brag about creating Silicon Valley billionaires without also recognizing the crushing burdens of decades of hostility to starter homes and other housing needed by our communities, nor can California's leaders lawfully hide behind unfunded rhetorical commitments to fund 100% "affordable" rental housing and again force our communities into segregated rental housing "projects."

We write because you have been entrusted with the decade's most important housing task, which is assuring that your agency complies with civil rights housing laws and updates your General Plan and Zoning Code to accommodate your community's share of new homes in compliance with your Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).

Both federal and state civil rights laws, as well as United States Supreme Court decisions, have long prohibited agencies from directing new "affordable" housing for lower income residents to a limited geographic subarea, and instead require the dispersal of new housing at all affordability levels throughout the community. In 2018, the California Legislature strengthened this longstanding civil rights requirement in AB 686 (effective January 1, 2019) which requires all public agencies to "affirmatively further fair housing" (AFFH) in California. As explained by the Housing and Community Development (HCD) agency, quoting from the new law, **"[p]ublic agencies must now examine existing and future policies, plans, programs, rules, practices, and related activities and make proactive changes to promote more inclusive communities."** [AFFH / Fair Housing \(ca.gov\)](#)

Before the AFFH was enacted in 2018, and based on a complex set of planning, zoning, and environmental laws, policies and principles, most California cities and counties did in fact adopt "policies, plans, programs, rules, practices and related activities" that constrain housing supplies, and raise housing prices so high that our hard working families – the majority of which now include members in our communities of color – can no longer afford to buy, and in many neighborhoods cannot even afford to rent, a home. These status quo housing policies result in unlawful racial segregation, and violate the affirmatively furthering fair housing laws. Our families, many of which are led by the essential workers each community relies on such as teachers, first responders, workers in construction, health care, hospitality, small business employees, and laborers – cannot and should not be asked to wait to have their name drawn in an "affordable" housing lottery, or wait for "magic money" to appear from the repeal of Proposition 13 (or capitalism). State and local agency actions violate civil rights laws, including California's new AFFH, must stop – and housing production, of market-rate housing that can be purchased by median income families, must increase more than tenfold under the current RHNA cycle.

We hereby formally and respectfully request that these civil rights housing legal violations be corrected in your General Plan Housing Element and Zoning Code updates which feasibly, based on your median income families and your available funding resources today, plan for housing typologies and locations that meet your assigned RHNA targets. We identify below the worst offenders, and practical solutions, to assure that you do not adopt General Plan and Zoning Code updates that violate civil rights housing laws.


1. **Charging Country Club Initiation Fees for New Housing is Racist and Exclusionary.**

Country clubs often charge initiation fees of \$50,000 or more, with the express intent to select wealthier members and exclude “those people” who cannot afford steep fees. Many local agencies have imposed fees on new housing that wildly exceed even \$50,000, such as San Francisco which has charged fees of \$165,000 per apartment! While we appreciate that new homes need to pay for their “hard” infrastructure needs like water and sewage services, too many jurisdictions have allowed well-meaning special interests seeking additional funds for important local priorities like art, affordable housing, and recreational programs to pile these fees onto new housing rather than obtain funding (as or if needed by special assessments or taxes approved by existing residents) equitably, which means paid for equitably by the city’s existing (not just future) residents. As documented by UCB, excessive and wildly different housing development fees increase housing costs and decrease housing production and affordability – and these fees are passed along to new residents. [Development Fees Report Final 2.pdf \(berkeley.edu\)](#) Most cities and counties defend high fees on new housing with “nexus” studies, based on made-as-instructed reports prepared by consultants paid by cities. “Nexus” may pass constitutional muster, but violates civil rights housing laws by excluding housing – and “those people” (us) from your community.

Civil Rights Compliant Solution to Exclusionary Fees: Residents of new housing should pay no more in fees than existing taxpayers. For example, if a city has 50,000 existing homes and a RHNA obligation to produce 5,000 more homes, housing fees should be capped at the levels paid by taxpayers. If existing city residential households subsidize arts program with \$500,000, residents of new housing should pay no more than the same share (\$100 per new home). If existing city residents contribute nothing to build affordable housing, then neither should residents of new housing: existing policies created the affordable housing shortage and crisis, and solving this problem on the backs of those shut out of the housing market creates an unfair, unlawful and racially discriminatory burden on new residents. Stop imposing discriminatory fees on new residents.

2. **Housing Delayed is Housing Denied.** While some jurisdictions have streamlined the housing project review and approval process, most have not. The two most commonly-identified delay factors in the housing project approval process are multi-step, multi-department review processes with no intra-agency deadlines or housing accountability production metrics, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process. As shown in Figure 1, in one recent study of the San Francisco entitlement process, all but the smallest (less than 10 units) took about three years to complete this combined bureaucratic and CEQA process.

**Figure 1: Housing Project Entitlement/CEQA Process Time in San Francisco
(by Project Size/Unit Count)**
[Measuring the Housing Permitting Process in San Francisco - Turner Center
\(berkeley.edu\)](#)



A. **End Bureaucratic Delays to Housing Approvals.** Also as explained by UCB, “[t]he most significant and pointless factor driving up production costs was the length of time it takes to for a project to get through the city permitting and development process” which in turn caused even higher costs as projects stuck in bureaucratic review proceedings were required to repeatedly modify their projects to deal with the “additional hoops and requirements” that “pop up” at various stages of the permitting and development process.
[San Francisco Construction Cost Brief - Turner Center January 2018.pdf \(berkeley.edu\)](#), p. 2.

Civil Rights Compliant Solution to Housing Delays Caused by Bureaucrats. This too has a simple solution: prescribe, disclose, enforce, and publish outcomes of housing review and approval deadlines on every city department (and responsible unit within each department), and hold responsible managers in each department accountable in performance evaluations and promotion decisions to meeting (or beating) deadlines. This is a housing production accountability metric that should be expressly added to General Plan Housing Element implementation mandates.

B. **End Anti-Housing CEQA Abuse.** Before a misguided appellate court decision, issued without Legislative direction in 1984, CEQA did not apply to city and county approvals of housing that complied with General Plan and zoning ordinances. For several decades, however, increasingly fussy academics and planners insisted that zoning codes require a “conditional use

permit” (CUPs) even for code-compliant housing, to allow local agencies to apply a “we know it when we see it” open-ended level of discretion to allow, deny, or condition housing approvals – the same standard the Supreme Court applies to obscenity. In 1984, this CUP process – brought to us all by the same generation of planners that (obscenely) insisted on single-family only residential zoning and outlawed even duplexes that had previously been allowed and common throughout California – unleashed the full force of CEQA delays and lawsuits even on fully compliant housing in “infill” neighborhoods. [Friends of Westwood, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles \(1987\) :: California Court of Appeal Decisions :: California Case Law :: California Law :: US Law :: Justia](#) By 2008, housing had become the most frequent target of CEQA lawsuits – and the tool of choice for both those seeking to block housing and those seeking financial and other payoffs for threatening CEQA lawsuits. In one study of all anti-housing CEQA lawsuits in the Los Angeles region, for example, 14,000 housing units were targeted in CEQA lawsuits – 99% of which were located in existing urbanized areas (not “greenfields), 70% of which were located within ½ mile of transit, and 78% of which were located in the region’s whiter, wealthier, and environmentally healthier communities. [In the Name of the Environment Update: CEQA Litigation Update for SCAG Region \(2013-2015\) | Insights | Holland & Knight \(hklaw.com\)](#) Instead of facilitating housing near jobs and transit, CEQA had been distorted into this generation’s anti-housing, anti-“those people” (us) redlining tool of choice.

Civil Rights Compliant Solution to Anti-Housing CEQA Abuse. *Under the Housing Accountability Act, cities and counties no longer have the discretion to disallow housing, require fewer units, or impose fees and exactions that make housing projects infeasible. Local control determines the allowable location and density of housing, but these cannot be “paper housing” that is never actually approved (or approved with feasible conditions). Only housing that causes a demonstrable and specific significant adverse consequence to human health or safety can be downsized, delayed, or conditioned with costly obligations.* [Housing Accountability Act Technical Assistance Advisory](#) Housing Element implementation procedures should expressly acknowledge this state law as a prohibition on the local agency’s exercise of its discretion on any issue other than a demonstrable and specific adverse health or safety risk caused by the proposed housing project, and eliminate or limit subsequent CEQA review under conforming zoning requirements to prescribed objective health and safety standards specifically caused by the proposed housing project. As determined recently by the California Supreme Court, local government may still preserve exterior architecture and design review processes that do not create discretionary authority to add new conditions addressing CEQA topics. [McCorkle Eastside Neighborhood Group v. City of St. Helena :: 2019 :: California Courts of Appeal Decisions :: California Case Law :: California Law :: US Law :: Justia](#). Local General Plan and zoning codes following this recommendation avoid mandatory CEQA processing and litigation risks, and are a mandate – especially in the whiter, wealthier and healthier communities such as most of Marin County that have elevated their “no growth” environmentalism into open and flagrant racist conduct such as intentionally segregating its public schools by race. [First desegregation order in 50 years hits Marin schools - Los Angeles Times \(latimes.com\)](#)

3. **Avoid Exacerbating Racial Segregation with Special Interest Demands that Retard Housing Production and Increase Housing Costs.** Increased production of housing that is affordable that working families can purchase has been repeatedly blocked by many California’s environmental organizations and their state agency allies. We and our families experience, and agree we should reduce, pollution – and we too enjoy and want to protect California’s spectacular natural resources. We also support California’s climate leadership, but do not agree that our working families and poor should be collateral damage in the state’s war on climate. Much as California led the nation in past decades in the involuntarily sterilization aimed primarily at women of color in the name of discredited “science,” and unleashed civic “redevelopment” schemes that wiped out once-thriving (and now forgotten) Black and Latino communities in the name of discredited economic theories, we now face demands that new housing consist of small rental apartments located near non-operating bus stops with rental rates of more than \$4000 per month to reduce “Vehicle Miles Travelled” (VMT). California leads the nation in buying, supporting, and ultimately mandating electric vehicles – but VMT housing policy is redlining, pure and simple.


