

FW: [External] LA SIERRA LAND-USE ISSUES:

From: Karen Renfro [<mailto:k.a.renfro7@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2015 4:20 PM

To: Bailey, Rusty; Gardner, Mike; Melendrez, Andy; Mike Soubirous; Davis, Paul; MacArthur, Chris; Perry, Jim; Burnard, John

Cc: Russo, John A.; jgeuss@riversideca.gov; Nicol, Colleen; Lorson, Deanna; Zelinka, Al; Nguyen, Alexander; rguzman@riversideca.com; Ramirez, Emilio

Subject: [External] LA SIERRA LAND-USE ISSUES:

The Honorable
William R. "Rusty" Bailey III,
Mayor of Riverside
3900 Main Street
Riverside, California 92522

Dear Mayor Bailey and Members of the City Council:

Although the above issue has not made its way to your agenda, the matter is serious enough that it deserves your attention, at least unofficially, as individual representatives of the people.

Right now, the developer who was behind Measure L-- the proposed development project for Rancho La Sierra last year-- is attempting once again to gain the support of the people of Riverside. Recently the Press reported that he has been in conversation with former opponents of Measure L and is proposing a scaled-down version of his original project with added incentives that are meant to distract our attention from what is going on here.

Now, although it is perfectly legal for a developer to place a measure on the ballot for voters to decide whether a project that has been rejected by city officials should be approved, there is no reason a developer would do such a thing unless they want something that isn't good for the community.

The issue is not what the developer wants to do or how much money he has already spent trying to get a project approved, the issue is that he does not want to abide by the Municipal Code, or the General Plan, or the wishes of the people of La Sierra, or the wishes of the people of Riverside, or the wishes of the people of Norco, or the wishes of the people of Corona.

He thinks he can buy us all off if he just puts the right package together.

But, if we fall for this, it will set a very bad precedent for other developers who don't want to play by the rules. It will mean constant turmoil with land use policy and laws in Riverside. It will mean ill-will with neighboring cities who have to live with developer-initiated/voter-approved bad policy decisions. It will mean Riverside will be ripe for the plunder.

There is nothing this developer has to offer that we can't do without.

Last year you were advised that taking a public stand against Measure L would put the Mayor & Council in a compromising position if the project ever had to go before the City Council or court.

This is not wise counsel. Our Mayor and Council have every reason to stand behind the city's land-use laws and planning process.

But, the fact that our current system needs a relatively-simple tune-up , such as adoption of a general policy that would apply to any and all permit applications "No leapfrog development-no objections from neighbors-no exceptions" and the hiring of additional planning staff to handle all the applications, is not a reason to abandon the people of Riverside to what will most-certainly become land-use chaos if you do not take advantage of this opportunity to make clear that you respect your constituents and uphold the Rule of Law principle that the law is equal to all and no one is above the law.

In discussion of property rights during controversies involving developers and neighborhoods, it is easy to forget that the issue is never the rights of one property owner vs. the NIMBY neighbors. The issue is always the rights of one property owner vs. the rights of other property owners. Because the neighboring property owners are each equal in the eyes of the law to the one property owner who is causing the problem.

I think the problem you are faced with is that if you do not take a stand against a proposal that violates the city's Municipal Code and General Plan out in La Sierra, you will have a hard time making a case for a Specific Plan for the Northside. Especially as the latter isn't paid for yet and an awful lot of people are going to be involved in the process for its adoption.

Either we uphold the Rule of Law or we don't.

Please don't be distracted by the red herrings.

I know you are anxious to do what is right for the people of Riverside, and we desperately need your leadership right now. We are willing to back you up.

With gratitude and respect,

Karen Renfro
(951)787-0617
k.a.renfro7@gmail.com

From: Perry, Jim

Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2018 12:25 PM

To: 'Sharon Mateja' <smateja@earthlink.net>

Cc: Ramirez, Emilio <ERamirez@riversideca.gov>; Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>; Zelinka, Al <azelinka@riversideca.gov>; Garcia, Sandy <SGarcia@riversideca.gov>

Subject: RE: [External] Questions for you and developer

Sharon,

We may have to agree to disagree on this one. This project is medium density (it's staying at the current zoning) and is not/will not be high density. I should also point out, while I have been in office, no new high density housing projects have been approved by the City Council and constructed within Ward 6.

