

Taylor, Matthew

From: Jason Hawkins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2019 5:17 PM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Cc: Kevin Akin; Bill Medina; Gary Lupo; Jane Block; Eugene Anderson; Taylor, Matthew; 2Mayor; Jean-Paul Baquiran
Subject: [External] Fw: New menace to Box Spring/Sycamore Canyon wildlife route (was: Re: Sycamore at Central (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project Plans)
Attachments: Project Plans.cleaned.pdf; archive.zip

This email's attachments were cleaned of potential threats by The City of Riverside's Security Gateway. Click [here](#) if the original attachments are required (justification needed).

Good afternoon Friends and fellow Highlanders. My name is Jason Hawkins. I am reaching out because of the Public hearing in regards to the proposed project Case Numbers are as follows P18-0028, P18-0031, P18-0032, P18-0033, P18-0034. The hearing is due to take place on 4/18/2019. We have not received a ENVIRONMENTAL impact study. We as a community do not agree with this development. It will cause issues with traffic/environment/toxic emissions, etc... What we love about our community is the NATURE that surrounds us. We do not need another Gas station/Liquor Store or fast food restaurant, and Car wash. The Canyon Crest Town Centre has all of those services available. This region has adequate resources for that. My Dear Friends at UCR I would like to have your input as we are at a loss for answers. This project will include a 24 hour car wash, bright lights, fast food restaurant (Please review the proposed plans). There are multiple construction projects taking place at this time. As a result it has affected Utilities, traffic congestion, etc... This is not a smart move! I welcome any comments.

Best Regards
Jason Hawkins
[REDACTED] Harvard Way
Riverside CA, 92507

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Kevin Akin <[REDACTED]>
To: Gary Lupo <[REDACTED]>; Bill Medina <[REDACTED]>; Eugene N. Anderson <[REDACTED]>; Eugene Anderson <[REDACTED]>; Jane Block <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019, 8:54:53 PM PDT
Subject: New menace to Box Spring/Sycamore Canyon wildlife route (was: Re: Sycamore at Central (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project Plans)

Friends,

A very few of us along Harvard Way, who fall into the area 300 feet from the proposed project, have been notified of a plan to erect a garish gas station/store/carwash/restaurant next to the 60/215 Freeway at Central and Sycamore Canyon overlooking the Box Spring Creek arroyo. The facility is expected to be well-lit 24 hours

a day. The developer and the city are seeking a negative declaration to the effect that it will have no effect on the environment, so that such effects need not be studied before it is built.

During night-time hours the Central/Watkins route under the 60/215 Freeway is the only wildlife corridor between the Box Spring Mountain/Box Spring Creek wildlife area to the north, and the Sycamore Canyon/Box Spring Creek wildlife area to the south, along the freeway from Martin Luther King Avenue to the Box Spring/Faire Isle bridge. I live in a house (at [REDACTED] Harvard Way) that faces this area, and the wildlife we have seen crossing in front of our house toward and away from the Central/Watkins undercrossing includes rabbits, foxes, coyotes, skunks, kangaroo rats, roadrunners, opossums, raccoons, lynx, and cougars, as well as several species of snakes. Many other species are presumed to be less visible, rather than absent. From late in the evening until early morning, traffic is scarce off the freeway, but still quite threatening on the freeway itself. This is the dark period when wildlife crosses from one side of the freeway to the other.

But if the proposed project is completed, there will never be another dark moment at the undercrossing itself or in its immediate vicinity. Many species will be entirely discouraged from crossing, others will be forced to try crossing the freeway, often with fatal results.

The freeway is much more difficult to cross than it was several years ago before it was widened, with additional barriers, fences, and grade separations. A previous crossing for some wildlife, the Box Spring Creek tunnel, is used now only by frogs, since it was considerably lengthened when the freeway was widened, and a permanent deep pool of water in a concrete basin was placed at its southwestern terminus. As for the availability of the possible crossing areas at Martin Luther King Avenue and the Box Spring/Faire Isle bridge, both are much less passable than they used to be before the freeway widening project. Vertical walls and fences essentially preclude use of the Martin Luther King Avenue undercrossing, and the Box Spring/Faire Isle bridge was lengthened and raised, with lights added that discourage wildlife using this crossing. Essentially, the wildlife crossing which will be lit up and made unavailable by the project is the only one between the Box Spring Mountain area and the Sycamore Canyon area, and the freeway will become an impassible barrier.