The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which includes 197 cities and 6 counties where collectively the majority of Californians live, was on the verge in 2020 of adopting a VMT-centric regional housing plan that prioritized agency-decreed VMT reductions above all other laws, including federal and state anti-discrimination and housing laws. Under this plan, which conflicted with and undermined almost all city and county General Plans by assuming the massive demolition of existing residential and commercial neighborhoods and replacement with high density apartment housing near planned bus routes, historical and existing residential racial discrimination was intentionally worsened. Figure 2, for example, shows where new housing in Long Beach should be located – noted with green dots in polygons called “Traffic Analysis Zones” (TAZ), which includes many of the most densely-populated, poorest neighborhoods in Long Beach – communities of color highly vulnerable to displacement and gentrification. The TAZ maps showing “red” dots or squares are dominated by single family residences, where even “infill” housing such as townhomes on former strip malls is excluded from SCAG’s VMT-reduction housing plan. The “no new housing” neighborhoods are far whiter, and far wealthier, than the neighborhoods slated to receive many thousands of new housing units in a haunting repeat of the “slum clearance” schemes that wiped out minority neighborhoods in years past.

Figure 2: Long Beach VMT Reduction Housing Plan (SCAG 2020)




When applied to smaller communities, such as the small town of La Habra in Orange County, SCAG’s VMT-reducing housing scheme was even more blatantly racist. As shown in Figure 3, SCAG decreed that housing belonged in the city’s two poorest TAZ zone neighborhoods – majority Latino – and excluded from the adjacent “nice” homes in nearby hills occupied primarily by Whites and Asians.

Figure 3: La Habra VMT Reduction Housing Plan (SCAG 2020)



SCAG’s VMT-based housing plan would also have created new obstacles under CEQA even to the buildout of approved housing. Figure 4 shows Ontario, with new housing planned along a heavily-commercial freeway corridor (Interstate-10) that also has an express bus route, and along another bus route through existing poorer parts of the city that are also near a bus route. (The bus was not operating in 2020, during COVID, and had consistently low ridership even pre-COVID.) The SCAG VMT-based housing plan wanted no more housing built in southern Ontario, which is actually the best selling new community in all of California – with an affordable price for new homes, and a majority Latino and other minority new home purchasers.

Figure 4: Ontario VMT Reduction Housing Plan (SCAG 2020)




To its credit, when SCAG realized the redlining consequences of its VMT-reduction housing plan, it disavowed the plan and forbade its use in any context (including RHNA and CEQA) in a Regional Council approval Resolution that recognized the “conflict” between California’s housing and climate goals. We can achieve climate goals without worsening racial segregation, demolishing disadvantaged communities (again), and ending attainable homeownership even within existing cities for the majority-minority families that have been shut out of the California homeownership market by catastrophic planning and policy decisions (many brought to us by the same advocates and bureaucrats who invented reducing VMT for electric cars as a “necessary” climate mandate) over the past two decades. In fact, the California Legislature has repeatedly declined to mandate reductions in VMT – and has repeatedly found that the housing crisis harms both existing California residents and exacerbates climate change by driving Californians to worse climate states like Texas to find a house they can afford to buy.

Although the VMT data is most accessible in the SCAG region of Southern California, it is critical that your agency recognize that this same discriminatory outcome occurs everywhere. In Figure 5, for example, we compare Oakland’s historic “redlining” maps where federal bureaucrats refused to approve low cost loans in Black neighborhoods and other communities of color (colored red) with the majority white communities where low cost mortgages were available (colored green and yellow). Oakland’s “low VMT” map (where housing is demanded by today’s special interests based on claimed climate “science”) is the redlined area of Oakland that has already lost much of its historic Black residents, businesses, and civic institutions – the remainder of which would be

wiped out by high density, transit-oriented housing near BART and bus lines. Oakland's "high VMT" map, where housing should not be built, is those lush, wealthy, white, and historically segregated hills.

Figure 5: Oakland Redlining and VMT Map Comparison



Both the future of work, and the future of transportation, are in flux. Even before COVID, however, more people were working from home in the SCAG region than riding fixed-route public transit – with bus ridership suffering the most substantial declines. Fixed-route transit ridership plunged during COVID, and has not recovered. VMT has increased over the past month with the re-opening of the state, although peak hour volumes (and trip durations) have diminished. From remote work, to the explosion of new electric technologies for short-distance localized trips, to the massive expansion of app-based rides and carpools, it's important to know what we don't know – which is the future – and what we do know, which as UCLA's transportation experts repeatedly confirmed, is that low income workers rely on low cost used personal vehicles instead of the bus: people can perform multiple trips (drop kids off at school before, carpool kids to soccer after school), and can reliably access more than twice as many jobs in less than half as much time. <https://www.its.ucla.edu/publication/transit-blues-in-the-golden-state-analyzing-recent-california-ridership-trends/>


There are two other inconvenient truth about this VMT-based housing policy civil rights violation.

First, there are no proven, or effective, ways of "mitigating" VMT to "below the level of significance" demanded by the state's CEQA lead agency, the Office of Planning & Research (OPR), for unsubsidized housing bigger than about 10 units that is located in a suburban scale existing community not served by high frequency transit. Using the methodology demanded by OPR, San Diego County calculated that the majority of the housing they have approved over the past decade – which helped meet their RHNA housing goals, and had been approved by state climate agencies – would have had significant unmitigated VMT impacts. Again using OPR-endorsed "mitigation" methodologies, for which there is insufficient evidence of effectiveness, San Diego County determined that VMT mitigation fees alone would add \$50,000 - \$690,000 *per housing unit*. San Diego County further acknowledged that it could not meet its RHNA

obligation if this VMT scheme was enforced as proposed by OPR.
<https://bosagenda.sandiegocounty.gov/cob/cosd/cob/doc?id=0901127e80d032bb>

Second, although the purported purpose of this VMT policy is to reduce greenhouse gases, there are many – many – alternatives to imposing a massive car tax on new housing that are more effective at reducing GHG without engaging in racially discriminatory housing policies. When smog was first identified as a problem in Los Angeles during World War II, initially scientists speculated it was a poison gas attack by the Japanese – only to later learn that smog was domestically produced by our own activities. When the Clean Air Act was passed in 1972, the same no growth special interests initially demanded that that cars and other smog sources be banned, but as shown in Figure 6 we instead banned lead in gas, and used catalytic converters and now clean engine/fuel mandates to cut vehicular emissions by more than 98% while VMT – cars driven by actual people to actual jobs etc. – rose steadily alongside population and employment, as reported by President Obama in 2016:

Figure 6: Reduction in Tailpipe Emissions from Vehicles (line) v. Increase in Vehicle Miles Travelled from Population/Job Growth (bar columns)



Civil Rights Solution to Special Interest Exclusionary Housing VMT Scheme: Comply with Civil Rights Housing Laws including Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.
The current housing emergency, which disproportionately harms our communities, is not the appropriate forum to “experiment” with a housing density scheme dependent on fixed-route bus ridership and high density, high cost rental housing. Housing locations,

densities, and typologies need to match the needs of our communities, including respecting – not just paying lip service – to racial equity and housing civil rights laws we helped enact to create equitable access to the American Dream of homeownership. We have sued the state agencies responsible for this VMT scheme, and the state has been unsuccessful in dismissing our civil rights claims – while engaging in years-long stall tactics like forcing us to file a Public Records Act lawsuit for VMT documents they attempted to hide (a lawsuit we won). VMT is simply a measure of the transportation options – even of 100% clean vehicles – available in a community. It must now be studied under CEQA (at least until our lawsuit is resolved), but it should not distort your Housing Update to worsen residential racial segregation, shield majority-white wealthy neighborhoods from housing in violation of the AFFH laws, and again wipe out our communities in unfunded displacement schemes.