Many of the concerns raised by the community concerning zoning, density, single family homes and the vocational center have been maintained, incorporated or eliminated from this project.

One problem in this process, has been the dissemination of rumors and inaccurate information which I have addressed concerning this site. This includes the property being used to construct a 3 story, 78 unit apartment complex, a 3 story homeless facility, transitional housing for the homeless, drug/alcohol rehabilitation center or halfway homes for parolees. All are false and have never been discussed or considered.

Improving the west side continues to be the focus of my energy. In the past 5 years, over 14 million dollars has been invested within Ward 6 to improve our roadways and sidewalks. No other Ward received this amount of funding. This includes repaving streets in your immediate neighborhood. Road maintenance will continue for at least the next couple of years.

In the past few years, resources and services have been provided to our neighborhoods to resolve issues and concerns and steps have been taken to replace aging infrastructure. For example, we are constructing a new storm drain on your street. The initial cost of this project was approx. \$550,000 and due to complications, it has increased to just under 1 million dollars. It will be completed very soon and your street will be repaved along with the replacement of the speed bumps.

Many new businesses have opened within Ward 6 with more to come. Several of our shopping centers have been transformed by renovations. These are just a few examples of Ward 6 not being ignored and work will continue to bring improvement and amenities to our side of town.

Your questions and statements regarding the RFP, PRD's and zoning have been addressed in the past by Emilio Ramirez, Al Zelinka and Rafael Guzman. In addition, the RFP and its interpretation was reviewed by the City Attorney.

Experienced developers know the RFP process and realize a project can change over the course of time and circumstances. It's also common for the city and a developer to negotiate changes to the RFP. In this case, 2 developers submitted proposals. If a proposal isn't submitted, it cannot be taken into consideration.

During this process, I took the steps to include 2 residents who live in the immediate neighborhood to participate in the review and evaluation of the submitted proposals. You submitted the name of at least one person who sat on the review committee.

Approx. one year ago, I had a telephone conversation with you regarding an unknown developer responding to the RFP without the vocational center. I encouraged you to have them submit their proposal.

This project probably will not have 100% consensus. I have spoken to a number of people who are comfortable with it. Several of these residents are hesitant to voice their opinion in public let alone attend another community meeting. A growing number of residents have told me they are “tired” of the many telephone calls, emails, and individuals showing up at their door by people who oppose this project. At the most recent meeting, there was one resident who said they just received a document at their door regarding the community meeting/project and described it as being “very disingenuous”. This document was not prepared or delivered by the city.

As this project moves forward, National Core and Tony Mize will take into consideration the opinions expressed at the community meeting. This project will be reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council. Prior to going to the Planning Commission, the developer will return to a community meeting in order to share the latest and most up to date information and renderings on this project. This will probably take place in the later part of this year.

Jim Perry
City of Riverside,
Council Member Ward 6

From: Sharon Mateja [<mailto:smateja@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Perry, Jim
Cc: Ramirez, Emilio; Guzman, Rafael; Nicol, Colleen
Subject: [External] Questions for you and developer
Importance: High

Dear Jim, due to a medical emergency I cannot be at the meeting tonight (4/26/18), but here are the questions/statements I had wanted addressed, and would still like addressed:

- La Sierra has its fair share of high density, EVEN MORE, than the rest of the city.
- Is La Sierra still the step-child of Riverside....MORE HIGH DENSITY in our neighborhood?
- This developer proposed a project that COULDN'T WORK...and now he is getting rewarded with a material change to the RFP; why?
- This developer proposed a project that did not qualify according to the bid which excluded many developers because THEY KNEW it didn't fit our community and COULD NOT work....why did the city modify its bid for someone who miscalculated on a multimillion dollar project?
- Should high density housing be put into a neighborhood that is NOT ZONED for it?

- How can the city manipulate this project to fit R1 7000 zoning and not rezone?
- Is it with PDR = Planned Residential Development....which allows for CLUSTERING...putting tiny plots next to each other and getting around the R1 7000 zoning requirement (1 family home on 7000 sf of land)?
- A PDR does not allow for the number of homes this developer is asking to put on this property. Why are you supporting this?
- You said you would be responsive to the residents; I have spoken with no one who wants this; if a few want this, they do not support the majority.
- The most vocal advocate of this plan is a resident in a gated Riverwalk community in Ward 7.
- Are residents being manipulated to accept what is not what we want for OUR neighborhood?

