

Terri Manuel

From: Brian Skvarca <bskvarca@uniwebinc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 03, 2018 9:59 AM
To: Terri Manuel
Subject: Arantine Hills

Hello Terri My Name is Brian Skvarca and I am a home owner adjacent to the Arantine hills project. I am located just south of the project. We had spoken a few time in the past. I received a public notice in the mail and as you can imagine I have a few questions and concerns. First it is somewhat confusing what the proposal is without some projected map illustrating the changes. As much as most people are concerned with too much medium density homes vs. low and the associated decline in overall property values ton adjacent ranch style homes and my main concern is that part of this parcel is located south of the wash on the bluff. I remember specifically asking if this project was part of or potentially part of at a later time and I was told NO. so I am curios how this land is now being asked to be included. It is my understanding the parcel is zoned R-A-5 meaning Residential/agriculture is this correct or did it change to just agriculture.

If you have any more information regarding this proposal can you share this with me.

Thank you. I am available by email or cell for your convenience.

Brian Skvarca | Vice President – Manufacturing/Facilities Operation
222 S. Promenade Ave | Corona, Ca 92879
Phone (800) 486-4932 | Fax (951) 279-8986
Cell (951) 532-0263
bskvarca@uniwebinc.com

Terri Manuel

From: Jannlee Watson <jannlee.watson@ca.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2018 12:44 PM
To: Terri Manuel
Subject: Public hearing ...
Attachments: 42165837_2181846091835055_1456167472972431360_n.jpg

Hello, Terri –

I hope you can help me with a couple of questions regarding the Arantine Hills/Bedford public hearing on the agenda for the Oct. 22 Planning & Housing Commission agenda.

1. I see that this 159.2-acre parcel is still owned by the McMillans. Is the New Home Company purchasing it?
2. Is this correct -- While the public hearing looks to change the zoning on 31.2 acres, the remaining 127.35 acres (the two plateaus), would remain Agriculture zoning?
3. The NOP in 2006 (attached), showed these two plateaus included in the original Arantine Hills plan. Are there intentions by the owner/developer (either verbal or in writing), to subdivide this acreage at a later date. Nelson Nelson at a parks meeting last month, indicated that may be the case.

Thank you ...

Jannlee Watson

PLANNING & HOUSING COMMISSION

- INTRODUCTION

- Fred Myers
8351 Butterfly Bush Ct.,
Temescal Valley, CA 92883
909-816-6698
- Received notice of public hearing – within 500 feet
- Multiple emails were submitted to Ms. Terri Manuel,
Planning Manager, with the majority of questions related to
the usage of the 2 plateaus of remaining McMillan acreage
 - I will be reading responses to those questions later in
the presentation
- I would like to take this time to thank Ms. Manuel for her
quick responses and her clear and precise answers
- After many hours of research it became clear the root cause
for Amendment #2 to the Arantine Hills Specific Plan was to
accommodate a water quality basin that was inadvertently
omitted from all previous approved specific plans and
amendments. This conclusion was arrived from the
minutes of the infrastructure committee meeting held on

May 2, 2018. As a result of the basin omission the New Home Co. had to reconfigure multiple approved planning areas and add the 31-acre partial parcel because it lost the 130 homes planned for PA12.

- It is requested the water quality basin information be added to the amendment prior to approval

Even though it is repeatedly stated, “no units were added to the specific plan” the density increased substantially

- MDR increased by 14%
 - HDR increased by 10%
 - If the 185 age restricted units were included, the increase would be a whopping 46%
 - LDR was reduced by 45%
 - The Amendment acknowledges density changes to the Parcel Map per the 7th bullet under Specific Plan Amendment and planning areas described in Table 1 on page #5
- It is requested the density increases be added to Amendment, section 1.1, background, last paragraph for transparency purposes prior to amendment approval.

- I am an adamant believer in transparency – because with transparency;
 - You earn the respect of your constituents
 - And it reflects on the integrity and honesty of the individual

- **1.3 PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS (PAGE 5)**
 - Under Subheading Specific Plan Amendment #2, Page 5
 - Bullet #6 Modification Request
 - “Permit age qualified DU’s in the MDR & HDR planning areas”.

It’s time for New Home Co. to say whether or not it is going to exercise its option to add 185 DU’s and identify which MDR & HDR PA’s are affected

 - Under Subheading – Parcel Map
 - The Retreat community and Temescal Valley have major concerns with any future development on the remaining two plateaus. Reference attached Parcel Map

- As mentioned earlier, I now would like to read a couple of Ms. Manuel's email responses to questions submitted by residents related to usage concerns for the two plateaus on Mr. McMillan's parcel of land.

Read email responses

- Here are additional statements related to remainder parcel (two plateaus) in Amendment #2
 1. Page 7, 1st paragraph, last sentence, and I quote
"The remainder parcel, is not proposed to be entitled in this action"
 2. Second paragraph, last sentence "no development rights are proposed for the remainder parcel shown on PM 37036, which would remain designated agricultural"

- Predicated on email responses from Ms. Manuel, quoted amendment statements, and the fact that the Remainder Parcel on PM 37036 is irrelevant to the purpose of this Amendment and was NOT included in the 2012 approved Specification Plan or the 2016 approved Amendment, it is requested the following items be removed/deleted from Amendment prior to approval

1. Sub-heading – Parcel Map, page 7, 3rd paragraph “an easement for future ingress/egress is shown on Parcel Map to provide future access to the Remainder Parcel. The ingress/egress easement is provided to avoid “land-locking” the Remainder Parcel without legal access. No plan for access is proposed at this time.

2. Subheading – Beford Canyon Wash Page 8, 2nd Paragraph & Subheading – 2.4 Biological Resources, Page 35, 3rd Paragraph

- A future bridge crossing may provide access from Parcel 1 to the Remainder Parcel of PM 37036. The precise location and engineering of the bridge would be the subject of future analysis if the Remainder

Parcel were proposed for development. The bridge is assumed to span Bedford Wash with one pier located in the Wash. The bridge is also assumed to be approximately 75 feet wide.

