

> From: Scott Heil <heils4@sbcglobal.net>
> Sent: Sunday, June 24, 2018 7:47 AM
> To: jennifer mermilliod <jennifer@jmrc.biz>
> Subject: Meeting
>

>

> Hi Jen,

> Garrett and I happen to be at the Cultural Heritage Board Meeting last week. He needed to attend a public meeting for Boy Scouts. I wanted to share my thoughts about the condo project as a resident who lives right off of Mission Inn. I couldn't agree more with Mr. Lech. The Board imposes such strict restrictions on any modifications to our historic homes and yet half of them were willing to sign off on this project. Do they really know the neighborhood? The other Board members and the developer need to look to the Starbucks/CVS buildings and the Raincross Promenade, to name a few, for direction. That condo facade as is would stick out like a sore thumb.

>

> Riverside has become a destination thanks to the Mission Inn and the Festival of Lights. This project is on Mission Inn Avenue. Better care should be taken to maintain the integrity of the historic beauty of our downtown.

>

> Amy

> Sent from my iPhone

From: Richard Block
To: [Equez, Judy](#)
Cc: jblock29@charter.net; [Watson, Scott](#)
Subject: Re: [External] concern about 4019 Mission Inn Ave
Date: Monday, June 25, 2018 5:32:49 PM

Judy,

Thanks for sending this. A couple of questions:

- 1) I see that the Specific Plan Amendment will change the zoning for the project site. What is the present zoning of our property at 4061-4079 Mission Inn Ave.? Will the SPA or any other measure for the project entail any zoning change for our property, and if so, in what way?
- 2) I see that the plan shows some steps from the sidewalk, and elsewhere, up to the units. How high are the steps? Also, the proposed buildings will be 24 feet high -- from what level (as compared to the present soil level) is that 24 feet measured?
- 3) Since there is apparently polluted soil on the site, what is going to be done about it. In particular, during any soil movement to determine and eliminate polluted soil, what measures will be used to help protect nearby persons and the general environment?

Thanks,
Richard

>

From: Richard Block
To: [Eguez, Judy](#)
Cc: jblock29@charter.net; [Watson, Scott](#); [Assadzadeh, Candice](#); [Brenes, Patricia](#); [Gardner, Mike](#)
Subject: Re: [External] concern about 4019 Mission Inn Ave
Date: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 4:23:37 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello, Judy.

Thank you for your responses. I have some remaining concerns regarding the impact on our bordering property to the west, 4061-4079 Mission Inn Ave., Jane Blocks office center for non-profits.

Here are some of our concerns. Please pass this along to the Planning Commission members and see that they have a chance to consider this, June 28 PCP meeting, Agenda Item 2, PLANNING CASES P17-0761 (SPA), P17-0762 (CUP), AND P17-0763 (TM).

1) You say " **Conceptual Grading Plan, which indicates that the proposed pad elevations are only 6" above the finished grade of the site.**" However, on page 1 of the Exhibit 7 in the attachment to tomorrow's Planning Commission agenda item, labelled Project Plans, in the upper right corner, it shows the existing and proposed grade levels along Section B-B, with the right end at our property boundary. What is of great concern is that at the as the line approaches the setback line 10.5 feet from our property, the existing grade slopes downward from the elevation of the existing grade, so that at the setback line the proposed grade is about 8 feet higher than the existing grade, as opposed to overall 6 inches that you mention, making the effective height of the proposed building adjacent to our property significantly higher 24 feet. We object to this. **the proposed grade level in the western part of the project needs to be lowered.**

2) Moreover, the said Project plan shows that along Section B-B, as the line goes from the setback line to the property line the proposed grade level drops sharply in a straight line to the existing grade level at the property boundary, whereas the existing grade level is more or less level, with a slight dip in the middle. Thus whereas existing drainage in that area is on the project site, **the proposed grading would direct all the flow in that area down an artificially created rather steep slope onto our property. That is of course unacceptable, and needs to be changed.**

3) At page 4 of the staff report, it says "Staff recommends a condition of approval, that a row of 15-gallon evergreen trees are planted along the west property line to provide a buffer and privacy between the proposed multiple-family and office uses to the west." In view of the narrowness (partly 10.5 feet, partly 5.8 feet) of the setback, **those trees need to be such that no branches will intrude over the property boundary, no leaves will fall onto our property, and the trees will not be flammable species such as pine or eucalyptus.**

4) The staff report, at p. 3, says "A five-foot high wood privacy fence is proposed along the western property line." That is also the property line of our property. We presume that will not interfere with the long-existing (I think roughly 8 foot high) chain link fence on the property boundary. But a five foot fence will do nothing for privacy in view of the steep slope mentioned above, and being wood, might constitute a fire hazard. **It needs at least to be constructed of material impervious to fire.**

Thanks,
Richard