4. **Paper Zoning for Economically Infeasible Housing is Illegal and Racist.** Partly in response to no growth anti-homeownership schemes like VMT, and partly because existing laws requiring that housing meet the actual needs of actual Californians alive today have become as routinely ignored by academics and bureaucrats as civil rights laws, some cities may be tempted to “solve” for RHNA allocations by assuming that mid-rise and high rise apartments costing in excess of \$4000 in monthly rent for even for one-bedroom units are lawful housing compliance pathways under RHNA. In fact, because that rental rate – and other real life obstacles to lower cost condo development – are entirely unaffordable to median income households, a Housing Element update that assume high cost higher density product types that cost more than 2.5 times more to build than single family homes, duplexes and townhomes as even admitted by an overly-optimistic UCB study that demanded an “all-infill” higher density housing future for California is a violation of housing civil rights law. (<https://www.next10.org/publications/right-housing>) The same study also acknowledged that to accommodate what has only grown to ever more severe housing unit shortfalls, “tens or even hundreds of thousands of single family homes” would need to be demolished to make way for the new high density units. We have seen these academic conclusions before, and we have seen the horrendous outcome of targeting the least expensive – aka neighborhoods housing people of color – and thus least costly/most profitable housing demolition/expensive new housing scheme. What is astounding is how often, whether in the name of openly racist segregation goals, or veiled “public harmony” goals, or “urban revitalization” double-speak, and now special interest NIMBY environmentalism, overwhelmingly white academics, bureaucrats, and hired gun consultant “experts,” keep finding new ways to destroy our communities and deprive our people of the right to achieve the American Dream of homeownership.

These same “experts” have now inserted yet another poison pill into state housing law, which is that when property designated in a General Plan for housing includes economically infeasible higher densities – which in most communities includes even mid-rise six story structures over podium parking – is approved for lower density economically feasible housing types like townhomes, local governments must transfer the unbuilt infeasible units to a different property that must accept even higher densities than included in the General Plan Housing Element update. Because the impacts of that receiving site’s additional spillover housing itself triggers CEQA, an applicant for an economically feasible housing project must also assume the cost, schedule, and litigation burdens of CEQA compliance for whatever unrelated receiving housing site is designated by the city – at an unknown point in the process – to add more density than

allowed in the General Plan Housing Element. Housing Elements that assume non-existent conditions (e.g., repeal of Proposition 13, end of capitalism, vast new tax revenues dedicated to missing middle housing to fund the millions of additional housing units, etc.) are illegal, as are Housing Elements that prescribe economically infeasible higher density housing and fail to plan for the vast majority of “missing middle” and “affordable” housing required by RHNA, are illegal. The San Francisco Bay Area has led the state in assuming that \$4000 per month high rise apartments will be financially feasible in suburbs where median incomes can pay \$1500 for housing – or \$2000 per month for a mortgage. This “paper zoning” of high rise transit-oriented neighborhoods at every bus stop has resulted in a massive out-migration of higher paid Bay Area workers to Stockton and the Central Valley, Salinas and the South Bay, and Sacramento and beyond – which in turn results in unattainable housing prices for those with local jobs in those areas. This paper zoning academic fiction, pursued for more than two decades by some “woke” Bay Area “experts” alongside “urban limit lines” and “ecosystem service taxes” paid by urban residents to non-profit “stewards” of natural lands, is the modern day form of Jim Crow strategies to deprive the hard working families in our communities access to attainable homeownership.

Civil Rights Solution to Paper Zoning for Infeasible Housing. *Just don't do it. Townhomes, stacked flats, quadplexes, garden clusters, and small lot homes are just some of the many examples of lower cost housing that once dominated the “starter” housing market before academics, planners, and special interest no-growthers decided they could intentionally create a housing crisis and nobody would notice because the people most harmed don't earn enough to donate to political campaigns. Housing densities, and locations, need to be designed for the people who need housing. “Move-up” housing for higher income families forced to rent or spend four times more for a home than they would spend in a neighboring state is also needed. General Plan Housing Element updates should include in the disadvantaged community/environmental justice analysis housing affordability criteria to designate housing typologies, densities, and locations, as well as expedited approval processes, to make new housing needed to meet RHNA targets “affordable by design” so that median income families without taxpayer subsidies or winning lottery tickets can buy a home. As recognized by the Legislature itself, solving the housing crisis will help achieve California's climate targets by keeping our families here, in new housing that is hugely more energy efficient, and climate friendly, than existing housing or housing built in our competitor states like Texas, Arizona and Nevada. The more new housing (and people) your agency plans for, the lower your per capita greenhouse gas emissions – a feasible, just, and civil rights compliant outcome that will actually help achieve California (and global) climate goals.*

When longtime civil rights champion Amos Brown was recently asked whether “the Bay Area is a safe haven for Black people and other people of color” he was unambiguous: “No. . . Since 1970, we have lost Black people who were pushed out of this city. The 70's Black population was between 15-16%. Well now it's down to about 4%. That didn't happen by accident and it wasn't just economics. This happened because of public policy.”

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/lift-every-voice/article/Amos-Brown-16219697.php>

Beyond the COVID pandemic, 2020 brought us yet another year of race riots and yet another round of rhetoric about the need to “address” the new race avoidance buzzwords of

diversity and inclusion. The time for rhetoric around housing justice should have ended before it started, and we thought for sure was made illegal with the 1960s civil rights laws. We were wrong: as Mr. Brown reports, “public policy” keeps shoving our communities out of neighborhoods that become desirable to white families. Stop it. Just stop it. Comply with civil rights laws, comply with RHNA, and plan for housing that can be purchased by median income households – not just for low income and homeless families, and not just for the wealthy. Housing experts like to call us the “missing middle” – we aren’t missing at all. We just aren’t being seen by housing “experts” and bureaucrats and special interests who get paid by the wealthy to advocate full-time while members of our communities hold down the essential jobs that make communities work. In fact, some sneeringly dismiss us entirely by concluding the “ship has sailed” on homeownership – and yep, communities of color weren’t allowed on the ship, and then got tossed off it with predatory foreclosures, but that’s just too bad we should wait for our lottery ticket to come in and move back into the projects if or when they are ever built.

Systemic discrimination doesn’t happen by accident – it happens because of bad policy

Come to your senses. Plan housing for people. Welcome us to your communities, not just to work but to live. Let’s restore our common love for California and build those diverse and inclusive communities your agency, and its advisors and consultants, have been talking about since our country’s racial reckoning last year. Do the right thing, and adopt the right Housing Element and Zoning Code updates.

Please contact me at robert@thetwohundred.org if you’d like to discuss any of this further. We can sue – and we have and will continue to sue to enforce civil rights housing laws – but doing right is by far the cheaper, faster, easier, and just pathway to doing your share to solve the housing crisis.

We look forward to hearing back from you at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully,



Robert Apodaca
Vice-Chair and Director of Public Policy
The Two Hundred
www.thetwohundred.org

From: doug shumway <boatroper@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 1:05 PM
To: Edwards, Erin <EEdwards@riversideca.gov>
Subject: Re: [External] Rezoning

Not one of them sounds good for the city I grew up in. You were not raised here and are not from here (Chicago correct?) It sounds like making a bigger mess than what or city is in currently. We are not a big city and don't want to compress more people into it creating mor problems. Since you are not from here let me explain...OUR CITY LOOKS REALLY BAD!. Don't vote on making it worse.

Thank you
The Shumway Family

Sent from my iPhone

> On Aug 11, 2021, at 9:56 AM, Edwards, Erin <EEdwards@riversideca.gov> wrote:

>

> Dear Doug,

> Thank you for your comment:

>

> The opportunity sites are listed on page 29 (figure ES2) in the linked document below.

>

> https://riversideca.gov/cedd/sites/riversideca.gov.chedd/files/pdf/planning/2021/Housing_Element/Draft_EIR_Vol1_07_19_21.pdf

>

> There are many sites being proposed. Are there any specific sites to which you object?

> I hope you are well,

> -Erin

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: doug shumway <boatroper@sbcglobal.net>

> Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 7:29 AM

> To: Edwards, Erin <EEdwards@riversideca.gov>

> Subject: [External] Rezoning

>

> Erin, this family is against the rezoning opportunity areas that is being proposed. I know you didn't grow up in Riverside but we did! Getting a little tired of this council trying to change our city for the worse.

> Sincerely

> The Shumway household

>

> Sent from my iPhone

cc Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs
C&ED Director

From: [Andrade, Frances](#)
To: [Nancy Magi](#)
Cc: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Subject: RE: [External] Hi and question
Date: Thursday, August 12, 2021 4:58:22 PM

Thank yo.u I will distribute to the commission.

From: Nancy Magi <troutquilt@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 4:57 PM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: Re: [External] Hi and question

Planning Commissioners:

My name is Nancy Magi. I live in Ward 3 at the intersection of Fairview and Central/Alessandro in a single family residential neighborhood. I am asking questions for nearly 700 residents of Ward 3. Victoria Area Neighborhood Alliance and No to 44 Condos.

Before the questions, my statement: You, along with the City Council Members, are our neighborhood advocates. We believe you will consider our words as you face a vote that, if passed, will forever alter the character of our historic City in a negative way. Your vote to move ahead with these proposed revisions to the Housing Element will change single family residential zoning to allow for dense building without notification to adjacent property holders nor will there be an individual hearing as is required now. As we have learned over the last 16 months, the Planning Division's job is not advocacy for the citizens of Riverside.

