

## Public Comments for the City Council meeting on Sept. 12th

Comments can be set to our e-mail and will post them if they meet certain criteria. Posts can be anonymous or feature a name. Please send e-mails to our e-mail address on our Contact Page

---

Sent by Matt and Lynda Underwood, sent 9-7-2022

RE:

Case number: PL20200000136 (20-136/PDP/TTM 20375)

Applicant: Premium Land Development on behalf of Yucaipa 52, LLC

Dear Yucaipa City Councilmember,

Thank you for your service to the city and for listening to your constituents and considering their concerns,

My wife and I have lived in the North Bench for 23+ years and raised our family there.

The biggest crux of the matter in this case is of course, lot size. Saying they are putting 50 houses on 50 acres is a deceptive sleight of hand. Unbuildable land is unbuildable land. Lot size should not be under an acre and limited to the acreage that is buildable. At the planning commission meeting we were given some mini lectures by voices that support this proposal on what we really want and that we have to accept the 50 houses in order to have open space. Unbuildable land is natural open space or available for vineyards. This is a smokescreen.

At the planning development meeting there was support of this project from the wine association. We were told that wine and vines were the economic future of Yucaipa. If that is actually true then the same amount of vineyard is available whether, 0, 1, 5, 10, 20, 50 homes are built on the buildable portion of the land. (and even though I don't drink, I have nothing against the wine advocacy)

The one and only reason this plan is offered is to maximize profit for the landowner and the developer. The fact that some of the land is not able to be developed into homes is not our fault, or anyone's fault, it's an earthquake fault. It should not be up to government to insure profitability for a land developer by making changes to the general plan, and imposing on residents that have lived here for 10, 20, 40+ years under the pretense that they bought into rural one acre lot zoning. Approval of this plan would set a very bad precedent for future cancerous-level lot-orange county type higher density developments on the north bench.

Now let's talk about traffic....

You wouldn't put a higher density apartment complex on the hillside of Rolling Hills or Chapman Heights or Stanley Ranch and then weave the traffic in and out of the streets and cul de sacs of the existing development. Likewise, it's not right to send traffic from a higher density development through a rural designated community where residents have lived for 10, 20, 40 years with the contextual promise of rural zoning.

There are two options for traffic to exit:

Yucaipa Ridge Road -> Quartz -> Diamond -> Goldstone -> Topaz -> Bryant... At certain times traffic on Bryant actually backs

*up beyond the Topaz exit. Or...*

*Yucaipa Ridge Road -> Crystal -> Azurite -> Juniper -> Bryant-> or Ivy/Bryant.*

*The exits out to Juniper and Ivy are also already sketchy if you aren't a car. These roads are actually narrower than the actual existing community and there is no shoulder, no bike lane, and no sidewalk.*

*General plans, rules and regulations can be changed to make things legal, but that doesn't mean it makes good sense and doesn't make it right.*

*Thank you for your consideration in this matter. I urge you to vote No on this plan and maintain one acre zoning on the North Bench.*

*Sincerely,*

*Matthew and Lynda Underwood*