Emilio Ramirez wrote the following in more than one email; why are they now accepting this proposal?

○ **December 18, 2017,**

- **“Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.”**

January 8, 2018

- **“Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.”**

January 11, 2018

- **“Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.”**
- **“If the proposal no longer includes vocation then the proposal will be unresponsive.”**
“if the proposal does eventually not include vocation then the City will withdraw.”

- Many would be developers did not submit because of the material vocational element; they KNEW this was a project that was not feasible; why are you considering a developer who did not have the experience to know our codes and zoning would not fit this RFP?
- Is the city practicing noncompetitive bidding?
- Why is our councilman, you, not listening to his constituents? Residents NEVER asked for this project (see RFP what residents want), residents NEVER asked for vocational school (Addendum 2 in the RFP),...RESIDENTS asked for low to medium market rate single family housing to fit within our neighborhood?

Sharon Mateja

ORIGINAL EMAIL FROM SHARON WITH QUESTIONS IN BLACK

From: Dr. Sharon Mateja [<mailto:mateja@matejadds.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2017 11:04 AM
To: eramirez@riversideca.gov; rguzman@riversideca.gov
Cc: jperry@riversideca.gov; smateja@earthlink.net
Subject: RFP 4350 La Sierra Avenue, No 17-04 Entitlements
Importance: High

Good morning all,

Reference: 4350 La Sierra Avenue
RFP No. 17-04

Developer: National Core (if this is incorrect, would you please provide the name of the developer)

I have a few questions:

1. What are the EXACT ENTITLEMENTS that are required to make this project happen?
2. Who are the public bodies who approve the entitlements?
3. Are you considering Planned Residential Development?
4. Are you considering Rezoning?
5. If rezoning is not being considered, please provide me with the references of the zoning code that allows for this project to occur.
6. Can this project be changed to meet the vision of the residents?
7. If many changes are necessary to be made by the developer, can we remove the vocational element? As demonstrated at the city meeting last week hosted by Councilman Perry, where this project was presented to residents, the vocational element was highly opposed.

Our community is meeting tonight, December 11, 2017, could I have these answers today?

Respectfully,

Sharon Mateja
Resident/Homeowner/Stakeholder

EMILIO RESPONSE TO SHARON IN RED TO ORIGINAL EMAIL FROM SHARON WITH QUESTIONS BLACK

From: Ramirez, Emilio [<mailto:ERamirez@riversideca.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 11:17 AM

To: Sharon Mateja; Guzman, Rafael; McLaughlin, Jeffery; White, Ted

Cc: Perry, Jim; 'Dr. Sharon Mateja'

Subject: RE: [External] RE: RFP 4350 La Sierra Avenue, No 17-04 Entitlements

Sharon,

Please see below to find responses to your questions regarding 4350 La Sierra Avenue. The various answers to your questions represent standard procedures that would be applied to any application that would be submitted to the Community & Economic Development Department given similar development concepts. They also are considerate of the currently known project information.

Reference: 4350 La Sierra Avenue

RFP No. 17-04

Developer: National Core (if this is incorrect, would you please provide the name of the developer)

National Community Renaissance (or National CORE)

I have a few questions:

- What are the EXACT ENTITLEMENTS that are required to make this project happen?

We will not have a precise answer for this question until the project concept is further refined. Based upon the concept presented to Staff, we are currently looking at a Tentative Tract Map (TM) to subdivide the land per Title 18 of the Riverside Municipal Code, Planned Residential Development per Section 19.780 of the Riverside Municipal Code (PRD) (to achieve the presented small-lot configuration) and Design Review (required for PRDs) per Section 19.710 of the Riverside Municipal Code. Depending on final site design there may be variances per Section 19.720 of the Riverside Municipal Code; Depending on the final program for the vocational element there may be a need to amend the General Plan (GPA) and Zoning (RZ) for the vocational portion of the site (more on that below) per Sections 19.800 and 19.810 of the Riverside Municipal Code.

- Who are the public bodies who approve the entitlements?

Also depends on final project design. The current concept as a TM-PRD-DR would go to Planning Commission (CPC) only, unless appealed to City Council (CC). If land use changes (GPA/RZ are required then it would need to go to CPC and Council.

- Are you considering Planned Residential Development?

