

Date: 10-1-19  
Item no.: 6

From: Richard Block <rblock31@charter.net>  
Sent: Sunday, September 29, 2019 8:07 PM  
To: Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>  
Subject: [External] City Council Oct. 1 agenda Item #6

Hello.

Attached as a 2-page Word file is a letter from Friends of Riverside's Hills to the City Council pertaining to the Oct. 1, 2019 meeting agenda item #6,

Cases P18-0970, P18-0971, P18-0972, P18-0973, P18-0974, and P18-0975 - Appeal - Oscar Graham of Passco Pacifica LLC - Intent to overrule Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission finding of inconsistency for General Plan Amendment to change land use designation from C - Commercial to MDR - Medium Density Residential, rezoning from CR - Commercial Retail Zone to R-1-7000 - Single-Family Residential Zone and portion of site to R-1-7000-S - Single-Family Residential and Building Stories (maximum three stories) Overlay Zones, Tentative Tract Map 37626, Planned Residential Development Permit for detached single-family dwellings, private streets and common open space, design review of project plans, and variance to allow reduced perimeter landscape setback to facilitate a residential subdivision consisting of 56 single-family residential lots, common open space, and private streets on 7.07 vacant gross acres - Schedule public hearing for 3 p.m. on November 19, 2019 - Southeast corner of Tyler Street and Jurupa Avenue (Community and Economic Development Department) (Ward 7).

Please confirm receipt of this letter and that it will be distributed to the Council members.

Thank you,

Richard Block for Friends of Riverside's Hills

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

Sept. 29, 2019

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the Riverside City Council

From: Friends of Riverside's Hills (FRH)

Re: Oct. 1 City Council agenda item #6 Cases P18-0970, P18-0971, P18-0972, P18-0973, P18-0974, and P18-0975 - Intent to overrule Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

FRH opposes this item for the following significant reasons, in addition to those pointed out in our August 28 letter to the Planning Commission (displayed as an attachment to this item, under "Letters").

This proposed overrule, and the project in its entirety, is simply wrong. It is now proposed to go against the previous staff recommendation to disapprove the project and to go against the Planning Commission's denial of the project. The change is apparently in response to the applicant's appeal claims regarding the ALUC finding of inconsistency.

**But please seriously consider the new Sept. 12, 2019 Memorandum ("Airport Memo") from the Airport Manager, pointing out the serious misstatements and blatant errors in the applicant's appeal arguments, and the dangers involved.**

For example, while the applicant states that the Airport Master Plan "requires" departing aircraft to turn northwesterly (so away from the proposed development), the Airport Memo points out that that is false and that "departing traffic heading west continue straight out and do not turn".

Another example: despite the applicant's claims about an adequate emergency landing area, the Airport Memo points out that the area suggested by the applicant does not meet the requirements for such an area.

Another issue, not even mentioned in the Airport Memo: the March 2019 ALUC staff report on the project lists as "uses specifically prohibited or discouraged in Compatibility Zone C (children's schools, day care centers, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, buildings with 3 above-ground habitable floors, ..." However, the current project plans now show that **a number of the proposed buildings WILL**

**have 3 above-ground habitable floors, which use is “specifically prohibited or discouraged in Compatibility Zone C”.** So this is an additional reason, not earlier considered, for sticking with the ALUC finding of inconsistency.

The Airport Memo notes the large number of airports, including some nearby airports, that have closed or are threatened for reasons specifically including “urban encroachment”. That controversy should not be encouraged here by such projects as this one.

The Airport Memo goes on to state “This project should not be approved so as to go backwards with the City’s public safety planning efforts. ... Approval of this project will only make conditions worse in the event of an aircraft accident.”

Yes, and in the event of such an accident, it appears that the City and its taxpayers will be on the hook for liability.

Quite aside from the ALUC finding of inconsistency, there are reasons to oppose this project, as incompatible with neighboring density and requirements for a PRD (some addressed in our letter to the Planning Commission). If the override goes forward this week, we will further address those other issues for the Nov. 19 public hearing.

And speaking of Nov. 19, that will be after the upcoming election, and there will be at least 3 new council members. Since an override requires the approving vote of at least 5 councilmembers, this whole matter should not have even been proposed to be considered until the new councilmembers are seated.

Thank you for your consideration.

Friends of Riverside’s Hills, prepared by its Legal Liaison Officer, Richard Block