For example, we only found out by accident that a 2.2 acre lot adjacent to our property line was proposed as a 44 unit project which will require massive engineering and the construction of a 19 foot freeway-style wall in an attempt to provide stability of the granite the builder will need to remove to fit in all of these little units. Initially this property was NOT an Opportunity Site, but in recent months, and in mysterious ways, we learned that its status had been altered which will now allow more units to be built. Thank you to our Council Member Ronaldo Fierro for notifying us of this change. The City Division did not have to make that notification because we were an ADJACENT property holder.

There are 1000 other lots in the city which the Planning Division has identified through mysterious means - most likely electronic and by vague references to "consultants" none of whom live in Riverside as far as we know. This proposal horrible plan will not require adjacent property holders to be notified. And you will be asked to vote to approve or veto that plan on either September 2 or another date to be determined.

As you learn more about the revision of the City Plan, the Housing Element, and the Opportunity Sites today, please consider asking the Planning Division these questions:

- What communication about this mass zoning change was sent BY MAIL to every citizen or at least every homeowner?
- Ask if the Planning Division believes that they have done enough to communicate with

citizens about the massive zoning change.

- Ask how many citizens watched Planning Division videos and asked questions about the Housing Element.
- Ask the Division if they will mail letters to notify property owners adjacent to the 1000 Opportunity Sites stating the City's plan to alter zoning to allow for dense housing/retail.
- Ask if any member of the Planning Division actually visited the sites of the 1000 lots to determine if the property was a genuine fit for dense housing.
- Or were properties chosen via satellite maps with no visitations?
- Ask them to explain in their own words how adding 24,000 dwelling units will impact air pollution.
- How will traffic be impacted?
- Do they believe green space is adequate? One answer to that question is to look at the "green space" at the new apartments on Merrill near Trader Joe's.

Allowing this massive zoning change and building dense housing in our community will be a calamity from which this City will never recover.

To be continued.

On Aug 12, 2021, at 4:47 PM, Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov> wrote:

Nothing was attached.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Magi <troutquilt@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 4:24 PM

To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>

Subject: Re: [External] Hi and question

Ok - I have emailed in Pages. If that isn't ok, I will send another way.

Nancy
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2021, at 5:20 PM, Nancy Magi <troutquilt@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Great solution - thx
Stand by

Nancy
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2021, at 4:44 PM, Andrade, Frances
<FANDRADE@riversideca.gov> wrote:

Yes. His comments are included.

Just to let you know there is a limit in the number of characters. It looks like from his comments "to be continued" is not showing in our report.

Your comments were cut off in the middle of the second to last paragraph.

If you would prefer to send me a complete text of your comments, those can be distributed to the commission as well.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Magi <troutquilt@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 3:29 PM

To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Hi and question

If you are able to see the e comments for tomorrow's meeting, could you see if my husbands questions came in? I got confirmation for my comments but he didn't get his? Thx.

Nancy Magi

Sent from my iPhone

Keep Riverside healthy: Maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. [RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19](https://www.riversideca.gov/COVID-19)<<http://riversideca.gov/COVID-19>>



City of Arts & Innovation

**Public Comment for August 13, 2021
 Planning Commission Meeting
 Prepared by the Planning Division at 8:00 a.m. on August 13, 2021**

Item	Name	Neighborhood	Position	Comments
<p>1. Public Comments: This portion of the agenda will be limited to a cumulative total of 15 minutes, with individual speakers limited to a maximum time limit of 3 minutes. Further discussion of any matter beyond 15 minutes will be continued to following the public hearing calendar or scheduled for a later agenda. If there is no one from the audience wishing to speak, the Commission will move to the next order of business.</p>	<p>Enn Magi</p>		<p>Oppose</p>	<p>SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR THE PLANNING DIVISION</p> <p>What communication about this mass zoning change was sent BY MAIL to every citizen or at least every homeowner?</p> <p>Ask if the Planning Division believes that they have done enough to communicate with citizens about the massive zoning change.</p> <p>Ask how many citizens watched Planning Division videos and asked questions about the Housing Element.</p> <p>Ask the Division if they will mail letters to notify property owners adjacent to the 1000 Opportunity Sites stating the City’s plan to alter zoning to allow for dense housing/retail.</p> <p>Ask if any member of the Planning Division actually visited the sites of the 1000 lots to determine if the property was a genuine fit for dense housing.</p> <p>Or were properties chosen via satellite maps with no visitations?</p> <p>Ask them to explain in their own words how adding 24,000 dwelling units will impact air pollution.</p> <p>How will traffic be impacted?</p> <p>Do they believe green space is adequate? One answer to that question is to look at the “green space” at the new apartments on Merrill near Trader Joe’s.</p> <p>Allowing this massive zoning change and building dense housing in our community will be a calamity from which this City will never recover.</p>

<p>1. Public Comments: This portion of the agenda will be limited to a cumulative total of 15 minutes, with individual speakers limited to a maximum time limit of 3 minutes. Further discussion of any matter beyond 15 minutes will be continued to following the public hearing calendar or scheduled for a later agenda. If there is no one from the audience wishing to speak, the Commission will move to the next order of business.</p>	<p>Nancy Magi</p>
<p>1. Public Comments: This portion of the agenda will be limited to a cumulative total of 15 minutes, with individual speakers limited to a maximum time limit of 3 minutes. Further discussion of any matter beyond 15 minutes will be continued to following the public hearing calendar or scheduled for a later agenda. If there is no one from the audience wishing to speak, the Commission will move to the next order of business.</p>	<p>Marilyn Schumert</p>
<p>1. Public Comments: This portion of the agenda will be limited to a cumulative total of 15 minutes, with individual speakers limited to a maximum time limit of 3 minutes. Further discussion of any matter beyond 15 minutes will be continued to following the public hearing calendar or scheduled for a later agenda. If there is no one from the audience wishing to speak, the Commission will move to the next order of business.</p>	<p>Sharon Dodgson</p>
<p>2. Workshop - Draft Environmental Impact Report - Phase 1 General Plan Update: Housing & Public Safety Element Updates And Environmental Justice Policies - Continued from the August 5, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.</p>	<p>Nancy Embry</p>

<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Planning Commissioners:</p> <p>My name is Nancy Magi. I live in Ward 3 at the intersection of Fairview and Central/Alessandro in a single family residential neighborhood. I am asking questions for nearly 700 residents of Ward 3. Victoria Area Neighborhood Alliance and No to 44 Condos.</p> <p>Before the questions, my statement: You, along with the City Council Members, are our neighborhood advocates. We believe you will consider our words as you face a vote that, if passed, will forever alter the character of our historic City in a negative way. Your vote to move ahead with these proposed revisions to the Housing Element will change single family residential zoning to allow for dense building without notification to adjacent property holders nor will there be an individual hearing as is required now. As we have learned over the last 16 months, the Planning Division's job is not advocacy for the citizens of Riverside.</p> <p>For example, we only found out by accident that a 2.2 acre lot adjacent to our property line was proposed as a 44 unit project which will require massive engineering and the construction of a 19 foot freeway-style wall in an attempt to provide stability of the granite the builder will need to remove to fit in all of these little units. Initially this property was NOT an Opportunity Site, but in recent months, and in mysterious ways, we learned that its status had been altered which will now allow more units to be built. Thank you to our Council Member Ronaldo Fierro for notifying us of this change. The City Division did not have to make that notification because we were an ADJACENT property holder.</p> <p>There are 1000 other lots in the city which the Planning Division has identified through mysterious means - most likely electronic and by vague references to consultants - none of whom live in Riverside as far as we know. This proposal horrible plan will not require adjacent property holders to be notified. And</p>
<p>Oppose</p>	<p>I'm trying to understand why this commission is moving to single family residences to allow builders to erect apartments. Is the housing shortage so bad that this is the only alternative? There is no land in this city available to build apartments that won't impact the neighborhoods with cars, exhaust, people!! It seems this needs to go back to the drawing board.</p>
<p>Oppose</p>	<p>I object to decisions on places to put future housing until the public is given a detailed map with street names and a definition of the color codes. The present map is inadequate.</p>
<p>Oppose</p>	<p>As a neighboring resident (Woodcrest), I would like to voice my concerns over the infill of high density housing in established communities. Putting a 10 or 14 unit development next door to and in a neighborhood of single family homes is a bad idea. Where will those 40 cars park? Solving one problem and creating another is not a good plan. I have no objection to creating housing, just not in that way. It is unfair to those that have invested in an area/zone to change them without notice or regard for those property owners. They built the city!</p> <p>You might wonder why I would care? I care because I'm sure at some point, Riverside might be looking to annex Woodcrest. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

1
August 13, 2021

MEMORANDUM

TO: HONORABLE PLANNING COMMISSION

RE: WORKSHOP ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Thank you for holding a workshop today. Our apologies for the late input; however, we were unaware that an EIR for the Housing Element was circulating. CURE's comments this morning will address some "big picture" issues, and we will supplement those comments once we have the benefit of the presentation.

1. Notice

If the City can send emails to notify residents when trash deliver is late, then they surely can give an e-mail blast out concerning the most critical decision that will affect resident's quality of life. Not everyone mines the website nor uses facebook. In that regard, when special workshops are posted, perhaps the clerk can somehow highlight that on the home page of the COUNCIL/MEETINGS homepage.