This would be a question for the developer who will ultimately be the applicant, but a Planned Residential Development would probably be the way to entitle the project since it would be necessary to accommodate the proposed smaller lot sizes and other project design elements.

- Are you considering Rezoning?

Once again, a question for the developer. I don't believe that a rezone is needed. A Conditional Use Permit may be needed for the vocational element.

This will depend largely on the program and scope of the vocational element. If the vocational programming that takes place is ancillary/secondary to the facility's primary function and character as an amenity/clubhouse for the residential development, staff opinion would be that rezoning is not necessary. If the facility is primarily a vocational school/training center, is not tightly integrated with the residential component and stands alone as a commercial or quasi-commercial land use, then a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would probably be necessary.

- If rezoning is not being considered, please provide me with the references of the zoning code that allows for this project to occur.

1. Can this project be changed to meet the vision of the residents?

The project can be amended in many ways and National CORE who will continue to work with residents to evolve the project design. However, providing fewer (or smaller) homes would lead to higher Project costs that cannot be met with City funds. Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.

2. If many changes are necessary to be made by the developer, can we remove the vocational element? As demonstrated at the city meeting last week hosted by Councilman Perry, where this project was presented to residents, the vocational element was highly opposed.

The developer will analyze all changes requested by project participants (residents, City, etc.) and will ultimately propose a project. We noted a mixed response to the vocational element, and would request that National CORE

come back in a next Project iteration with a more developed vocational element (e.g., services, hours, operational management, etc.).

SHARON'S FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS IN BLUE TO EMILIO RESPONSE TO SHARON IN RED TO ORIGINAL EMAIL FROM SHARON WITH QUESTIONS BLACK

From: Ramirez, Emilio [<mailto:ERamirez@riversideca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 11:17 AM
To: Sharon Mateja; Guzman, Rafael; McLaughlin, Jeffery; White, Ted
Cc: Perry, Jim; 'Dr. Sharon Mateja'
Subject: RE: [External] RE: RFP 4350 La Sierra Avenue, No 17-04 Entitlements

Sharon,

Please see below to find responses to your questions regarding 4350 La Sierra Avenue. The various answers to your questions represent standard procedures that would be applied to any application that would be submitted to the Community & Economic Development Department given similar development concepts. They also are considerate of the currently known project information.

Reference: 4350 La Sierra Avenue

RFP No. 17-04

Developer: National Core (if this is incorrect, would you please provide the name of the developer)

National Community Renaissance (or National CORE)

I have a few questions:

- What are the EXACT ENTITLEMENTS that are required to make this project happen?

We will not have a precise answer for this question until the project concept is further refined. Based upon the concept presented to Staff, we are currently looking at a Tentative Tract Map (TM) to subdivide the land per Title 18 of the Riverside Municipal Code, Planned Residential Development per Section 19.780 of the Riverside Municipal Code (PRD) (to achieve the presented small-lot configuration) and Design Review (required for PRDs) per Section 19.710 of the Riverside Municipal Code. Depending on final site design there may be variances per Section 19.720 of the Riverside Municipal Code; Depending on the final program for the vocational element there may be a need to amend the General Plan (GPA) and Zoning (RZ) for the vocational portion of the site (more

on that below) per Sections 19.800 and 19.810 of the Riverside Municipal Code.

- Who are the public bodies who approve the entitlements?

Also depends on final project design. The current concept as a TM-PRD-DR (**what does TM-PRD-DR mean?**) would go to Planning Commission (CPC) only, unless appealed to City Council (CC). If land use changes (GPA/RZ **What is this acronym?**) are required then it would need to go to CPC and Council.

- Are you considering Planned Residential Development?

This would be a question for the developer who will ultimately be the applicant, but a Planned Residential Development would probably be the way to entitle the project since it would be necessary to accommodate the proposed smaller lot sizes and other project design elements.

- Are you considering Rezoning?

Once again, a question for the developer. I don't believe that a rezone is needed. A Conditional Use Permit may be needed for the vocational element. (**Who would approve a CUP?**)

This will depend largely on the program and scope of the vocational element. If the vocational programming that takes place is ancillary/secondary to the facility's primary function and character as an amenity/clubhouse for the residential development, staff opinion would be that rezoning is not necessary. If the facility is primarily a vocational school/training center, is not tightly integrated with the residential component and stands alone as a commercial or quasi-commercial land use, then a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would probably be necessary. **The RFP was written for a vocational element and other developers and their plans were excluded from being considered UNLESS a vocational element was included....does this require a NEW RFP if not used as a vocational element? Is it legal to issue an RFP, exclude developers who were not responsive to one of the elements, THEN change that element?**

- If rezoning is not being considered, please provide me with the references of the zoning code that allows for this project to occur.