There is certainly no overwhelming societal need that will be served by the project, as a mile or so up the hill at the Box Spring/Fair Isle crossing there is a store, gas station, and restaurant, and down the hill on Central Avenue to the west just over a mile away is the Canyon Crest Towne Center, with a gas station, car wash, restaurants, and grocery and drug stores. The "need" for a particular business to get a share of this commerce is certainly not a compelling reason why the city should permit the destruction of wildlife that will follow this construction.

There are many other problems with the proposed project. For example, traffic is already very bad on the freeway, as everyone in the area knows, and at peak times much of the traffic moves to the Sycamore Canyon frontage road, which also becomes blocked. To put this project on Sycamore Canyon Boulevard at Central will guarantee that this traffic sharply worsens. If this project actually served an important societal need, it would require reshaping the intersection of Central, Sycamore Canyon, Watkins, and the 60/215 Freeway, with alterations to the traffic lights. This would require the involvement of Caltrans, that has control over the traffic lights and traffic patterns next to freeway interchanges.

Just as the life patterns of wildlife will be disrupted, human life on the facing hillside of the University City neighborhood also will be disrupted. The installation of traffic lights at Central and Sycamore Canyon provided a distraction that most have now overcome, but a garish 24-hour light display along with accompanying traffic noise and car headlights on the surface streets at all hours will bring new challenges to the people who live in this neighborhood because they appreciate the relative silence of the area, and who have previously rejected

the installation of street lights. Being asked at 2:30 in the morning whether they "WANT FRIES WITH THAT?" will certainly not improve their lives. Most houses on this hill have lovely night views of the Riverside area (which a retired realtor friend tells me are worth a lot of money), and those views will be destroyed by a nearby bright light source in the middle of them.

This is the eastern gateway to Riverside. This proposed project, which apparently according to the plans will be ugly as sin, is not an appropriate entrance to my native city, with its regard for history, culture, and aesthetics.

Please, let me know if you have any ideas for how to stop this misbegotten project. Thank you. -Kevin

From: Jason Hawkins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 6:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fw: [External] Re: Sycamore at Central (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project Plans

Here is the second email from the city planner.

Not sure if the attachment went through with my 1st email but here is the PDF of the project plan.

Your Neighbor, Thank you

Jason

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jason Hawkins <[REDACTED]>
To: Maryann Concepcion <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019, 12:50:15 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: [External] Re: Sycamore at Central (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project Plans

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Taylor, Matthew" <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Fri, Mar 29, 2019 at 12:41 PM
Subject: RE: [External] Re: Sycamore at Central (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project Plans

I forgot to include the link where the agenda packet will be posted; it will be [here](#).

Thanks,

Matthew Taylor | Associate Planner

951.826.5944 | mtaylor@riversideca.gov

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street | 3rd Floor | Riverside 92522

From: Jason Hawkins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 12:36 PM
To: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] Re: Sycamore at Central (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project Plans

Thank you.

Jason Hawkins

951-901-5270

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

On Fri, Mar 29, 2019 at 12:24 PM, Taylor, Matthew

<MTaylor@riversideca.gov> wrote:

Hello Jason,

Please find attached herewith plans for the project for which you received a Notice of Hearing. Plans, a draft Environmental Document, and a full Staff Report will be posted on the City's website here next Friday. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any additional questions, comments or concerns.

Thank you,

Matthew Taylor | Associate Planner

951.826.5944 | mtaylor@riversideca.gov

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street | 3rd Floor | Riverside 92522



**WALK TO END
HOMELESSNESS**

APR. 13, 2019 • 7 AM
FAIRMOUNT PARK

REGISTER NOW

Taylor, Matthew

From: Jason Hawkins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 10:31 PM
To: Taylor, Matthew; eugene@kaenterprises.net; Zimmerman, Mike; chancellor@ucr.edu
Cc: Kevin Akin; Eugene Anderson; 2Mayor; Bill Medina; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
cnasdean@ucr.edu; lifescidean@ucr.edu; agdean@ucr.edu; physcidean@ucr.edu;
[REDACTED]
Subject: [External] RE: Sycamore Canyon/Central Project, (Planning Cases P18-0028 & P18-0031-0034) - Project City Of Riverside
Attachments: archive.zip

