



## **Fact Sheet on the Arantine Hills Specific Plan Amendment**

*The following are answers to commonly asked questions regarding the revised master plan proposed by The New Home Company for the 276-acre site located west of Interstate 15 and south of Cajalco Road known as Arantine Hills.*

### **1. Does the revised plan increase the number of homes originally entitled in 2012 under the existing approved plan?**

No. The original plan approved in 2012 provided for up to 1,806 units, and the revised plan likewise features up to 1,806 units. The original approval provided for varying densities of low, medium and high. The revised plan eliminates apartments for families and reduces high density by 38% in favor of more low and medium density across the site.

### **2. What changes are proposed for the Commercial designation of original plan and what does this mean for the existing over-burdened commercial center at Eagle Glen?**

The original plan had a total of 38 acres set aside for regional-serving general commercial use. . The revised plan features 10 acres of General Commercial which is comparable in area to the existing Eagle Glen shopping center. Although there is no identified user for the commercial property at this time, the project is reserving land for future neighborhood-serving retail opportunity as market forces will dictate what will ultimately be developed on the property. The revised proposal also eliminates two Mixed Use designations together totaling 39.7 acres. One featured the potential for a mix of commercial and high density residential uses together, and the other featured the potential for a business park, industrial and commercial uses. The project proponent has eliminated the density and traffic associated with these land use designations. It is very important to understand that the 87% reduction in the commercial acreage and elimination of mixed uses have a positive effect on anticipated levels of traffic. In other words, these types of commercial-focused uses are traffic generators, but the proposed de-intensified land uses will result in lower traffic levels from the original approved plan.

### **3. What does this revised plan mean in quantified terms of traffic?**

The reduction in acreage devoted to commercial and elimination of acreage devoted to mixed uses equates to a *reduction* of almost 11,000 average daily vehicle trips

(10,896). A new traffic analysis was prepared to analyze the revised project based on the less intense land uses. Mitigation measures that are required to offset the impacts of the anticipated traffic including the improvement of roadways and intersections near the site and beyond, (e.g., along Masters Drive), are clearly identified in the Supplemental Environment Impact Report (pg. 4-3) and will be required to be implemented by the developer at specific time frames as triggered throughout the project. As with all development, the required improvements to mitigate the impacts brought about by that development must be implemented with the development. This includes the developer being responsible for the actual construction of certain infrastructure as a result of the project and in some cases the developer will pay a fair share toward the cost of infrastructure anticipated in the future. Another important factor in the traffic analysis is that it also takes into account broader circulation improvements that are being implemented unrelated to this project, but ultimately resulting in better overall circulation in the area.

#### **4. What does this new proposal mean for the Cajalco bridge and interchange?**

The new bridge and interchange are very important for improved circulation in the overall area and *will be* a requirement of the project proponent. Based on the traffic analysis for the project, up to 308 units (or other units (townhouses) equivalent to trips associated with 308 single family units) can be built and occupied before the widening to the Cajalco interchange is required. The developer is still responsible for its fair share toward the construction of the interchange which is 32.5% of the construction cost. However, there is insufficient funding for the construction of this multi-million dollar infrastructure project, and those funds are not available to the City or the community for the foreseeable future. The developer is proposing to advance the funds to the city for the remaining 67.5% of the total cost.

This means the city would get the interchange constructed during the course of this project rather than having to wait for other agency funds or developer-paid impact fees to become available. It also means that the community does not have to go through the construction of the interchange and then “start over” with the construction of the project. The city does have a schedule lined up for the interchange construction and it’s likely that the developer would get additional residential units beyond 308 while the bridge is being widened and other circulation improvements are implemented.

#### **5. Why can’t everything just stay the way it is?**

Assuming that this project never happens, and the infrastructure in the area remains as is, natural growth will still occur simply with population increase. This

equates to natural increases in traffic levels not only within the city, but within the entire region for western Riverside County and southern California. Traffic engineers apply an assumed growth rate overall of anywhere from 1% to 3% per year to account for this natural growth. Without a solution to the immediate concerns of the area circulation, this natural growth alone will add to the increase that area residents are already experiencing and increase the burden on existing facilities.

**6. What are the changes proposed relative to the parks in the revised plan?**

In accordance with City of Corona policy, all developments are required to provide for parks either in the form of land dedication and construction or the payment of fees for the acquisition of parkland and construction of park facilities. The original approved plan featured 15.2 total acres of parks of which 13.1 acres were public and 2.1 acres were private. The city believes that it is better served utilizing the developer's park fee contribution on its existing parks that have not been fully developed, rather than creating a new public park. The revised plan provides for 1.92 acres of a public park in the form of trails along the Bedford Wash which could ultimately become part of a regional bike trail system once the other sections are approved and constructed. The project also provides for 8.4 acres of private parks that will be maintained by the master homeowners' association, at no cost to the taxpayers.

