

From: [Irmgart Mitchell](#)
To: [Benjamin Matlock](#); [Justin Beaver](#); [Matt Garner](#); [Jon Thorp](#); [Chris Venable](#); [Bobby Duncan](#); [Public Comment](#)
Cc: [Irmgart Mitchell](#); [Greg](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Case No.22-150/PDP/FDP/TTM 20375 - City Council meeting 4/17/2023
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 1:40:46 PM

City of Yucaipa Representatives:

We are opposed to the Serrano Estates Project as it is proposed, for several reasons, among which are:

The land is zoned RL-1 (Rural Living, minimum one acre per one house) in the Custom Home Overlay district. Contrary to the developer's plan of 51 homes on 24 acres of land with lot sizes from approximately one quarter acre up to one acre, the zoning requirement does not allow the number of homes to be equivalent to the number of acres of a parcel, but on lesser acreage even for the reason of some acreage being unbuildable. That is illogical as one would be able to propose many homes on very little acreage if their parcel was predominantly unbuildable. Just because following the General Plan poses a problem of unprofitability for the owner and developer, is not the City's issue and the City should not bend or ignore the zoning requirements in order to make the project profitable for them.

It is prohibitive to have 80% of the homes designated as senior housing for so many reasons. Just one, as stated in the Planning Commission meeting where the commissioners voted 4-3 to approve the project, if any senior sold their home to someone not a senior they would open themselves up to be sued. This is absurd. This and other problems places a noose around the neck of any senior who may purchase a home there.

We are not against development at all. We just, as residents of the City, of which you are our representatives, are stating that this project needs to follow Yucaipa's General Plan which, as the Plan states, is the "vision" which "guides the features of Yucaipa that will be preserved and retained, where and how the City will change in the future..."

"Yucaipa's General Plan represents the community, its values, and its aspirations."

As the City's Organizational Structure shows, the Residents of Yucaipa are at the top. It is our voice, our values and our aspirations you as representatives are to represent. The goals of the General Plan describe what the results are, that "Yucaipa seeks to create or preserve through the implementation of its General Plan." And the policies in the General Plan guide "decision making as the City works to achieve a goal. The General Plan's policies set the standards that will be used by City staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council in their review of land development projects and in decision-making processes."

One goal: "HN-1.7 Neighborhood Identity. Recognize, preserve, and enhance neighborhood character through adherence to design, development, and other standards in the municipal code, overlay districts, and specific plans" is being ignored by this proposed project.

The General Plan, in specifically addressing the North Bench area states: "The Wildwood Canyon and North Bench areas are largely rural. These areas have large lots, and much of the area is covered by the custom home overlay that requires a minimum size of home. In order to preserve the character of this rural area from residential densification, the 2035 Yucaipa General Plan land use map for this area is the same as the 2004 General Plan. Although there may be scattered planned developments, these two planning areas are not anticipated to generate significant residential development."

Another goal: HN-2.4 is to "require all new residential development in the North Bench and Wildwood Canyon to be consistent with the custom home overlay, adopted density and development standards, and the rural character of those areas." The proposed development

ignores this goal.

Justin Beaver, at your meeting with the North Bench residents earlier this year you stated that if it were up to you, you would not vote for this project. It is up to you. You are our representative (as are the rest) and as our representative your vote needs to speak to what the wishes are of the majority.

Additionally, anyone who has had a relationship with the developer (friendship, business of any kind, etc.) needs to recuse themselves from voting because as human beings it is too difficult to honestly know and keep those relationships from influencing one's vote. There is a lack of trust among the residents of a number of representatives, both on the Planning Commission and on the Council that were not upfront with their relationships. This is not right, and the right thing to do is to remove oneself from the vote. If one doesn't on their own, the Commissioner and the Council must ask that they step aside from being a part of the voting process. Please, all, be honest and above board in this regard.

Thank you for your time.

Irmgart Mitchell
Greg Mitchell