Greetings All. My name is Jason Hawkins. I am reaching out to you all to address the issues of this project. The concern of the neighborhood is the infraction that it will create. Mainly issues with Wild life/ traffic/emissions/Public safety. As a long time resident of Riverside, I value what our community has maintained and endured. We come together. Help each other. Enjoy the wild life. I love getting up in the morning and having a cup of coffee, and seeing the wild life. This project will significantly jeopardize that. There are plenty of resources within this community to accommodate all. The wild life has to have a corridor to naturally LIVE! I love seeing Bob Cats, Raccoons, etc.. This for us is accomplishing our goal, and Home ownership goal. From the time I have lived here since 9/28/2018, we all have a unconditional love for our Neighborhood. Some of my neighbors have been here 30 years plus. When myself and Fiance moved in, we were welcomed with opened arms. We do not need another liquor store/Gas Station/ Fast Food Restaurant etc... Also we were not Informed of who received the notices, or how many dedicated home owners received the notices. Case and point, the notice I received was addressed to the previous home owner that has not occupied this property for 3 plus years. The information does not add up. Also, being there is no environmental impact study for the residents to review. Further more, why is it that an invitation was sent out for 4/15/2019 to attend a meeting? Makes no sense! I welcome any comments. Lastly. I would like to thank UCR, FRH and the people who care

Jason Hawkins

Taylor, Matthew

From: Maryann Concepcion <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 5:31 AM
To: Taylor, Matthew
Cc: Brenes, Patricia; Jason Hawkins
Subject: Re: [External] RE: Proposed Vehicle Fuel Station and Drive-thru Restaurant Project at Northeast Corner of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and Central Avenue (Case Nos. P18-0028, P18-0034, P18-0031, P18-0032, and P18-0033)

Mr. Taylor,

Thank you for your response.


From the definition provided above, it is quite the stretch to categorize a project as a “commercial complex” containing three or more uses when there are only two small one-acre parcels, with only one primary use for each parcel (vehicle fuel station and drive-thru restaurant). The Planning Department may argue that the convenience market and car wash are also uses that contribute to the commercial complex, but these uses are accessory uses to the primary use of vehicle fuel station and should NOT count as a third use. Even in the Parking Code requirements, the Zoning Code shows the Vehicle Fuel Station as the primary use with the convenience market and car wash clearly as accessory uses to the primary use of vehicle fuel station (refer to screen capture of Zoning Code 19.580.060 below). For instance, if the Planning Department were to start applying accessory uses to the “commercial complex” definition above to achieve that third use, technically “indoor storage area” is also shown as an accessory use in the parking code under vehicle fuel station - it would not make sense to categorize the accessory use of indoor storage area so the project could conveniently fit the definition of a “commercial complex”.

Having a CC&R agreement does not make the proposed project anymore or less in compliance with the “Commercial Complex” definition. It is understood that it is a set of private agreements written by the applicant for the benefit of the property owners and maintenance of the parcels and has no bearing in making the project fit into the “Commercial Complex” definition from a Zoning Code perspective.

There are some major problems in calling this project a “commercial complex” as stated above. When a project is not a commercial complex with only two parcels each with one use, the proposed Parcel 1 (drive-thru restaurant parcel) should still be subject to Drive-Thru Businesses development standards as set forth in Section 19.475.040.A of the Zoning Code requiring that the drive-thru restaurant parcel have a frontage on an arterial street (Sycamore Canyon Boulevard), for which the proposed project is in violation of this zoning code standard.

I still maintain my position from my initial email and add that the proposed project is NOT a “commercial complex” by definition and has only two primary uses. Since the proposed Parcel 1 (drive-thru restaurant parcel) does NOT have frontage along a designated Arterial Street (Central Avenue), the proposed project is in violation of Zoning Code Chapter 19.475.040.A, the development standard requiring drive-thru businesses be located on an arterial street.

Please forward my response to the Planning Commission as well.