**7. What are the implications if Arantine Hills is a gated Community?**

The gating of the community must meet the standards for emergency responder access. There are gated communities all over the city that function well because they are equipped with the necessary access provisions as required by the Fire Department and the Police Department. The requirements of this project would be no different. Furthermore, the project will include privately maintained streets and parkways, which is normal in master planned gated communities.

**8. Will the revised plan make proper provision for access including emergency response?**

Just as the original plan provided for, the revised plan features two points of access from Eagle Glen Parkway. The access and circulation for the revised plan have been evaluated by the city's Traffic Engineer and Police and Fire Department personnel, and meet the requirements for proper circulation and emergency

access. Each subdivision that would be proposed within the master plan must meet all city standards for emergency access with both the overall master plan and the individual subdivision maps.

**9. What effect does the revised plan have on the public schools?**

As with all development projects, impact mitigation fees will be payable to the Corona-Norco Unified School District (CNUSD). The original project proponent offered to the school district land for school facility purposes. The district declined the offer of land based on its own enrollment projections and facilities planning methodologies implemented by the school district under the auspices of the state. With the school district being an entity of the state, the city does not have authority over it, and is further precluded by state law from denying development based on impacts to schools because the payment of required fees is considered “full and complete” mitigation for school-related impacts ( CGC §65995[h]).

**10. What effects will the revised plan have on the estate and animal-keeping properties to the south in the unincorporated area of the County of Riverside and will new residents be properly advised that animal-keeping properties are located in this area?**

The project site is separated by landform features and topographical differences which create natural buffers. Development standards and design guidelines within the master plan will further result in the project development being properly buffered from the existing, adjacent land uses. This project will be reviewed by the City for specific development plans at a later date and can be conditioned to provide written disclosures to inform future owners and occupants, where appropriate, regarding the animal keeping properties in the unincorporated County of Riverside area to the south.

**11. Will the revised project result in additional noise and glare to the area?**

Noise and glare are topics that are required to be analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act, and were properly evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report that was prepared for the original project. The same mitigation measures carry forward with the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report that accompanies the revised project. Exterior lighting is required to be directed downward to be contained as much as possible on the subject site, just like it has been implemented with the existing development in the area. Noise levels are also governed by the Corona Municipal Code. A certain amount of ambient lighting is expected with any development, as well as typical noise associated with residential

neighborhoods and small shopping centers. This project poses no greater impacts than that typified with the existing development in the area, and again, must be mitigated through design for minimal impact to surrounding properties.

**12. Is there enough water supply to serve the revised proposal?**

Water supply is a topic that is also required to be analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act. A new analysis was prepared for the revised project, reviewed and accepted by the city's engineers, and is included with all the associated technical documents that are posted on the city's website and cited in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (see link below). The revised project features a lower density than the original approved project. Lower density development has a higher per capita water demand than the General Commercial and Mixed Use zones it replaces, and therefore, results in some increase in demand for potable water and reclaimed water. However, the analysis concluded that, based upon the city's Urban Water Management Plan, the city has sufficient water supplies to support the project as revised. In order to reduce the project's demand for potable water, the developer must extend the necessary infrastructure to supply the site with reclaimed water for use on exterior common areas such as streetscape irrigation, fuel modification areas (fire protection zones), and parks.

The development is required to landscape the site with a California friendly plant palette in lieu of turf within residential front yards. All landscaping except for single family homes will be utilizing reclaimed water for irrigation purposes. The city reclaims the majority of the water that is used within all residential units and uses this reclaimed water to irrigate schools, parks and common landscaped areas. This water is also used to recharge our groundwater basins.

**13. Why isn't the site being set aside as an alternate route to Orange County?**

In 2003, the city implemented a temporary moratorium on the entitlement of the subject site in order to afford time for the regional transportation agencies to study the feasibility of an access corridor to Orange County. The agencies responsible for making such regional circulation decisions and land acquisitions chose to not move forward with any such connection in the location of the project site. Therefore, no land within the area of the project site has been purchased for the once studied transportation corridor.

**14. With Bedford Wash the path of natural water flow during rain events, what protection will the development have from flood hazards?**

Another topic that is required to be analyzed under the California Environmental Quality is hydrology. An extensive hydrologic analysis for the revised project

carefully evaluated by the city's engineers as well as Riverside County Water Quality Control Board staff is included with the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report materials posted online at the link below. The project features three different design options that each would safely convey surface waters as well as storm events that would affect the Bedford Canyon Wash flowing northward to the Temescal Channel. Site development must be elevated to levels that will protect any construction from both surface flows as well as inundation along the wash. It is important to understand that this aspect of the environmental review is subject to review not only by the city's engineers and the Riverside County flood control staff, but also by the US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

**15. Where can I find more information on the project?**

The proposed amendment and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report including Technical Studies are posted at the following city website:

<http://www.discovercorona.com/City-Departments/Community-Development/Planning-Division/Arantine-Hills-Project.aspx>