3. Can this project be changed to meet the vision of the residents?

The project can be amended in many ways and National CORE who will continue to work with residents to evolve the project design. However, providing fewer (or smaller) homes would lead to higher Project costs that cannot be met with City funds. Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP. **You said above you were considering**

abandoning the vocational element? You also said a General Plan Amendment and rezoning would be considered.

4. If many changes are necessary to be made by the developer, can we remove the vocational element? As demonstrated at the city meeting last week hosted by Councilman Perry, where this project was presented to residents, the vocational element was highly opposed.

The developer will analyze all changes requested by project participants (residents, City, etc.) and will ultimately propose a project. We noted a mixed response **(there was an over whelming response AGAINST this project at the city community meeting hosted by Perry at the senior center)** to the vocational element, and would request that National CORE come back in a next Project iteration with a more developed vocational element (e.g., services, hours, operational management, etc.). **You are again talking vocational center....which is it? Vocational or quasi-commercial? This doesn't appear to be presented fairly or accurately to the residents. This WAS NOT WHAT WAS IN THE RFP that was issued. The RFP clearly said vocational element NO MENTION OF QUAISI COMMERCIAL. It appears that the RFP should be reissued.)**

**EMILIO'S RESPONSE IN GREEN TO SHARON'S
FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS IN BLUE TO EMILIO
RESPONSE TO SHARON IN RED TO ORIGINAL
EMAIL FROM SHARON WITH QUESTIONS
BLACK**

Thank you!

Al Zelinka, FAICP, CMSM
Assistant City Manager

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "**Sharon Mateja**" <smateja@earthlink.net>

Date: Tue, Dec 26, 2017 at 7:58 AM -0800

Subject: [External] RFP 4350 La Sierra Avenue, No 17-04 Entitlements

To: "Zelinka, Al" <azelinka@riversideca.gov>

Al,

Here are the questions that were answered by Emilio as referenced to property at 4350 La Sierra Avenue.

Can you help me understand the significance of the information sent to me by Emilio?

Also, RRR meets Monday January 8th; I would like to give an update to the community and also help them understand why they should not accept this project from National CORE and ask for the original RFP to be reintroduced. But, I personally do not understand all of the information he gave. It sounds like a way to change R1 with so many variances or "new names" that I do not understand what is important and what is not. If you are not the one who can help me understand this, do you know who I should ask? I haven't sent him the new questions/statements I made in blue; I will today.

Sharon

Emilio answered my questions below in red

From: Ramirez, Emilio [<mailto:ERamirez@riversideca.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 11:17 AM

To: Sharon Mateja; Guzman, Rafael; McLaughlin, Jeffery; White, Ted

Cc: Perry, Jim; 'Dr. Sharon Mateja'

Subject: RE: [External] RE: RFP 4350 La Sierra Avenue, No 17-04 Entitlements

Sharon,

Please see below to find responses to your questions regarding 4350 La Sierra Avenue. The various answers to your questions represent standard procedures that would be applied to any application that would be submitted to the Community & Economic Development Department given similar development concepts. They also are considerate of the currently known project information.

Reference: 4350 La Sierra Avenue

RFP No. 17-04

Developer: National Core (if this is incorrect, would you please provide the name of the developer)

National Community Renaissance (or National CORE)

I have a few questions:

- What are the EXACT ENTITLEMENTS that are required to make this project happen?

We will not have a precise answer for this question until the project concept is further refined. Based upon the concept presented to Staff, we are currently looking at a Tentative Tract Map (TM) to subdivide the land per Title 18 of the Riverside Municipal Code, Planned Residential Development per Section 19.780 of the Riverside Municipal Code (PRD) (to achieve the presented small-lot configuration) and Design Review (required for PRDs) per Section 19.710 of the Riverside Municipal Code. Depending on final site design there may be variances per Section 19.720 of the Riverside Municipal Code; Depending on the final program for the vocational element there may be a need to amend the General Plan (GPA) and Zoning (RZ) for the vocational portion of the site (more on that below) per Sections 19.800 and 19.810 of the Riverside Municipal Code.

