

Matthew Underwood
Lynda Daniel-Underwood
Yucaipa

We oppose the Serrano Estates project Case No.22-150/PDP/FDP/TTM 20375

The Serrano Estates planned development on Yucaipa Ridge Road is the wrong type of development in the wrong place. This is poor city planning that will forever detrimentally affect all of Yucaipa. All types of housing are needed, but this plan sets precedent that limits the opportunity for those that are looking for a home in rural zoning that has helped define the attractive rural character of Yucaipa. From my understanding planned developments that are exceptions to zoning rules and standards and should bring some special need to the community, and this does not.

This is presented by the developer and city in a positive manner and ignores other objectives in the Rural Living and Custom Home overlay that would put it in a more negative light. Just a few:

CDL 1.8: does not comply with overlay district
CDL 2.4: grading does not blend with existing topography
CDL 2.7: land use patterns not consistent with topography
CDL 5.2: violates identity of the district
CDL 5.7: violates quality of residential neighborhood
CDL 10.2: does not preserve positive characteristics of the site
HN 1.7: gross violation of neighborhood identity
HN 2.4: violation of custom home overlay and rural character of North Bench
HN 3.5: violation of overlay district
HN 3.6: not compatible with character of neighborhood

Fire concerns:

This is within the very highest designation wildfire zone. This cul-de-sac with limited egress is a death trap! My kids and I have watched many fires over the years. All of them that have come onto this property or threatened it have come from the Northeast direction which is inaccessible and does NOT have fire mitigation. There are a number of pieces of legislation in the works in Sacramento that prohibit developments in high fire risk areas. I have had USAA insurance for 35 years. Despite multiple combined and longevity policy discounts they want over \$9K this year, excluding earthquake and I am relatively protected 3 streets removed from this project. Everyone in the surrounding area is scrambling year to year to obtain insurance.

Senior housing and Traffic concerns:

There is no need for million dollar senior housing isolated from amenities and public transportation. Mr. Heaps says that this is for "active and well to do" seniors so they don't need those amenities. If that is the case then traffic WILL NOT BE MITIGATED! When I go to work I leave at 3am and return 14-16 hours later and that's it - one trip for the day. When I have a day off to be a "retired guy" I make trips all day long (gym, hardware store, groceries, dining out), have contractors over, my kids and friends come over, etcetera. I might generate 10 trips a day as a "active retired guy". This senior traffic reduction is bogus selling point, that in reality I just don't believe to be true, and does not mitigate all the other bad aspects of this planned development.

Common Sense:

It does not make sense to build a higher density development that does not have an exit of it's own and run it through a rural designated neighborhood. Following logic would you allow a 50 unit apartment on 2 acres if only 2/50 acres were able to be developed? Of course not. If the builder had presented a plan of one acre lots on the buildable portion of the property they would likely already be breaking ground.

Some notes on Planning Commission Decision:

1. Craig Heaps of Premium Land Development (PLD) lied about "never donating to anyone". That is factually not true provable with a 10 second google search. He has donated to council members and one of the planning commissioners. If he lies about something so easily fact-checked, what else does he lie about and misrepresent?
2. Donna Snodgrass previously recused herself at a previous meeting on a PLD project because of her conflict of interest with PLD but not this one. Hmmmm....
3. The City Planners father and Donna Snodgrass's husband spoke in favor of the project. It's their right, but weird...
4. One of the main arguments by a couple of the commissioners (paraphrased) is "We need to pass this high density plan, to mitigate against other high density plans on the North Bench". Huh???
5. One of the commissioners big concern is that it will generate a lot of revenue for the city in property tax. This is a dumb argument. 50 houses at \$1 million is roughly the same tax base as 33 houses at \$1.5 million. As an aside, I have several practice partners that are looking for homes on 1-2 rural zoned acres or property to build, but I don't know anyone looking for \$1million dollar small level lot tract homes with 2:1 landscape slopes. It is also my understanding that the special senior designation results in significantly less development fees to support revenue for schools and other services.
6. I think almost every planning commissioner said that they had spoken with the developer and it was clear that they had their minds made up and speeches prepared and did not listen to concerns of long time Yucaipa residents.

Reminders:

We have Mayor Beavers promise after listening to residents and councilman Garner's campaign promise (one home on one acre, not Bill Clinton's "what the meaning of is, is"). Councilman Duncan must recuse himself or be removed for his conflicts of interests and blatant bias demonstrated against North Bench residents.

Final Plea:

General plans, zoning, municipal codes, housing overlays, planned developments.... It's all very confusing. There are contradictions and loopholes that can be exploited in a negative way to violate strong Yucaipa neighborhood identities. It is up to a discerning city council to see through the smoke and lead the right way forward. We trust that you will come to the right decision after careful consideration.

Sincerely,

Matt and Lynda Underwood