2. Timing

The EIR apparently was issued on July 16, 2021, with comments due on September 2, 2021, and final adoption of the housing element in mid-October. This presupposes that there will be NO comments requiring recirculation of the EiR, nor will it give staff or the public a true opportunity to digest and respond to comments. Further, many people (including our City Manager) was on vacation in August or kids are getting back to school. This is the second time the city has adopted consequential "plans" in the past six months ostensibly because of state deadlines that can and should be extended to accommodate meaningful discussion.

3. Engagement

A "workshop" with three minute comments is not "interaction". Nor are powerpoints a true reflecting of what these housing element decisions will mean. First, the public deserves input from experts both who support the City's approach or other possible approaches. Staff instead presents their findings and data, and a public largely ill-equipped to respond to lengthy technical documents is expected to respond. The California Public Utilities Commission has an administrative process that truly allows for engagement with both an office of Ratepayer Advocate defending the public and compensation for qualified intervenors and experts.

Further, the City should provide a 3D model that actually reveals what Riverside will look like if this plan is implemented with the resulting increase in traffic, smog and noise affecting neighborhoods. The EIR is a drab, unimaginative documents designed to avoid legal challenges and is not a replacement for the kind of analysis the public needs to make choice. Further, the



model should specify what the cost of infrastructure will be to support those new units and how, with a structural deficit, the City intends to pay for them.

4. New Information

2020 census information is trickling in now. The City should step back and analyze how this data informs future decisions and how it matches up with assumptions adopted during the last General Plan discussion.

5. Environmental Justice

Putting hundred if not thousands of units within 2500 feet of freeways and railroad tracks is the antithesis of environmental justice and defies all the scientific evidence demonstrating how the lung and brain development of children will be stunted leading to long-term health consequences, learning disabilities and early death. CURE will submit several studies highlighting these problems; however, City Staff and Council already are well aware of the serious air quality, climate and temperature factors that will worsen with growth. There is no mitigation that truly protects units that close to increasing diesel emission. Moreover, poorer people purchase/lease these units, and they are least able to afford high electricity bills to run air conditioning units.

6. Water Availability

If every drop of Riverside's water goes to housing, then perhaps we have enough; however, the urban water management plan and council have acknowledged that Riverside must assess the baseline benefits from trees and green spaces and evaluate how much additional tree planting/water is needed to combat and adapt to climate. This EIR does not realistically evaluate the limitations of our resources in this area.

The State has countervailing policies to its housing demands. How a court reconciles them remains to be seen. Riverside must maintain its green spaces and tree coverage to protect the public's health and safety. The legislature cannot undermine the City's police powers to do so because it arbitrarily sets housing requirements. Other options to address homelessness and lack of affordable should be considered before worsening the environment in our City.



Citizens United for Resources and the Environment

TO: HONORABLE PLANNING COMMISSION

RE: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUES IN PROPOSED HOUSING ELEMENT

Thank you again for providing input.

This letter summarizes some key issues to address environmental justice issues in our community that are worsened by the proposed housing element.

1. No units should be sited cited within 2500 feet of freeways or railroads. Who moves there: the poor!!!! The American Lung Association has long established the impacts particularly on children. Eliminating all units in this area will still allow the City to reach the 18000 goal.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4486117/>

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4486117/>

<https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-freeway-pollution-advisory-20171227-story.html>

<https://gustancho.com/buying-home-near-railroad-tracks>

2. Notice how the rich up the hill aren't impacted?

In 2012, the City adopted an EIR with a preferred alternative that required opening Overlook for traffic circulation. This would significantly reduce traffic on Arlington and Central. None of the proposed housing along Central should be approved because the ability for ingress and egress and the increased pollution for individuals living in the vicinity

3. Climate Change is more critical than complying with RHNA

The legislature has adopted conflicting mandates. On the one hand, we are required to reduce Green House Gas reductions, expand green spaces, and ensure poorer communities have more trees. One critical tool for doing so is the application of water for public benefits as the City Council just acknowledged; however, determining how much water is needed and actually allocating that water particularly in poorer communities. The City Council received comments from C-CERT showing how regional logistics expansion will worsen our air quality.

4. This plan does not address Affordable Housing

Most homes will be market based attracting more people to our region who have to drive for jobs. This proposal does not discuss other options to address affordability, i.e. subsidizing rents; converting some apartments to affordable units, or converting unused retail to housing. These options would have fewer environmental impacts but are not thoroughly analyzed.



Citizens United for Resources and the Environment

5. EJ organizations should receive grants to respond

Most non-profit organizations and poorer residents lack the attorneys and technical consultants needed to review, understand and comment. This is an oversight that makes this effort almost meaningless no matter how many public hearings you hold.

CURE intends to supplement its comments as part of this process.

From: [Kopaskie-Brown, Mary](#)
To: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Cc: [Murray, David](#)
Subject: FW: [External] High Density Housing
Date: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 9:48:22 AM

FYI

Mary Kopaskie-Brown
City Planner
City of Riverside
mkopaskie-brown@riversideca.gov
(951) 826-5108

From: Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 9:38 AM
To: CMO CM-ACM-DCM <CM-ACM-DCM@riversideca.gov>; Kopaskie-Brown, Mary <MKopaskie-Brown@riversideca.gov>; Welch, David <DWelch@riversideca.gov>
Cc: Norton, Phaedra <PNorton@riversideca.gov>; Beaumon, Anthony <ABeaumon@riversideca.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] High Density Housing

FYI

From: brush2roll@aol.com <brush2roll@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2021 9:20 AM
To: Cervantes, Cindy <CCervantes@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; ccondor@riversideca.gov; CityClerkMbx <City_Clerk@riversideca.gov>; Edwards, Erin <EEwards@riversideca.gov>; gplacencia@riversideca.gov; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Gonzalez, Larry <LGonzalez@riversideca.gov>; pldawson@riversideca.gov; Fierro, Ronaldo <RFierro@riversideca.gov>; Hemenway, Steve <SHemenway@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] High Density Housing

City Government:

I want you know that I am **OPPOSED** to high density housing in **Riverside**.

Having grown up in Berkeley California, a city that has high density housing intermixed with single family residences, I know first hand the problems that are associated with zoning changes.

I lived in a house that sat in the front of the lot with a six unit apartment on the back of the lot. Try getting a good nights sleep with cars coming and going all night. The affect on air quality is a

major concern as is parking, traffic, noise, crime etc.

Don't ruin a great city by loading with renters.

Sincerely,

Ronald Todar

Keep Riverside healthy: Maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. [RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19](https://www.RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19)

From: [Andrade, Frances](#)
To: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Zoning changes
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 11:13:52 AM

From: Holly Clark <hollclrk@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 10:52 AM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Zoning changes

Hello,

I purchased my house in the Wood Streets neighborhood in 2004. Because of the nature of our houses and lots, there are some ADUs already. We also have single car driveways (if any driveway at all), so many of us rely on street parking for our 2nd cars.

My immediate nextdoor neighbor has a double wide driveway, that up until last month (so, 10+ years of this) had 7-9 cars parked in and around. Some cars were non functional, but the result was the same. Basically a used-car parking lot situation that resulted in them blocking the sidewalk, as well as taking up more than their fair share of street parking.

Given the number of adults that were living in that house for so many years, I can easily imagine a similar situation with the proposed zoning changes. This will negatively impact our neighborhood greatly.

Not to mention, we already have sewer issues in the wood streets, given how old the city infrastructure is. We cannot accommodate adding so many people to our neighborhood.

I understand that there are state mandates involved for adding affordable housing, but I think the approach needs to be very surgical in nature, taking into account neighborhood characteristics and abilities. The current residents cannot be cast aside for new residents. I bought my house in an established neighborhood so that I knew EXACTLY what I was getting into - I never considered houses near vacant lots for this exact reason.

Please feel free to reach out.

Thanks,
Holly Clark

Keep Riverside healthy: Maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. [RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19](https://www.riversideca.gov/COVID-19)

From: [Andrade, Frances](#)
To: [Randall Hord](#)
Cc: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Subject: RE: [External] Planning Counsel
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 1:59:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Do you want it handed out tomorrow or at the September 9th meeting when this will be heard?