- Who are the public bodies who approve the entitlements?

Also depends on final project design. The current concept as a TM-PRD-DR (**what does TM-PRD-DR mean?**) The paragraph in response to the bulleted question above this question identified these acronyms as the following: TM – Tentative Tract Map; PRD – Planned Residential Development; and DR – was not specifically defined but is defined as Design Review would go to Planning Commission (CPC) only, unless appealed to City Council (CC). If land use changes (GPA/RZ **What is this acronym?**) The paragraph in response to the bulleted question above this question identified these acronyms as the following: GPA – was identified relative to “amend the General Plan” but GPA is defined as a General Plan Amendment and RZ – was identified as “Zoning” but is defined as Re Zoning are required then it would need to go to CPC and Council.

- Are you considering Planned Residential Development?

This would be a question for the developer who will ultimately be the applicant, but a Planned Residential Development would probably be the way to entitle the project since it would be necessary to accommodate the proposed smaller lot sizes and other project design elements.

- Are you considering Rezoning?

Once again, a question for the developer. I don't believe that a rezone is needed. A Conditional Use Permit may be needed for the vocational element. **(Who would approve a CUP?)** A Conditional Use Permit is approved by the Planning Commission unless appealed to the City Council.

This will depend largely on the program and scope of the vocational element. If the vocational programming that takes place is ancillary/secondary to the facility's primary function and character as an amenity/clubhouse for the residential development, staff opinion would be that rezoning is not necessary. If the facility is primarily a vocational school/training center, is not tightly integrated with the residential component and stands alone as a commercial or quasi-commercial land use, then a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would probably be necessary. **The RFP was written for a vocational element and other developers and their plans were excluded from being considered UNLESS a vocational element was included....does this require a NEW RFP if not used as a vocational element? Is it legal to issue an RFP, exclude developers who were not responsive to one of the elements, THEN change that element?**

The RFP did include a request for vocation. Only two proposals were submitted in response to the RFP. Both did include the request for vocation. There were not any proposals there were excluded. If the proposal no longer includes vocation then the proposal will be unresponsive. At this point, the selected proposal includes vocation. The response above is relative to process. The response indicates that if the "vocational school / training center" is not integrated with the residential development then a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would be necessary. A General Plan Amendment and Rezoning is approved by the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

It is legal amend the project after review of responses, however if the proposal does eventually not include vocation then the City will withdraw. Again, all submitted proposals included vocation and were considered and deemed responsive. There were not any submittals that were non responsive.

- If rezoning is not being considered, please provide me with the references of the zoning code that allows for this project to occur.

1. Can this project be changed to meet the vision of the residents?

The project can be amended in many ways and National CORE who will continue to work with residents to evolve the project design. However, providing fewer (or smaller) homes would lead to higher Project costs that cannot be met with City funds. Abandoning the

vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP. You said above you were considering abandoning the vocational element? You also said a General Plan Amendment and rezoning would be considered.

I never said we were considering abandoning the vocational element. The response said: *"Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP."* If the *"vocational school / training center"* is not integrated with the residential development then a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would be necessary. A General Plan Amendment and Rezoning is approved by the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

2. If many changes are necessary to be made by the developer, can we remove the vocational element? As demonstrated at the city meeting last week hosted by Councilman Perry, where this project was presented to residents, the vocational element was highly opposed.

The developer will analyze all changes requested by project participants (residents, City, etc.) and will ultimately propose a project. We noted a mixed response **(there was an overwhelming response AGAINST this project at the city community meeting hosted by Perry at the senior center)** We do not agree that there was an overwhelming response against the project at the community meeting. We observed significant support. **to the vocational element, and would request that National CORE come back in a next Project iteration with a more developed vocational element (e.g., services, hours, operational management, etc.). You are again talking vocational centerwhich is it? Vocational or quasi-commercial? This doesn't appear to be presented fairly or accurately to the residents. This WAS NOT WHAT WAS IN THE RFP that was issued. The RFP clearly said vocational element NO MENTION OF QUAISI COMMERCIAL. It appears that the RFP should be reissued.)** We are considering vocation. This has not changed. The response was relative to process and is indicative of a potential General Plan Amendment and Rezone for a portion of the development that is not residential. This non-residential portion was described as *"a commercial or quasi-commercial land use,"* which encompasses a *"vocational school/training center"* included within the same response.

