July 10, 2014

TO: DEANNA LORSON, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER

FROM: KAREN RENFRO, SPRINGBROOK HERITAGE ALLIANCE

City of Riverside City Clerk's Office

City Clark

cc: Mayor, City Council, City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk, Public Utilities Director, Parks & Recreation Director, Community Development Director; Springbrook Heritage Alliance & Friends

RE: LAND-USE POLICY & RELATED MATTERS
Revised & corrected

Northside's Old Riverside Golf Course:

- 1) We have just learned that Riverside Public Utilities Water Division is underway with a plan to water the trees on the former Riverside Golf Course. This is good news! We wish to thank everyone at City Hall who has been involved in making this happen, for responding to our request in a timely manner.
- 2) Is there any reason the City cannot dedicate all of the former Riverside Golf Course as a permanent public recreational/open space facility/parkland?
- 3) Is there any reason the City cannot set aside the five-acre parcel at North Orange and Columbia (the golf course's southeastern corner) for an outdoor farmer's market or Grow Riverside trading post, either as a special part of the proposed park or as a separate publically-owned or privately-owned parcel?
- 4) Which agencies of the City own which parcels on the former golf course, what are their parcel numbers, and how are they currently zoned? We have been given conflicting information at different times depending upon who we have talked to, when we talked to them and if a document of some kind was involved. We have also found that public records show different parcel numbers for the same parcel, and don't know if these are typographical errors or some kind of re-assignment of numbers by a public agency. The following are the parcel numbers we have:

206-070-002

206-070-003

246-060-001

[A response to this request is pending]

246-060-003

246-060-011

Northside's Ab Brown Sports Complex:

5) Is there any reason the Ab Brown Sports Complex (two-dozen beautifully-maintained soccer fields operated by the local chapter of the AYSO) cannot be dedicated as a permanent public recreational facility?

General Northside Issues:

- 6) As flooding issues in the Northside, especially below North Orange, are not restricted to Santa Ana River overflows, but include run-off from higher land-side elevations to the north, east & south of the river, no amount of human intervention can mitigate the effects of heavy rainfall on the Northside. Proposals to allow high-density residential below North Orange Street or expansion of commercial & light industrial in areas east of North Main Street (except for La Cadena Drive) are unsuited to the area and the alteration of Springbrook Arroyo is no longer an option (except for clean-up & restoration). Wouldn't sthis tends to see support a new land-use policy that encourages a re-introduction of rural and agricultural uses (the urban agriculture movement, Grow Riverside, etc.)? Couldn't the City introduce Transferrable Development Rights for Northside commercial property owners who don't wish to revise their plans?
- 7) Is there any reason the City cannot remove the proposed Northside Neighborhood Vision and Master Plan for the former Riverside Golf Course and Ab Brown Sports Complex from the rest of the Smartcode proposal?

Riverside Smartcode vs. transect-based Planning:

- 8) If the purpose of Riverside Smartcode is to replace current landuse laws in 20% of the City with Transect- and Form-based principles to encourage economic development and simplify the planning process for everyone involved, why are the following unrelated, unnecessary and counterproductive elements included in the proposal?:
 - a. Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs)
 - b. penalties for Smartcode-compliant developers
 - c. rewards for Smartcode non-compliant developers
 - d. consultant involvement
 - e. excessively-detailed advance planning for Smartcode target-area properties without involving property owners or their tenants --which cannot be considered in any way a "public" process
 - f. no notification for Smartcode target-area property owners or their tenants of the City's intentions, or the consultant's two-year marathon of meetings involving the future use of their properties, or public hearings relating to either the hiring of the consultant and terms of the contract, or the preparation of Riverside Smartcode documents, or their possible adoption by City Council
 - g. archeological, biological, environmental, land-use & other evaluations by consultants of historical, Greenbelt and Smartcode target-area properties for "highest-and-best" use
 - h. discrimination against property owners, their tenants and anyone who is unwilling or unable to participate in the Smartcode "community engagement activities" during the preparation period
 - i. Northside Neighborhood Vision
 - j. Master Plan for former Riverside Golf Course & Ab Brown Sports Complex

- 9) If the City adoptes a proposal containing these elements, wouldn't that invite affected property owners to file individual or class action suits against the City on a number of grounds, including violations of Due Process, Equal Protection, and Discrimination laws?
- 10) Is there any reason the City couldn't eliminate these elements from the Riverside Smartcode proposal and just restrict it to a formulation of Transect—and/or Form—based planning principles to enhance existing land—use laws, not replace them, and not spend millions of dollars for something that might not be adopted by Council after all?

Comments:

- A. Excessive case-loads in the Planning Department have been mentioned as a main reason for the Riverside Smartcode proposal. But, there is nothing in it that would lessen the burden on the four planners we're told are handling a total of about 200 applications at any given time. However, nothing in this proposal would change that because the problem is not so much current land-use laws, but long-standing understaffing in Planning.
- B. Two other problems are responsible for much of the economic development and land-use problems in Riverside: first, the City's age-old tradition of inconsistent and unpredictable enforcement of whatever land-use laws we have. Variances and zoning changes that are intrusive or otherwise unsuitable for a neighborhood are given often enough that it encourages applicants to pursue a project that should be denied; second, all applicants suffer from the long-standing lack of communication among staff from the various departments involved in approving cases, resulting in conflicting requirements that must be resolved, often at great expense of time and money. "Fast-track" adds another step and more time in process.
- C. A solution to these problems could be adopted as a land-use policy resolution by City Council, or an administrative policy, saying "No leapfrog development/no objections from neighbors/no exceptions" would resolve a lot of questions up-front, encourage much-needed development in suitable areas, protect at-risk neighborhoods, stabilize land-use which in turn would have a stimulating effect on business, and be easy for city officials, staff, and the people of Riverside for whom these laws are made, to monitor.