From: Randall Hord <Randall.Hord@RaymondJames.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 1:23 PM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Planning Counsel

Hi Frances,

Could you please place a copy of this email in each planning commissioner's packet for the meeting tomorrow:

Members of the Planning Commission:

First, thanks for what you do, through this process I have begun to realize that city planning staff represent the builders and it seems there are very few who actually represent the citizens of our town. I attended the PC meeting last week and I'll put it nicely and say it was eye opening. Our neighborhood group (Victoria Area Neighborhood Alliance) have been fighting the proposed 44 condo project on Central and Fairview for almost two years now. Conveniently this same site has now been added as one of their opportunity sites. This is surely why the developer has stopped submitting plans, he's just going to wait until this housing element goes through then we will have no say in the matter. I would hope there might be a way to carve it out, at least give us a chance for a fair fight. I'm not sure any of them have driven Central lately but it's insane the amount of traffic with delivery vans and 18 wheelers flying down it daily. In just a ½ mile stretch of Central where the 44 condos are proposed that are 3 pre-schools, 1 elementary school and 1 high school. And along with the 44 proposal they have added two other "opportunity sites" that would add another 200+ apartments. So I have a few thoughts:

- When is enough enough, will there ever come a time when they consider the safety of our citizens on this street, accidents happen here almost daily, how many deaths are enough?
- What I took from last weeks PC meeting:
 - The state says they have to submit the housing plan every 5 or 8 years. And our staff are CHOOSING to do it for 8 years simply because they don't want to have to do in another 5 years. This is a joke right? That's exactly what they said. How about they think of what's best for their city and not their job, it is what they get paid for after all. And wouldn't a 5 year plan equate to less housing sites needed?
 - We are required to identify roughly 18K units but they are CHOOSING to do 23k and possibly up to 31k??? Again, this must be a joke. Why in the world if you are having concern from your actual citizens about the density would you just choose to do 30%+ more. They can go on and on about the numbers they think won't actually get done but the STATE asks for 18k so give it to them.

- No answer that I heard that was reasonable about the lack of water resources in our town not to mention our state....they have heard of our problems right?
- They stated the density would result in less vehicle miles on our roads...again, straight from the meeting. How exactly would that happen? Do they think we are in NYC? Chicago? LA? All of the sudden the empty busses and trollies around town would fill up. Someone needs to have them realize exactly where we live.
- Probably the biggest eye opener for me was how they said they communicated this with the public. In my opinion Planning department were given a break with COVID, an excuse to ram this stuff thru without really needing to tell anyone until it's too late. Some of the laughable communication tactics they mentioned:
 - Letting City Counsel know and hoped they would get it out via word of mouth, sure that will happen. From what I hear most of counsel are in favor of this
 - Social Media: Like people are following City Planning on Facebook etc.
 - 2 City billboards.....seriously, 2
 - Planning also said they let their "stakeholders" know. Do they think were dumb, some of us realize their stakeholders is another word for DEVELOPERS who we all know sure don't have a problem with adding density.
 - Last and I mentioned it during my 3 minutes, as I was sitting there I received what seems to be a regular email about my trash being picked up a day or so late. Odd to me, it is regularly communicated to my that my trash will be late but a plan that is going to change our town forever is buried in city websites.

Again, none of this is a reflection on you or the job you do, it's staff and the counsel that worries many of us. There's a groundswell of momentum coming, people are starting to realize what's happening. Unfortunately the only way most people are realizing now is because residents like us are letting them know.

This is being rammed down our throats and I know they can tell the state they need a delay but they just don't want to.

Please help us stop this madness.

And feel free to reach out to me at any time.

Thanks,

Randy



Randall D. Hord, MBA, PPC®
President & Founder of Raincross Financial Partners
Registered Principal, RJFS

(951) 328.1190
Randall.Hord@RaymondJames.com
www.raincrossfp.com



Investment advisory services are offered through Raymond James Financial Services Advisors, Inc. Raincross Financial Partners is not a registered broker/dealer and is independent of Raymond James Financial Services.



Securities offered through Raymond James Financial Services, Inc. member FINRA/SIPC.

Please visit <https://www.raymondjames.com/legal-disclosures/social-media-disclaimer-icd> for Additional Risk and Disclosure Information. Raymond James does not accept private client orders or account instructions by email. This email: (a) is not an official transaction confirmation or account statement; (b) is not an offer, solicitation, or recommendation to transact in any security; (c) is intended only for the addressee; and (d) may not be retransmitted to, or used by, any other party. This email may contain confidential or privileged information; please delete immediately if you are not the intended recipient. Raymond James monitors emails and may be required by law or regulation to disclose emails to third parties.

Investment products are: Not deposits. Not FDIC or NCUA insured. Not guaranteed by the financial institution. Subject to risk. May lose value.

This may constitute a commercial email message under the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003. If you do not wish to receive marketing or advertising related email messages from us, please reply to this message with "unsubscribe" in your response. You will continue to receive emails from us related to servicing your account(s).

Keep Riverside healthy: Maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. [RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19](https://www.riversideca.gov/COVID-19)

From: [Andrade, Frances](#)
To: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Subject: FW: [External] Please print and place in each commissioners packet
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 11:14:14 AM

From: jlkafamily <jlkafamily@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 10:46 AM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Please print and place in each commissioners packet

Dear Board,
Please reconsider your plan to put in housing without regards to neighbors, neighborhoods, and parking in all wards. This is not okay to take away peoples property or bring down their hard earned housing. Please take another look at what you are doing. Planning department needs to actually sit down and plan instead of making a hurried decision that effects peoples lives, livelihoods, and houses.
Mrs. Ludwig

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S21+ 5G, an AT&T 5G smartphone

Keep Riverside healthy: Maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. [RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19](https://www.riversideca.gov/COVID-19)

From: [Andrade, Frances](#)
To: [Taylor, Matthew](#)
Subject: FW: [External] SMART thinking on the massive zoning change
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 9:40:05 AM

From: Nancy Magi <troutquilt@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 9:34 AM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] SMART thinking on the massive zoning change

Frances, please include copies of this email in the Planning Commissioners' packets. Thank you

August 18, 2021

Members of the Planning Commission:

Questions regarding the 1000 Opportunity Sites-

- How were these 1000 Opportunity Sites chosen?
- Did anyone WALK on the chosen properties to determine their “fitness” for dense housing?
- In actuality, were these sites chosen by looking at satellite maps?
- Were builders a significant source of site selection?
- What notification did adjacent neighbors to these sites receive?
- Are you comfortable in a decision to approve this plan knowing that the vast majority of our citizens do not even know about this proposed massive change to our community?
- Do you believe the Planning Division when they say they will not “necessarily allow building” on each site given the potential zoning change?
- Do you believe, if the zoning is changed on these 1000 lots happens, that it can be changed back?

An example to consider and how many more like this one are there-

Three Opportunity Sites within a single mile range from Fairview to the entrance of Olivewood Cemetery:

By the City's own estimate, **a total of 444 dwelling units are proposed in this mile long corridor** which also includes 5 schools and 4 places of worship. This total figure is determined by reviewing the Housing Opportunity Site Information Tool and the RHNA Housing Element Opportunity Site Inventory.

1 - Possible **200** dwelling units at the Church on the Hill on an estimated 10 acres with 400 more cars. Is anyone concerned about traffic safety, dense traffic, and sufficient parking?

2 - Proposed **44** dwelling units on 2.2 acres with 88 more cars
Is anyone concerned about traffic safety, dense traffic, and sufficient parking?

3 - Possible **200** units on 8 acres comprised of a place of worship and three residential properties adjacent to Olivewood Cemetery. Potential for 400 cars. Is anyone concerned about traffic safety, dense traffic, and sufficient parking?

Residents of this corridor have requested accident statistics 4 times and have been ignored. Why can we not receive those statistics? We have seen the crashes, broken light poles, trees cut in half, multiple emergency vehicles, and fatalities. We want to see the stats.

Please walk the properties. Please talk with the residents.

Do you know the Opportunity Sites in the Ward you represent? Are those sites SMART decisions for growth?

We must slow down the process and look at each site. Some are SMART and some are very foolish.

Our fellow citizens do not know this massive zoning change is happening- they must be notified by mail and by various other city wide means - for example, the manner in which we are told about trash pick up delays.

Once again, ask how individual citizens were notified? Answer: Totally electronic.

Please consider this decision thoughtfully. Approval of the hundreds of housing sites on Central/Alessandro corridor sites is just **one example** of irresponsible lot choice.

Where are similar sites in your Ward?

Nancy Magi

Keep Riverside healthy: Maintain healthy diet and exercise, wash your hands, and get vaccinated. [RiversideCA.gov/COVID-19](https://www.riversideca.gov/COVID-19)

Eric Uli
5420 Glenhaven Ave.
Riverside, Ca. 92506
951/781-8105

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2021

City of Riverside
City Clerk's Office
ON 44 (CON) OS
& MORE

City Clerk,
Dear Councilmember

Re: NO

I'm sending a printed copy of an e-mail I attempted to send you on July 7, 2021, of which I recently learned, did NOT reach you. Therefore, I felt compelled to send my letter now, as the subject is extremely important to several hundred people who share my concerns & live in or very near to my address.

I attended a live city council meeting on July 6, 2021, and I spoke at that meeting regarding the NO ON 44 CONDOS issue.

In addition to the letter of July 7, 2021, I would like to add the following questions, of which I request answers from you or qualified persons who have the information:

Re: issue related to SB10 & SB9:

- Will we be notified or informed of modifications to SB9?
SB10, as you know, openly invites gentrification of older, diverse, multi-family and single-family areas. It requires NO affordable units. A copycat of Wiener's defeated SB902, SB10 is an antigen, anti-voter bill that also allows a City Council to override voter-approved land-protection initiatives, including boundaries & open space, an attack on our 108-year-old right to voter initiative.
- What communication about this mass zoning change was sent BY MAIL to every citizen or at least every homeowner?
- Does the Planning Committee believe they have done enough to communicate to every citizen about the massive zoning change?