From: tunerutan [<mailto:tunerutan@aol.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 2:45 PM

To: Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] BLUEPRINTS FOR LA SIERRA/ COLLETT

Good afternoon Mr Perry.

Sorry to trouble you however I thought it would be important if the developer brought along paper copies of the blueprints or site map for his development.

Cheryl Hardin

4254 Lockhaven Lane

Riverside California 92505

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: tunerutan <tunerutan@aol.com>
Date: April 23, 2018 at 5:29:31 PM PDT
To: "Perry, Jim" <JPerry@riversideca.gov>, cnicol <cnicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: [External] La Sierra Collett Property.

Since the property is still zoned R 1 7000 why was a bid even remotely looked considered for 1800 sq ft. Lots? Now this project is not responsive to the RFP and also not suitable for R 1 7000 why are we still holding a meeting on Thursday? Also, please include residents when drawing up a NEW RFP.

Thank you.
Cheryl Hardin
4254 Loc khaven Ln.
Riverside, CA 92505

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----
From: "Perry, Jim" <JPerry@riversideca.gov>
Date: 4/23/18 3:05 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: 'tunerutan' <tunerutan@aol.com>
Cc: "Garcia, Sandy" <SGarcia@riversideca.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] La Sierra Collett Property.

Cheryl,

Sorry for the typo in the last sentence. It should read, Based on this , the site has maintained its current zoning of R-1-7000.

Jim Perry

City of Riverside,

Council Member Ward 6

From: Perry, Jim
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 2:59 PM
To: 'tunerutan'
Cc: Garcia, Sandy
Subject: RE: [External] La Sierra Collett Property.

Cheryl,

I'm still waiting for the presentation from the developer and the current zoning of R-1-7000 (Single Family Residential) has not changed. We have not received a request to re-zone this property and based on this information, a public hearing isn't necessary or required.

Last year, when we were updating our Housing Element, there was consideration to change the zoning on this property. As stated at the September community meeting, once our Housing Element was approved by the State, we immediately removed this site from any further consideration. Based on this, the site has maintained at its current zoning of R-1-7000.

I hope this helps.

Jim Perry

City of Riverside,

Council Member Ward 6

From: tunerutan [<mailto:tunerutan@aol.com>]

Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 2:33 PM

To: Perry, Jim

Subject: [External] La Sierra Collett Property.

Good afternoon Mr Perry! Would like to know if you are for or against the proposal. Would also like to know if the land has already beenre zoned? If it has , was there a public hearing? Who changed it? And when was it changed?

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: tunerutan [<mailto:tunerutan@aol.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 12:13 PM

To: emilioramirez@riversideca.gov; Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] La Sierra Property

Good afternoon!

Gentlemen I am sending my question to both of you. I'm not sure who can answer my question. Regarding the La Sierra Collette property... are the number of homes allotted based on the gross acreage? It seems to me this property has very little Frontage on La Sierra necessitating five roads to access the homes. These roads are necessary for the homeowners to reach their property however it seems to me, that takes away from usable space. Another concern is for the safety Factor caused by this developer not adhering to the 10-foot set back from the road to the first structure. I went down to City Hall and talked to the planning division. They said that 10 foot is to the first structure. With a 3-foot driveway that means that for structure is 3 ft from the road. Mothers with strollers and children walking to school we'll be having to use these roads. There is parking allotted along parts of these roads. I'd rather address these issues now before this property is built and someone gets hurt. Plus another concern is there have been numerous established residential areas where the city of Riverside has gone back and built sidewalks. This property will not have that as an option. I don't want to have someone get hurt and feel I could have call City Hall attention to the situation. If you'd like the list of areas that Riverside has gone in and had to put in sidewalks I'll be happy to forward you that list. Thank you. I look forward to your swift reply.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: tunerutan [<mailto:tunerutan@aol.com>]

Sent: Monday, May 14, 2018 3:42 PM

To: emilioramirez@riversideca.gov; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] La Sierra Property

Good afternoon mr. Ramirez

Mr. Perry has been kind enough to answer the questions that he was able to. I thanked him for his efforts. I was wondering if you would mind addressing the developmental issues with this property?

First issue: is the number of homes developed before or after considerations are taken for the infrastructure?

This property has very little Frontage on La Sierra. That necessitates five roads for the homeowners to have access to their property.