<div>  <div> <div>CITY OF</div> <div>RIVERSIDE</div> </div> </div> <div> <div>Search or jump to</div> <div> <div>NOTIFICATIONS</div> <div>SIGN IN</div> <div>HELP</div> <div>Select Language</div> </div> </div>	
<div> <div>Riverside, California</div> <div>Title 19 - ZONING</div> <div>ARTICLE VIII - SITE</div> <div>Chapter 19.580 - P.</div> <div>19.580.050 - Parki..</div> </div> <div> <div>SHOW CHANGES</div> <div>Q</div> <div>MORE</div> </div>	
<div> <div>VERSION: MAR 29, 2019 (CURRENT)</div> <div> <div>19.580.010 - Purpose.</div> <div>19.580.020 - Applicability.</div> <div>19.580.030 - Exemptions.</div> <div>19.580.040 - Permit Requirements.</div> <div>19.580.050 - Basic limitations for off-street parking.</div> <div>19.580.050 - Parking requirements.</div> <div>19.580.070 - Off-street parking location and type requirements.</div> </div> </div>	
<div> <div>Tutoring Center</div> <div> <div>1 space per each faculty/staff;</div> <div>1 space/2 students, for students 16 years old or older; and,</div> <div>1 space/10 students, for students under 16 years old</div> </div> </div>	
<div> <div>Vehicle Fuel Stations</div> <div> <div>a. With Accessory Retail/Convenience Market</div> <div>a. 1 space/250 square feet of retail area including cooler areas (14)</div> <div>b. 2 spaces/service bay (14)</div> <div>b. With Vehicle Maintenance/Repair</div> <div>c. 1 space/1,000 square feet of storage area (14)</div> <div>d. With Restaurants (including all cooking, serving and seating areas)</div> <div>d. 1 space/100 square feet of floor area (14)</div> <div>e. With Car Wash</div> <div>e. 1 space/washing bay (14)</div> </div> </div>	

Thank you
Maryann Concepcion

On Mon, Apr 15, 2019 at 6:25 PM Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov> wrote:

Good evening Ms. Concepcion,

Thank you for your comments, which will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration at the upcoming Public Hearing.

To clarify our application of these provisions of the Zoning Code, this project is considered a commercial complex as all proposed uses will share common access, circulation, parking and other facilities and will be legally tied together by CC&Rs governing unified management and maintenance. Therefore, the Central Avenue arterial frontage is applied to the entire project site, including the proposed drive-thru restaurant. By comparison, if the two proposed parcels were physically and operationally separated (for instance, by a solid wall with no common access), the proposed drive-thru restaurant would not be considered to have the required frontage on an arterial street.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or I can help you with anything else. Thank you,

Matthew Taylor | Associate Planner

951.826.5944 | mtaylor@riversideca.gov

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street | 3rd Floor | Riverside 92522

From: Maryann Concepcion <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2019 5:57 AM
To: Taylor, Matthew <MTaylor@riversideca.gov>
Cc: Brenes, Patricia <PBrenes@riversideca.gov>; Zimmerman, Mike <MZimmerman@riversideca.gov>; Jason Hawkins <[REDACTED]>
Subject: [External] RE: Proposed Vehicle Fuel Station and Drive-thru Restaurant Project at Northeast Corner of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and Central Avenue (Case Nos. P18-0028, P18-0034, P18-0031, P18-0032, and P18-0033)

Mr. Taylor,

I am writing to you as a concerned new property owner/resident of 20248 Harvard Way, Riverside for which I live near the proposed project. I am in opposition to the proposed vehicle fuel station and drive-thru restaurant project.

In reviewing the Planning Commission Memorandum Staff Report of Agenda Item No. 2 from Associate Planner, Matthew Taylor for the Planning Commission Hearing Date of April 18, 2019, there is an error on page 8 of the Project Analysis in regards to Compliance with Applicable Development Standards for the Drive-Thru Restaurant. The Zoning Code requirement for Drive-Thru Businesses reads:

Chapter 19.475 - DRIVE-THRU BUSINESSES

19.475.040.A - Site location, operation and development standards


The drive-thru business shall maintain a minimum 100-foot street frontage and be located on an arterial street, as indicated by the Riverside General Plan Figure CCM-4 - Master Plan of Roadways.

On page 8, the staff report incorrectly states that the Drive-Thru Restaurant has frontage along Central Avenue, an arterial street. In fact, the proposed Parcel 1 (Drive-Thru Restaurant Parcel) only has frontage along Sycamore Canyon Road (designated a "66-Foot Collector Road") and does NOT have frontage on Central Avenue (designated an "Arterial Street"), according to General Plan Figure CCM-4 - Master Plan of Roadways. See attached graphic of a rough sketch showing locations of the arterial street (Central Avenue) and the collector road (Sycamore Canyon Boulevard) drawn on top of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map.

