

RECEIVED

APR 11 2016

City of Riverside
City Clerk's Office

4/6/16

Dear Riverside City Council Member - Mike Scubiroos

We are writing today to urge you to consider a few points in opposition to the zoning change approved by the Riverside Planning Commission for the property at the corner of Alessandro and Glenhaven in Riverside known in the past as "The Swim Club"

My wife and I are long time Riverside residents and home owners - my wife for 50 years - myself for 30 years. We are both native Californians

It has been my understanding that property zoning has - among other objectives - been in place in order to assure the proper development of a community and also to assure a home owner that the property he owns or first purchaser will remain pretty much as he envisioned it to be at the outset. In my opinion this type of assurance is vital to the harmony that exists in a community and to its continued growth - upkeep and improvement

As you know the property in question is the entry-way for a large number of residences west of Chicago and north of Alessandro and Central. A 100 bed assisted living rest home with a huge footprint - two entrances

on to Glenhaven - parking for over 50 cars with a work force of 50-60 employees over three shifts is not the proper or best use - considering the neighborhood of residences that now exists and has been in place for many years.

It is my understanding that the current owners of the property, who are not Riverside residents, are real estate speculators (nothing wrong with that) who have turned down offers from home builders because those offers did not provide the hoped for or expected profit. With a zone change and sale to Oakmont the profit will approach 400%. Without a zone change the property will no doubt be sold to home builders who will honor current zoning.

There is no guarantee that life will be fair. - we all know that! In this case, fairness is on the side of Riverside residents and we urge you to vote to retain the current zoning on the property in question.

Regards

Mina P. Mitchell
David R. Mitchell

MITCHELL

5650 QUEEN PALM DR.

RIVERSIDE, CA

— 92506 —

FW: [External] Collective Letter to t
Collective Letter to the City Council.docx; ATT00001.htm

From: Joan Semonella <sems3@dslextrreme.com>

Date: April 9, 2016 at 9:58:07 PM PDT

To: Mike Gardner <mgardner@riversideca.gov>, Andy Melendrez <asmelendrez@riversideca.gov>, "'Soubirous, Mike'" <msoubirous@riversideca.gov>, 'Paul Davis' <pdavis@riversideca.gov>, "'Chris MacArthur'" <cmacarthur@riversideca.gov>, 'Jim Perry' <jperry@riversideca.gov>, 'John Burnard' <jburnard@riversideca.gov>

Cc: 'Mayor Rusty Bailey' <rbailey@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Collective Letter to the City Council

From: Joan Semonella
5642 Glen Cliff Drive
Riverside, CA 92506

Please read the attached letter; it's important. I'll write again to each of you to outline the most egregious violations of Federal, state, regional, and municipal codes in the proposal.

Please check the document,* protect the most vulnerable "sensitive receptors"** — victims through the life of the project, support Mike Soubirous and vote against the Oakmont proposal.

*on the riversideca.gov home page, if you type the project number [P 15-6010-6011] the search gives two prompts; clicking the Oakmont proposal allows you to work with the PDF format rather than the city document. It's shorter (116 pages vs. 227) and has fewer blank sheets. It also allows you to print individual pages. The page numbers I reference are from this format.

** sensitive receptors are briefly outlined in the last 2 paragraphs of page 33. These not only include the neighbors but **anyone who lives in the facility itself, since "The prosed project, once completed, would also be considered a sensitive receptor."**

To the Members of the Riverside, CA City Council
Regarding P 15-6010-6011

Gentlemen:

The Planning Commission let you down. Had they actually read the “Oakmont Assisted Living Facility” “Mitigated Negative Declaration” they would have known that that patchwork of contradictory data had errors in information and conclusions. More importantly, they might have pursued their own questions before proceeding to a vote. But the visual material was impressive, the answers quick—even if they differed from fact—and the Commission agreed to a Request for Conditional Use Permit for R1 zoned property at 5695 Glenhaven Avenue.

I am among 29+ owners of the HOA immediately adjacent to the Oakmont proposal, many of whom were present for the meeting and spoke to their concerns. Mine, as I explained, was about the medical nature of the facility in a quiet neighborhood of single family homes. And I appreciate that I was heard. At the end, one of the commissioners asked the lead presenter if this was, in fact, a medical facility, but **he quickly answered, “No,”** a reality check for those of us who heard his colleague say just the opposite in his presentation to us. Another question was asked about **the medical examination required of occupants**, and they were assured by the 2nd presenter that it was a “**routine**” form for anyone living in a residential community—even the staff, she said, needed a similar form. The vote came quickly after that.

Fortunately for us, both the lead presenter at the Planning Commission (James Lawson) **and** his colleague who had made the presentation to us (Wayne Sant) came to meet with us on April 5. Mr. Sant made it clear, as he had before, that the proposal **is for a medical facility; all of the occupants require an Rx, 30% for memory care**, the balance being **medically dependent** and not able to live alone. **There is No Independent Living.** I asked Mr. Lawson about his answer to the commissioners; he said his presentation was to emphasize the quality of construction. His photos were to demonstrate that--plush seats in a theatre, the popcorn machine, a grand piano. He acknowledged his answer to the commission’s question would be on record for you to see.

Certainly answers to the commission’s questions affected the vote—one commissioner thought the pictures (identified as from northern California)—show a place his father might enjoy being independent. “A lecture for 200 guests!” Impressive indeed. But that’s not my point, though the truth is. My point is that **if** the Planning Commission read the Declaration, flawed as it is, they would **know** the **kind of facility** Oakmont proposes, at one point called a “**a nursing home.**”

I hope to write each of you—to express thanks, praise or concern. This is collective because the “Mitigated Negative Declaration” points to critical negative impacts the project will have on our property & community forever. It begins saying “**impacts on air quality from implementation would be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation incorporated**” (33); “**operational emissions**”(31) “**direct and indirect would occur over the long term operational life of the proposed project.**” Carcinogens are “**expected to be included later when the toxic emissions ... are better understood.**” (34) It concludes: “**The project would create several potentially significant impacts relating to biological and cultural resources, hazards, noise, land use, and air quality.**” The Project Director says these will be “**adequately**” mitigated, but data argue this point, too.