(Please see pg. 2)

Re: NO ON 44 CONDOS

- How many citizens watched Planning Division videos and asked questions regarding Housing Element?
 - Will the Planning Division mail letters to notify property owners adjacent to the 1,000 Opportunity Sites stating the City's plan to ALTER ZONING to allow for DENSE HOUSING/RETAIL?
 - Was any member of the Planning Division ACTUALLY VISITED IN PERSON the sites of the 1,000 lots to determine IF the property was genuinely FIT for DENSE HOUSING?
 - Regarding the above referenced properties: were these properties chosen/selected from viewing a satellite map WITHOUT personal/actual/ONSITE VISITATION?
 - I request that you/whomever is knowledgeable regarding these issues, explain in your/their own words, how adding 24,000 dwelling units will IMPACT AIR POLLUTION!
 - How will traffic be impacted? Exhaust emissions? Air pollution? Use of additional water & electricity?
 - Do these people involved believe green space is adequate? one can only WONDER when you look at the "green space" apartments currently being built on Merrill St, near Grader Joe's and CVS AND AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL? These buildings are packed in like sardine cans - HIDEOUS!
- This proposed massive zoning change & building of dense housing in THIS particular location is NOT SUITABLE in relation to the adjacent businesses. There's no way to protect shoppers & local school children from tenants who might be child molesters or drug users, etc.
(illegal)
- This whole proposal along w/ the NO ON 44 CONDOS is a mess & will permanently degrade Riverside, & we will never recover from it!
- Respectfully, Ellie Uli

Fw: Subject: City of Riverside; Planned Victoria Woods
Project Radically Changes Neighborhood AKA No on
44 Condos

Yahoo/Sent



Ellie Uli <mizzellie@att.net>

To: Nancy Magi

Wed, Jul 7 at 8:04 PM

Atttn: City Clerk -

Subject: Subject: City of Riverside; Planned Victoria Woods Project Radically Changes
Neighborhood AKA No on 44 Condos

Dear Honorable Mayor and Council Members:

I am writing to inform you of my concerns for the above noted project. First,
please allow me to introduce myself to you

My name is Ellie Uli (pronounced You-lee). My husband (Jim Uli) bought
our house at 5420 Glenhaven Ave. Riverside, CA, 92506 approximately
1975. I married him and moved into this house 5/23/1981, now just over 40
years ago. I have lived in Riverside since 1954 when my parents moved
here from Washington state.

A little background info on myself:

I worked for the City of Riverside for 15 years, from 1994 to 2009. Nine of
those 15 years was spent in the City Council's office where I assisted all
seven councilmembers and from time-to-time, also supported phones for
three City Managers, the Mayor and the City Clerk's offices. During that
time, I upgraded the "receptionist" position for City Council and City
Managers office by helping to lay the groundwork for what was then known
as Council Relations Assistant, (or at least, that was the title when I left that
position), and also during the time I working the the City Council's office I
laid the groundwork for/and was 75% instrumental in developing and
implementing the 3-1-1 Call Center. Later, my last position with the City,
was to renovate and implement an efficient manner by which to process and
issue the street closure Special Event permits, (i.e. neighborhood block
parties, the Festival of Lights, the former Orange Blossom Festival, etc. Any
time an event necessitated the closure of city streets to make the event
safe.

Prior to working for the City, I had been a Dental Assistant for
approximately 20 years, then owned/managed by own retail card & gift store
here in town for 5 years. I worked at several different jobs over the years,
one of which was as a 9-1-1 Emergency Dispatcher for the County of
Riverside Sheriff's Dept. I also worked in mental health, in a "lock-down"
crisis intervention facility in Corona, as extecutive secretary for the two M.D.
Psychiatrists in chage of the adult and the adolescent programs; and later in
private practice as office manager and business manager.

My education includes, graduation from (Ramona High School), here in
Riverside, and I received a B.A. Degree in Political Science from Cal Baptist
University (here in Riverside), I also had studied to become a court
reporter, therefore, I am well versed in English grammar, Dental, Medical
and Legal terminology. Having worked for the City of Riverside, I feel I have
a very good understanding regarding how all the different city departments
function.

My family moved to Riverside, CA in 1954, I grew up, attended local
schools. I graduated from Ramona High School 1965, and later achieved
my BA Degree in Political Science from CBU.

Topic at Hand: NO on 44 Condos, and here is my opinion as to WHY this
should not happen!!!

*Please
keep
"on file"*

This neighborhood cannot sustain 44 condos which will house anywhere from 2 - 6 persons (and possibly more) per unit. This means at least 88 more vehicles, (if not more), plus vehicles by their friends/relatives and babysitters, repair people, etc. who might come to visit on weekends/holidays or weekdays to provide services, etc.

ISSUES:

TRAFFIC

Glenhaven and Fairview have only been repaved once in the 40 years I've lived here, and it was over 20 years ago that Glenhaven was repaved, as per my own notations.

We get a tremendous amount of "through" traffic that comes as far away as Banning/Beaumont (and probably farther), that I personally have followed all those miles from those locations, into Riverside, past my house on Glenhaven, down Sedgwick, to 14th St., then down 14th St. to the 91 FWY ! Glenhaven Ave. is a "through" street and a "shortcut" from beyond Banning/Beaumont/Moreno Valley to the 91 Fwy at 14th St., Riverside.!

WATER PRESSURE:

I've lived at 5420 Glenhaven Ave. since May 23, 1981, and the water pressure for this area was very low THEN and has continued to be LOW even up to NOW! The City had slated to put in larger water pipes down Central Ave., to serve this and other neighborhoods along Central Ave, in 2005, it was slated, and then it was post-poned to 2010, and then it was forgotten.....except in 2017, the city did a LITTLE work on Arroyo Dr. (from Victoria Ave. to the bend in the road where Arroyo Dr. curves onto Glenhaven Ave. Then the new pavement stopped, as did the water pipe project.!

Another water concern: Over the past 2 - 3 years, the City's Streets and/or Water Department staff have had work crews and huge trucks, cutting open areas in front of my house, and the houses immediately to next to me and across the street from me SEARCHING for water leaks that they detect but don't seem to be able to find. I'm concerned about underground water leakage from these very old water pipes, and concerned that one day I might try to drive into or back out of my driveway and have my car fall into a huge sink hole!

ELECTRIC POWER:

The power grid for this neighborhood is over 60 - possibly even closer to 70 years old. We have power failures very often! It's been "overloaded" for nearly 50 years now, and the addition of 44 units to accommodate the number of people (mentioned above), is just not practical, in fact it's just insane.!

The City is WAY BEHIND in upgrading the electrical power service to this area now, it cannot and will not sustain additional housing units of ANY NUMBER! And, even if the city upgrades the power grid, we are still faced with several other pertinent issues.!

Safety:

There is one public school (Alcott), and one private school, (Immanuel Lutheran School), as well as a church in this neighborhood, and a lot of children live in this area. Alcott Elementary School is currently under mass construction to enlarge the capacity of that schools enrollment capabilities, which will also mean MORE TRAFFIC coming into this area. The more housing units that are allowed in this area brings more and more possibilities for crime and unsafe situations for our children and elderly. Also, the topic that the projected 44 condos might be zoned as "subsidized housing units" is just not practical. This is an older, established neighborhood, and there is no room for a RADICAL INFLUX of 44 condo units. and all the added problems stated above. If that property were to be used for anything, it would be MAYBE one or two large parcels for PRIVATE residences for one or two additional families AT THE MOST.!

With houses designed to enhance and complement the existing style of housing.

GRANITE: Most of the houses already here were built on top of ground with mass amounts of granite boulders beneath the visible portion of the ground. In my own back yard, the builder had to BLAST the boulders away to build the swimming pool, and had to cut off one corner of the pool to avoid a HUGE boulder. When I re-landscaped my back yard, I found a lot of large ROCKS and another HUGE BOULDER which broke the tractor's scoop. Anyone who would wants to build on that area in question, I would recommend they highly reconsider ANY type of building.....gee. maybe that's WHY no one else built on it before now ? HMM??? Granite, wonder how much damage some of our current properties might suffer if a contractor had to BLAST away huge granite boulders in order to build anything in that location.

I remember about 15 years ago, when condo units were built next to the former Riverside Swim Club (which is now defunct) and the added traffic we've had since then ! The added number of people to utilize our water and electric power sources, etc. (And NO, we don't want any more condos on that site, either !!!)

Respectfully, *E. Uli*

Ellie Uli, Resident/Home Owner/ Tax Payer

5420 Glenhaven Ave.
Riverside, CA 92506

Phone: 951/781-8105 (FYI: this phone does not receive TEXT messages. Thank you).



From: Michelle Brown <michbrown@att.net>
Sent: Friday, August 20, 2021 12:25 AM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] No on 44 condo's/1000 Opportunity sites

Hello Frances Andrade. Can you please place a copy of the my email (below) in each Planning Commission's packet for tomorrow's meeting?