Since the proposed Parcel 1 (Drive-Thru Restaurant Parcel) does NOT have frontage along a designated Arterial Street (Central Avenue), the proposed project does not comply with Zoning Code Chapter 19.475.040.A, the development standard requiring drive-thru businesses be located on an arterial street. Because the project does not meet the Zoning Code, the project as currently proposed can NOT be approved by the Planning Commission. For the reason stated above, I request that the Planning Commission DENY this project because it does not meet the Zoning Code Chapter 19.475.040.A.

Please also forward this message to Mary Kopaskie-Brown, City Planner as I was unable to locate her email address.

I look forward to your response.

Thank you,
Maryann Concepcion


Taylor, Matthew

From: Andrew Sall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 3:06 PM
To: Kopaskie-Brown, Mary; Taylor, Matthew; Nicol, Colleen
Cc: Roth, Cindy; Brooke Biddle
Subject: [External] Letter of Support: KA Enterprises Development
Attachments: Marini Project Letter of Support.cleaned.pdf

This email's attachments were cleaned of potential threats by The City of Riverside's Security Gateway.
Click [here](#) if the original attachments are required (justification needed).

Good Afternoon,

On behalf of the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce, please see the attached letter of SUPPORT on the proposal for development by Eugene Marini of KA Enterprises, which will go before Planning Commission tomorrow. The proposal would allow for the development of several amenities along Central Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard near the 60/215 Freeway, ultimately creating jobs and bringing new services to this critical corridor.

Thank you and please let us know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,



Andrew Sall

Governmental Affairs Manager
Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce
Email: [REDACTED]
Phone: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]

Stay updated 24/7:



"The Chamber...building a stronger local economy"

		<p>HONORING: Kathy Y. Allavie Riverside Unified School District</p>	<p>May 23 12PM The Mission Inn Hotel & Spa</p>
---	---	---	---



GREATER RIVERSIDE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

The Chamber...building a stronger local economy

April 17, 2019

Chair Maartin Rossouw
City of Riverside Planning Commission
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92501

RE: KA Enterprises Development – SUPPORT

Dear Chair Rossouw and Members of the Riverside Planning Commission,

On behalf of the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce, we respectfully request your SUPPORT on the proposal for development by Eugene Marini of KA Enterprises. The proposal would allow for the development of several amenities along Central Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard near the 60/215 Freeway, ultimately creating jobs and bringing new services to this critical corridor.

The Chamber's EastHills Business Council heard from Eugene Marini on the specifics of the proposal, which include a fueling station consisting of 12 pumps, a 3,200 square-foot convenience store, a 1,518 square-foot car wash facility, and a 3,800 square-foot drive-thru restaurant. This will bring much-needed amenities to an area that serves an extensive amount of travelers entering and exiting through the eastern portion of the City.

The Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration developed by the City's Community and Economic Development Department finds that the project will not have a potentially significant impact on the surrounding area.

For these reasons, the Chamber encourages your SUPPORT for the KA Enterprises development. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Cindy Roth
President/CEO

cc: Members, City of Riverside Planning Commission

CR/as

Taylor, Matthew

From: Richard Block <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 12:23 AM
To: Nicol, Colleen; Taylor, Matthew
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASES P18-0028 (RZ), P18-0031 (CUP), P18-0032 (CUP), P18-0033,(DR) & P18-0034 (PM)

Please confirm receipt of this email and that it will be provided to the Planning Commission for consideration of this item and made part of the record for this case.

April 18, 2019

To: Riverside City Clerk and Matthew Taylor, contact planner for this project

From: Friends of Riverside's Hills

Re: City Planning Commission April 18, 2019 agenda item 2: PLANNING CASES P18-0028 (RZ), P18-0031 (CUP), P18-0032 (CUP), P18-0033 (DR) & P18-0034 (PM)

Please consider the following comments on this Agenda item in opposition to present approval of this project.

