

3

Post-it® Fax Note	7671	Date	8/22	# of pages	3
To	BenConty	From	Crystal Quinly		
Co./Dept.		Co.			
Phone #	825-2349	Phone #	825-7810 eves		
Fax #		Fax #			

August 18, 2003

TO: City Council, Planning Staff
City of Manteca

FROM: Crystal Quinly
2079 Goldeneye Way
Manteca, CA 95337
209-825-7810 eves.

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2003

Community Development Department

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) - City of Manteca General Plan

Upon reviewing the Draft EIR, I have several questions and comments concerning the proposed land use in the southwest section of the city. Specifically, the inconsistencies in land use goals and policies in relation to the proposed land use in the newly developed residential areas in the vicinity of Airport and Woodward Roads.

- 1) LU-P-15 "Higher density shall be located by the full range of urban services, along collector and arterial streets..." If the City intends to follow this policy, then shouldn't the neighborhoods developed between Airport, Atherton, and Woodward be high density? These neighborhoods are Low-density residential (LDR), not High-density residential (HDR). The draft EIR land use correctly identifies these neighborhoods as LDR, however, to the north General Commercial (GC) is planned, and along Airport and Woodward Roads, Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) is planned. The proposed land uses of placing GC and CMU next to LDR are not consistent with the policy. 1
- 2) LU-P-16 "The City shall promote the preservation and integrity of existing stable residential neighborhoods". The LDR homes in the Bella Vista and Meritage neighborhoods are existing (for over 3 years) and are considered by many residents to be stable. How can placing GC and CMU around three sides of these neighborhoods promote the preservation and integrity of these neighborhoods? 2
- 3) LU-P-24 "New commercial development shall be designed to avoid the appearance of strip development." How can proposing CMU on the west side of Airport Road from Atherton to Woodward avoid strip development? This is going to be nothing but a strip of parcels, which of course is strip development. 3
- 4) LU-P-27 "The City shall monitor commercial development to balance growth in residential, commercial and industrial development." What criteria is used to monitor commercial development? Certainly, placing commercial on three sides of a LDR neighborhood, resulting in an increase of noise and traffic, is not a balance to the voting citizens. 4

5) LU-P-47 "The City shall develop and apply standards for pedestrian circulation that enable residents to select a reasonably direct and safe pedestrian route to schools, parks, transit stops and commercial services." If the proposed land use of CMU and GC are approved for these areas, again with a substantial increase in traffic, how will the city enforce the above policy? Residents have already expressed concern on direct and safe pedestrian routes to schools. Even the bus stops located on Airport Rd. are not considered safe. The proposed land uses will make Airport Rd. even less safe, thereby; the proposed land uses are not consistent with the policy.

5

6) LU-I-1 "The City shall maintain a growth management system...following objectives: Preserve and protect the quality of life and character of the community." The proposed CMU and GC uses will certainly not protect the quality of life and character of the above referenced neighborhoods. How will the city ensure that this implementation policy will protect the neighborhoods from a lesser quality of life if the city leaders allow these residents to be trapped by commercial on three sides?

6

My understanding is that the issues of commercial land use along Airport Rd. from Atherton to Woodward, and the proposed CMU on Woodward and Airport Rd. have already been discussed/debated by the Planning Commission and the City Council. The Commission clearly saw that the proposed land uses were not consistent with City policies and the needs of the voting residents in those areas. As such, the Commission voted to not "zone" CMU at the Woodward and Airport Rds. Intersection. This issue was taken to the City Council who refused to vote, for or against, on the proposal for CMU. Instead, this issue was sent to the Steering Committee, who recommended CMU along Airport and at the intersection of Airport and Woodward. I understand there is an appeal process, which is why this issue was initially forwarded to the Council after the Commission denied the first request for CMU at Woodward and Airport.

7

The residents in these areas are just now becoming knowledgeable on what the City is proposing. In fact, we only found out on August 11, 2003, that there was another proposal for a developer to again try to place CMU in the wrong place. This seems like a rather devious way for a developer to work. First, try to follow the rules...to the planning commission...appeal to the council when denied...and now work behind the scenes with the Steering Committee to change the land use. This way, the neighbors are not specifically notified of a proposed land use change, because it is not a specific project within 300 feet of their property. This is only after all, the General Plan that all residents will live with. Yes, this is devious. When the residents bought the homes (and the developer, the Airport/Woodward parcel(s)), the area was zoned either LDR or was urban reserve/agricultural. To change to commercial will negatively affect the integrity and stability of the neighborhoods.

8

If the City chooses to go against the needs of these neighborhoods and against the proposed policies mentioned above, I ask for a few items to be included in any and all conditions of approvals for proposed commercial developments in those areas. First, in the CMU proposed areas, that there are no strip malls (policy), and like the conceptual drawing on page 2-6 of the Land Use Element, that the planning staff and City enforce

9

the plan. That is, CMU is for use as a public plaza, neighborhood park, and pedestrian paths (several feet off of Airport and Woodward). Also, that if the General Plan proceeds as proposed, there needs to be "a strong relationship" between the different land uses for pedestrian access and a common design theme.

9

As stated earlier, the residents are becoming knowledgeable concerning "the rules" for land use changes. We only hope that we can work behind the scenes to change the proposed land use from CMU and keep it consistent with the City policies. However, we will also work diligently within the City protocol (commission, council meetings) to be heard at the public hearings.

10

I look forward to the final EIR to ensure each question above was addressed by your consultant. I may also be contacted by phone in the evenings at 825-7810.

Thank you,



Transmit report

P.1

08/22/2003 15:53
40LE04759
TC:24971

REMOTE STATION	START	TIME	Pages	RESULT	REMARKS
919169392346	08-22 15:51	00:01 40	004/004	OK	

REMARKS TMR:Timer, POL:Poll, TRN:Turn around, 2IN:2in1 Tx, ORG:Original size set, DPG:Book Tx
FME:Frame erase Tx, MIX:Mixed original, CALL:Manual-Com, KRDS:KRDS, FWD:FORWARD
FLP:Flip Side 2, SP:Special Original
FCODE:Fcode, MBX:Confidential, BUL:Bulletin, RLY:Relay, RTX:Re-Tx, PC:PC-FAX
S-OK:Stop communication, Busy:Busy, Cont.:Continue, No ans:No answer
M-full:Memory full, PW-OFF:Power switch OFF, TEL:Rx from TEL



Community Development Department

1001 W. Center Street, Manteca, CA 95336
Phone: (209) 239-8424
Fax: (209) 825-2349
Email: bcantu@ci.manteca.ca.us

BC 'FAC' SIMILE



To: David Wade, Wade Associates

Fax No.: (916) 939-2346

Phone No.: (916) 565-7629

Reference:

From: Benjamin Cantu, Advance Planning Manager

Date: Friday, August 22, 2003

Number of Pages: 4 (includes cover sheet)

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

David:

EIR comments.


Ben



Community Development Department

1001 W. Center Street, Manteca, CA 95336
Phone: (209) 239-8424
Fax: (209) 825-2349
Email: bcantu@ci.manteca.ca.us

BC 'FAC'SIMILE



To: David Wade, Wade Associates

From: Benjamin Cantu, Advance
Planning Manager

Fax No.: (916) 939-2346

Date: Friday, August 22, 2003

Phone No.: (916) 565-7629

Number of Pages: **4** (includes cover sheet)

Reference:

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

David:

EIR comments.

Ben