Attention Members of the Planning Commission:

Please, I urge you, as my family happily resides in the beautiful Victoria Woods neighborhood. I live here with my husband, four boys and recently, my senior citizen mother. Please, just open your eyes by going to the actual proposed sites to see the ridiculousness of this proposed 44 condo project. If approved, I believe whole heartedly that it is:

- Unsafe/dangerous for our kids of all ages who are walking to one of the four surrounding schools.
- Unsafe/dangerous to dig so close to single family homes right next to the proposed area.
- Unsafe/dangerous to triple the amount of traffic, which significantly raises the % of accidents that will happen on one of the busiest streets in Riverside.
- Unsafe/dangerous for our current power circuits/water needs along with gas that will be necessary to each condo.
- Unsafe/dangerous for our city services and infrastructure.
- Unfair/detrimental to the families who CHOOSE to live and raise their families in this beautiful neighborhood; what is going to happen to the value of our homes?
- Unsafe/dangerous for the safety of our cars, homes and families as this will invite more crime.

Please, I urge all of you to at least walk the properties, talk with the residents, ask yourself, "Would I feel safe and want to live in this neighborhood with your family after 200 dwelling units and 44 condo's are added within a quarter mile of each other?"

Is it really more important to push all of the laws/rules that have been in place to protect neighborhoods, zoning changes, etc., and sacrifice the integrity and character of our city because the State is mandating it and all they need to do to convince our elected leaders is us money as the bait? What happened to standing up and doing what is right for our city and people who chose to live here? It is extremely disheartening.

Money seems to be the driving force behind all of these changes and it is extremely disappointing that our elected officials are willing to build and sacrifice the residents of Riverside County and their quality of our life (living in a safe, traditional, beautiful city) for money. I don't believe our city was meant the zone changes and massive increase in condo's/apartments, etc., will turn our welcoming, beautiful, traditional city into an overcrowded, over populated, polluted one. It makes me feel very sad, helpless and frustrated

Frankly, I pray that all of you on the planning committee will actually use your knowledge, common sense, brains and voices physically investigate each proposed site by walking them, doing thorough research and immediately removing the sites (like the 44 condo's and Church on the Hill) that would do more harm than good if you approve those project sites.

I stand by my neighbors to simply fight for preserve the integrity and safety of the people who live in our neighborhood. Please try to listen to and work with us, taking into consideration all of our valid concerns. I truly believe our safety is at great risk if these proposed project sites are approved. There are better lots and areas to satisfy the state's requirement for more housing. Please do what is right because it is the right thing to do. *"Do What is Right, Not What is Easy!"*

Sincerely,

Michelle Brown
2232 Drummond St.

From: Susan Pike <sugarpike@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, August 21, 2021 8:46 PM

To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Please copy the email below and forward to each Commissioner.

You've already received the email below from a resident local to the site being discussed at your meetings. Please re-think this plan. Riverside has so many problems more pressing than putting more money into developer's pockets. Housing is needed - sure. A city can't grow without places for people to live. But these plans for such DENSE housing make no sense to anyone but the greedy developers.

Please vote NO on stupid plans like this.

Members of the Planning Commission:

Questions regarding the 1000 Opportunity Sites-

How were these 1000 Opportunity Sites chosen?

Did anyone WALK on the chosen properties to determine their "fitness" for dense housing?

In actuality, were these sites chosen by looking at satellite maps?

Were builders a significant source of site selection?

What notification did adjacent neighbors to these sites receive?

Are you comfortable in a decision to approve this plan knowing that the vast majority of our citizens do not even know about this proposed massive change to our community?

Do you believe the Planning Division when they say they will not "necessarily allow building" on each site given the potential zoning change?

Do you believe, if the zoning is changed on these 1000 lots happens, that it can be changed back?

An example to consider and how many more like this one are there-

Three Opportunity Sites within a single mile range from Fairview to the entrance of Olivewood Cemetery:

By the City's own estimate, a total of 444 dwelling units are proposed in this mile long corridor which also includes 5 schools and 4 places of worship. This total figure is determined by reviewing the Housing Opportunity Site Information Tool and the RHNA Housing Element Opportunity Site Inventory.

1 - Possible 200 dwelling units at the Church on the Hill on an estimated 10 acres with 400 more cars. Is anyone concerned about traffic safety, dense traffic, and sufficient parking?

2 - Proposed 44 dwelling units on 2.2 acres with 88 more cars

Is anyone concerned about traffic safety, dense traffic, and sufficient parking?

3 - Possible 200 units on 8 acres comprised of a place of worship and three residential properties adjacent to Olivewood Cemetery. Potential for 400 cars. Is anyone concerned about traffic safety, dense traffic, and sufficient parking?

Residents of this corridor have requested accident statistics 4 times and have been ignored.

Why can we not receive those statistics? We have seen the crashes, broken light poles, trees cut in half, multiple emergency vehicles, and fatalities. We want to see the stats.

Please walk the properties. Please talk with the residents.

Do you know the Opportunity Sites in the Ward you represent? Are those sites SMART decisions for growth?

We must slow down the process and look at each site. Some are SMART and some are very foolish.

Our fellow citizens do not know this massive zoning change is happening- they must be notified by mail and by various other city wide means - for example, the manner in which we are told about trash pick up delays.

Once again, ask how individual citizens were notified? Answer: Totally electronic.

Please consider this decision thoughtfully. Approval of the hundreds of housing sites on Central/Alessandro corridor sites is just one example of irresponsible lot choice.

Where are similar sites in your Ward?

Susan PIke

Date: 8/20/21

From: Kevin Pope, Laura Pope, Gayle Morrison

To: Riverside Planning Commissioners: Judy Teunissen, Larry E. Allen, Christine L. Roberts, Andrew P. Villalobos, Raj K. Singh, Todd D. Ridgway, Jonathan K. Parker, James R. Rush, Richard L. Kirby

Subject: **Written Request to Remove APN 233150019 From Opportunity Site List**

My name is Kevin Pope. On behalf of myself and my family, who own the property, I'm writing this letter to oppose the general plan redesignation and rezoning of our property located at 3315 Van Buren Blvd, Riverside, CA 92503 (APN 233150019).

During the 8/13/21 planning commission meeting, Commissioner Jim Rush asked Matthew Taylor how a property owner can request to be removed from the opportunity site list if they oppose their redesignation/rezone. Matthew Taylor explained that the owner should make such a request known to the Planning Commission, and that the Planning Commissioners have the authority to remove sites. This letter is our formal written request.

For the past several years I've worked at Brookhurst Mill, which has been located on this site since 1959, spanning four generations of family ownership. In March of this year, we made the difficult decision to close the doors, as the demand for commercial animal feeds continues to decline in southern California. We've watched this trend for decades, and knew that our time operating the mill would eventually come to an end. We often discussed what we would do with the property after the mill closure, usually landing upon leasing it out to businesses that could make use of the existing buildings and infrastructure on site.

Immediately after closing the doors in March, we began deconstructing Brookhurst Mill and preparing the site for 3 separate commercial tenants, in accordance with our current industrial zoning. We were well underway with this process and had already sunk tens of thousands of dollars into this project when we received notice in late May that the City planned to redesignate and rezone our property to attempt to turn the site over to residential uses.

I'd like to point out why this site is not well suited for housing, and should be removed from the opportunity site list that is scheduled to be voted on in October by City Council. The site shares a property line on all four sides by industrial uses. Automotive repair shops to the south. A business manufacturing park to the east. A new tilt-up warehouse to the west. And two highly active rail lines, BNSF freight lines and Metro link within 15 feet of the property line to the north. The site is over 2 miles from the La Sierra metrolink station, not within walking distance to public transit. That's not to mention the constant homeless and drug problem along the railroad tracks next to this property. Two encampments have already been hauled away by railroad police this year. And for what it's worth, historically speaking, the East side of Van Buren has always been zoned for business use (like us), while the west side of Van Buren has allowed for housing.

Additionally, I'd like to mention the extremely short notice given. I was notified by mail in LATE MAY 2021 of this proposed redesignation and rezone. That gave us less than 5 months to do anything about it before the October vote. And in the meantime, we've already sunk thousands and thousands of dollars into preparing the property for commercial tenants, according to our current zoning! Given that we shut down mill operations, there was no legal non-conforming use to continue. A redesignation would result in our family being housing developers as we have no plans to sell the property. Significantly, the land use change would leave two adjacent parcels containing a rail spur valueless. These parcels only have value as appended to an industrial land use.

Our desire is simple; we want to maintain the zoning we've had for over 60 years. We're not just trying to be obstinate or anti-development. We understand that responsible development is good for everyone. But when you actually look at our location specifically, you'll see it is not well suited for housing, and maybe that's why it's surrounded on all four sides by commercial and industrial uses, not housing. The companies scheduled to soon move into the property are very stable, longstanding companies with excellent reputations, bringing jobs and growth to Riverside.

Lastly, I'd like to point out that we've been highly engaged through this whole housing element process. During my time dialoging with City staff and speaking at City Council and Planning Commission meetings, not once have I heard from another property owner opposing their rezoning. So I would think it's a short list of people who want to be removed, and I'd like to be the first. We understand that City staff has purposely built in a buffer, albeit a narrow buffer, to their opportunity site list because they know some sites may not pass muster, so I kindly ask that you exercise your authority to remove this property for all the reasons stated above.

Thank you for your understanding. -Kevin Pope, Laura Pope, Gayle Morrison