Aside from issues concerning the potential negative environmental impacts of this project on traffic, night light, and wildlife movement, we are concerned about what appears to be a violation of the voter approved Prop R and Measure C. Per the project's Existing and Proposed Zoning Maps, the Existing Zoning is "Not Zoned" and the Proposed Zoning is "CG – commercial General Zone". But according to the voter-passed Measure C, the provisions of Prop R shall be extended to any area annexed to the City (which includes this site). In particular, any parcels with Average Natural Slope at least 15% must be zoned RC. While the staff report states "The project site is generally flat, with the exception of an existing manufactured slope along the Sycamore Canyon Boulevard frontage.", the RCA Joint Project Review (on its p. 2 of 13) states "The existing condition of the project site includes soil disturbance related to cut and fill activities during the construction of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. According to the Analysis, **the entire project site was scraped and used for spoil deposition** during the construction of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard in 2005." Thus the existing "generally flat" condition does not represent the natural condition (which would be before any grading). Per a 7/28/2015 email to me from planner Jay Eastman regarding the parcel across Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, it appears that the City has no record of the actual average natural slope of the larger parcel as it existed before Sycamore Canyon Blvd was constructed there (and before some extreme grading was done), and thus apparently no record of the ANS of the parcel under consideration here. Further the RCA Joint Project Review, in the map on p. 12 of 13 of that document, shows that the soils on most of the site consist of "Cieneba rocky sandy loam, 15 to 50 percent slopes, eroded", and the rest consist of "Cieneba sandy loam, 15 to 50 percent

slopes, eroded” (respectively colored purple and green on that map). Those 15 to 50 percent slope figures covering the entire parcel indicate that the ANS (that is, prior to any grading) of the site was very likely at least 15%. Until the ANS of the site is actually determined (say from old topo maps), it is premature (and a violation of Prop R and Measure C) to consider assigning any zone to the site, and thus premature to consider approving the project. Please delay further consideration of this project at least until the ANS is determined, and please keep us informed as to that determination and any further consideration of the project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Block for Friends of Riverside's Hills



Taylor, Matthew

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2019 1:57 AM
To: Nicol, Colleen; Taylor, Matthew
Subject: [External] PLANNING CASES P18-0028 (RZ), P18-0031 (CUP), P18-0032 (CUP), P18-0033 (DR) & P18-0034 (PM)

April 18, 2019

To: Riverside City Clerk and Matthew Taylor, contact planner for this project

From: Friends of Riverside's Hills

Re: City Planning Commission April 18, 2019 agenda item 2: PLANNING CASES P18-0028 (RZ), P18-0031 (CUP), P18-0032 (CUP), P18-0033 (DR) & P18-0034 (PM).

The project being considered has a number of potentially significant environmental impacts that are not adequately mitigated. For this (and other reasons documented elsewhere) Friends of Riverside's Hills opposes this project in its current form. Friends of Riverside's Hills, a non-profit group dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of the quality of life of the residents of Riverside by maintaining the natural beauty of the City, and by promoting the establishment of a network of linked natural open space areas in the City of Riverside and in the surrounding area.

The project site is a very environmentally sensitive area near to Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park, which is part of the Western Riverside County MSHCP, and to the constrained linkage 7 that links the park to the Box Springs Mountains. This linkage includes Quail Run Park to the west of the project and land to the south of the project. This proximity creates important potential environmental impacts that are not adequately evaluated in the Initial Study, including:

1. **Nighttime Views.** The project will create a massive increase in light pollution in the area from new exterior lighting for streetlights, parking lot illumination, gas station canopy lighting, and signage. This lighting will be clearly visible at night from Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park and adversely affect the viewscape. The lighting of this project needs to be severely curtailed, especially on the western side of the project, and no illuminated signage should be permitted.

2. **Lighting.** A very important related issue concerns the increase in ambient light levels in the MSHCP constrained linkage 7. The problem is partly recognized in Mitigation Measure BIO-3. This measure is generally designed to satisfy the urban-wildlands interface requirements of the MSHCP, but the portion relating to light pollution has been changed from the original condition defined in the MSHCP document. Specifically, it is stated in BIO-3 that:

"Night lighting shall be directed away from the MSHCP Proposed Constrained Linkage 7 to protect species from direct night lighting. If night lighting is required during construction, shielding shall be incorporated to ensure ambient lighting in the MSHCP Proposed Constrained Linkage 7 is not increased."

Note that this condition only requires that ambient lighting in the MSHCP Proposed Constrained Linkage 7 is not increased during construction. This presents a serious potential impact – the condition should include the precise MSHCP wording: "Shielding shall be incorporated in project designs to ensure ambient lighting in the MSHCP Conservation Area is not increased." However, it is not clear that the current design of the project can satisfy this necessary condition.

3. **Toxics.** Leakage from the gasoline storage tanks polluting the MSHCP conserved area is a potentially significant environmental impact. While surface runoff is considered, the immediate detection and control of a much more serious underground leak is not considered.