Second issue: is the developer requesting a waiver for the 10-foot setback? This appears to be a safety concern.

Mothers pushing strollers and children walking to school with only a three foot driveway appears to be an accident waiting to happen. Part of a planned residential development includes not only streets but sidewalks.

Again this is not addressed in his conceptual presentation.

Thank you addressing my concerns. Looking forward to your swift reply!

Cheryl Hardin

4254 Lockhaven Lane

Riverside 92505

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: tunerutan [<mailto:tunerutan@aol.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2018 11:03 AM
To: Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>
Subject: [External] La Sierra Property

Good morning Mr. Perry,

#1

Since the layout of the land necessitates multiple streets, is this taken into account when determining the number of homes allowed?

#2.

I do recall at one of the meetings you stating that if the number of residents did not like this project that it would be abandon. You also stated that there were other properties and that this one didn't need to be included at this time. Please comment on the above.

#3.

Planned residential communities are required to have a 10-foot setback from the street to the nearest structure whether that be garage or house. Why did this developer not adhere to this regulation?

#4.

Now that the state is requiring solar panels installed on new construction which will raise the price of these houses, have you discussed with the developer making smaller homes?

At the last two meetings regarding this property, the only two people who were in favor of it are not from our Ward. All of the people in this area are totally against this design. Is it possible to refile the request for proposal? Since the Vocational Center has been eliminated other developers would be more inclined to present projects. I understand you said they all could have submitted their projects, however we all know that coming up with the design is an expensive endeavor. Now that the Vocational element has been removed we might get a better development for our community.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hardin
4254 Lockhaven Lane
Riverside 92505

cc: Mayor
City Council
City Manager
City Attorney
ACMs

From: Sharon Mateja [mailto:smateja@earthlink.net]

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 6:33 PM

To: Perry, Jim <JPerry@riversideca.gov>

Cc: Ramirez, Emilio <ERamirez@riversideca.gov>; Guzman, Rafael <RGuzman@riversideca.gov>; Nicol, Colleen <CNicol@riversideca.gov>

Subject: [External] Questions for you and developer

Importance: High

Dear Jim, due to a medical emergency I cannot be at the meeting tonight (4/26/18), but here are the questions/statements I had wanted addressed, and would still like addressed:

- La Sierra has its fair share of high density, EVEN MORE, than the rest of the city.
- Is La Sierra still the step-child of Riverside....MORE HIGH DENSITY in our neighborhood?
- This developer proposed a project that COULDN'T WORK...and now he is getting rewarded with a material change to the RFP; why?
- This developer proposed a project that did not qualify according to the bid which excluded many developers because THEY KNEW it didn't fit our community and COULD NOT work....why did the city modify its bid for someone who miscalculated on a multimillion dollar project?
- Should high density housing be put into a neighborhood that is NOT ZONED for it?
- How can the city manipulate this project to fit R1 7000 zoning and not rezone?
- Is it with PDR = Planned Residential Development....which allows for CLUSTERING...putting tiny plots next to each other and getting around the R1 7000 zoning requirement (1 family home on 7000 sf of land)?
- A PDR does not allow for the number of homes this developer is asking to put on this property. Why are you supporting this?
- You said you would be responsive to the residents; I have spoken with no one who wants this; if a few want this, they do not support the majority.
- The most vocal advocate of this plan is a resident in a gated Riverwalk community in Ward 7.
- Are residents being manipulated to accept what is not what we want for OUR neighborhood?

Emilio Ramirez wrote the following in more than one email; why are they now accepting this proposal?

○ **December 18, 2017,**

- **“Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.”**

January 8, 2018

- **“Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.”**

January 11, 2018

- **“Abandoning the vocational element would be against the tenants of the RFP.”**
- **“If the proposal no longer includes vocation then the proposal will be unresponsive.”**
“if the proposal does eventually not include vocation then the City will withdraw.”

- Many would be developers did not submit because of the material vocational element; they KNEW this was a project that was not feasible; why are you considering a developer who did not have the experience to know our codes and zoning would not fit this RFP?
- Is the city practicing noncompetitive bidding?
- Why is our councilman, you, not listening to his constituents? Residents NEVER asked for this project (see RFP what residents want), residents NEVER asked for vocational school (Addendum 2 in the RFP),...RESIDENTS asked for low to medium market rate single family housing to fit within our neighborhood?

Sharon Mateja