4. **Wildlife Movement.** The project has a potentially significant impact on the movement of resident wildlife species. At present the only functional corridor between Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park and the Box Springs Mountains is for animals such as bobcats to cross the project site before passing under the freeway. There is a plan developed by the RCA for constrained linkage 7 to be relocated to the south of Central Avenue, but this alternative route does not currently satisfy the minimum requirements of the linkage (an undercrossing at least 10 feet wide) and there is no guarantee that it ever will.

Regards,

Len Nunney, for Friends of Riverside's Hills

From: "Diana Ambrose" <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, May 18, 2019 at 3:45 PM -0700
Subject: [External] Proposed Development on Sycamore/Central Freeway area
To: "Gardner, Mike" <MGardner@riversideca.gov>

In regards to meeting(s) of May 20, 2019 and June 2019:

I am totally against any development in this area. There is already traffic problems to get on or off the freeway there.

Watkins is already way over used as a traffic route, because of all the traffic on the freeway in this area.

We certainly do not need to destroy anymore animal habitats, let alone our neighborhoods.

Please do the right thing and vote NO for this project.

Sincerely

Diana Ambrose a VOTER

--

Diana

"The taxpayer-that's someone who works for the federal government but doesn't have to take the civil service examination."

Ronald Reagan

To: The Mayor and City Council of Riverside
Riverside County Supervisor Kevin Jeffries
State Assembly Member Jose Medina
State Senator Richard Roth
Governor Gavin Newsom
Member of Congress Mark Takano
And other elected and appointed officials, and candidates for office.

I, the undersigned, wish to bring to your attention the damage to the environment, to our neighborhood, to our region, to traffic patterns, and to some Federally-protected and State-protected species, that would result from the hasty and un-studied approval of a noisy and brightly-lit 24- hour gas station, liquor store, drive-through restaurant, and carwash at Central Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, in a dominating position immediately adjoining the only remaining nocturnal wildlife corridor between the Sycamore Canyon area and Box Spring Mountain, and right at one of the worst traffic chokepoints in the area.

Please do what you can to halt this project!

Name (Printed) Raymond Burns

Name (Signed) Raymond Burns

Street Address [REDACTED] Mt Vernon Ave

City Riverside ZIP 92507

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

From: Audrey Kirtland <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2019 3:44 PM
To: Andrade, Frances <FANDRADE@riversideca.gov>
Subject: Re: [External] Sycamore Canyon/Central Ave Gas Station Complex

Thank you for your prompt reply to my email requesting how to send concerns to the Riverside Planning Commission. Please forward this email to all Planning Commissioners.

Our household has four voting adults who use the intersection of Sycamore Cannon and Central Avenue on a daily basis. We are very concerned with the proposed gas station complex that is being proposed for this intersection. We attended the meeting held at 6 p.m, on May 20 and found that many other residents are also very opposed to the gas station complex. We, like the other residents, are concerned about the increase in traffic, the safety aspect of having a 24-hour complex located around a curve leading to a residential area, the light pollution the complex will generate, and the overall environmental impact in the area.

The civil engineers had many questions from the audience—most concerned with the safety of the location of the project and the traffic that would be generated on a road that already experiences high traffic volume of folks using the road to get to the University and those accessing the 215. The civil engineers could not answer any questions about these concerns because they did not come prepared with the reports on traffic increase, environmental impacts, and safety issues raised.

As a new resident to California and Riverside, I was highly concerned that there were no flyers or mailers sent to the local residents giving them time to voice their concerns and that the meeting was offered at a 6 p.m.—a time when many residents could not attend because of work commuting and family dinner hour. We only found out about this proposed project through the Next Door Canyon Crest social network

The bottom line is that you have four taxpayers represented in this email who strongly encourage you to decline this project.

Audrey Kirtland
David Kirtland
Kyle Turner
Sandra Turner

From: Marcy Whiting [<mailto:>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2019 8:03 PM
To: 2Mayor
Subject: [External] Sycamore Canyon and Central Avenue

Dear Mr. Mayor,

I was unable to attend the Public meeting the other evening over the development of the Sycamore Canyon and Central Avenue property. I have lived in this area for 33 years and have seen the traffic become worse with each new project built in the area. I oppose the gas station complex that is being vetted for that area. I drive by that intersection daily to get to work and it takes longer with each new development. With all the new homes/apartments being built over off of Central there is no room on the roads for for anything else to be built in the area. The second reason I oppose this new construction is due to the wildlife in the area. Each new development changes their habit. Why are you in favor of it?

I look forward to your reply,

Sincerely,

--

Marcy Herman-Whiting