

Search Terms: **Rose Institute, Rose Institute**

FOCUS™

[Search Within Results](#)[Edit Search](#)[Print](#) [Email](#)[◀ previous](#) Document 4 of 6. [next ▶](#)[Document List](#) [Expanded List](#) [KWIC](#) [Full](#)Copyright 2005 The Press Enterprise Co.
Press Enterprise (Riverside, CA)

October 9, 2005, Sunday

SECTION: LOCAL; Pg. B01**LENGTH:** 1255 words**HEADLINE:** REDLANDS;
Measure fuels growth debate**BYLINE:** NAOMI KRESGE; THE PRESS-ENTERPRISE**BODY:****REDLANDS**

Doomsday rhetoric is coming from both sides of the debate over growth-constricting Measure P.

Proponents from the slow-growth Redlands Association argue that the measure on the Nov. 8 ballot will safeguard the city's charm, heritage and open space from rampant development.

Opponents counter that the measure will stifle downtown development, choke off the city's revenue and plunge Redlands into economic troubles.

The measure itself is 10 dense pages of changes to the General Plan, the city's long-range planning rules, that restrict commercial and residential development, building height, traffic, and density.

The measure closes loopholes the city could have used to deviate from its rules, requiring in some cases unanimous votes of the Redlands City Council or additional ballot measures to approve any exemptions.

It also makes it easier and cheaper for residents to challenge city decisions - appeals would be free with a petition signed by at least 20 registered Redlands voters.

"The jewel of Redlands is tarnished," reads the ballot argument in support of the measure. "Adoption of this measure gives our citizens a direct voice in defining the policies that are crucial to the future of our city."

The argument against the measure points to an independent study by the **Rose Institute**, a public-policy group at Claremont McKenna College, that predicts the measure could increase the city's budget deficit to \$ 4 million.

The measure, opponents write, "undercuts our city's financial stability and leaves taxpayers holding the bag."

Campaign finance reports released Sept. 29 and last week show more than \$ 130,000, most of it from developers, has been raised so far to combat the ballot measure. Supporters raised \$ 2,246.

Redlands Association president Bill Cunningham dismissed the disparity.

"We've never had any money," Cunningham said.

MEASURE'S HISTORY

Cunningham was mayor and led a slow-growth bloc on the City Council for about seven years until 1999.

His association was formed in 1986. It helped pass Measure M in 1987, which created a 400-unit annual cap on residential development. In 1997, its Measure U added more restrictions, including studies to compare how much a project would provide the city in revenue with how much it would cost in services.

Many of the clauses in Measure P, which qualified for the ballot in January 2004, tighten restrictions already passed under Measure U. Cunningham said the city has found ways to sidestep the rules approved in the previous initiatives.

He dismissed the idea that the measure would harm the city financially.

"They said the same thing about Measure U, and they said the same thing about Measure M," Cunningham said.

Measure P has not drawn any support from City Council candidates. All but one, slow-growth candidate Eddie Tejada, oppose it. Tejada has taken no position on it.

Candidate Teddy Banta signed the measure two years ago but said she can't support it because it would allow some hillside properties to build houses on 2 1/2-acre, instead of 5-acre, lots.

COMPLICATED RULES

Some managed-growth supporters say that while the measure has many good proposals, it is too complicated and constricting to support.

"I have a lot of sympathy for what they're trying to do," said candidate Brian Roche. But the measure would tie the city in too many knots and prevent economic growth, he said.

The two sides dispute whether the measure would affect the Donut Hole, the unincorporated area surrounding Citrus Plaza where the city provides services in exchange for 90 percent of the sales taxes.

The **Rose Institute** report said it might throw the Donut Hole agreement into question. Cunningham said it would not because the agreement predates the measure.

Also in dispute is how the measure would affect downtown. Cunningham said it promotes downtown development by enlarging an area in which development fees could be waived - by unanimous vote of the City Council - for nonresidential projects.

"What it will do is really choke off any kind of plans we have for revitalizing downtown," said Kathie Thurston, executive director of the Redlands Chamber of Commerce, which has organized a fundraising committee to oppose the measure.

Thurston said the restrictions on traffic and building height could keep out restaurants and other projects.

Community Development Director Jeff Shaw said the measure's full effect probably would not be clear until after it is passed.

The limitation of 500 trips on residential streets, for example, probably would affect the twisting streets of south Redlands the most, Shaw said. Depending on how much traffic already is using a street, he said, a new subdivision of a handful of homes could trigger the rule and be prohibited.

A prohibition on new streets wider than two lanes south of Redlands Boulevard also is tricky, he said. It could prevent widening to ease bottlenecks at intersections.

A land-swap clause that says land use can't be switched to allow homes unless residential land elsewhere in the city is changed to nonresidential also has unclear ramifications, Shaw said.

Could the city create a land bank to coordinate the swapping?
And what about agricultural land?

The net effect, Shaw said, is to create more hoops for developers to jump through, and possibly dissuade them from choosing Redlands for projects.

"It limits options, alternatives," Shaw said. "P kind of locks the door."

* * *

MEASURE P

The wide-reaching measure tightens existing city restrictions on growth and creates some new restrictions. Its 10 pages make 32 changes to six kinds of city planning regulations. A sampling:
GROWTH:

- * Tightens restrictions and increases cost to landowners to bring city services such as utilities to areas outside the city

- * Prohibits projects that would add more than 500 vehicle trips daily on residential streets and prohibits residential streets from being reclassified as higher-traffic streets

- * Prohibits any private project that could decrease water quality or lead to a water-rate increase or restrictions on water use

- * Requires a unanimous City Council vote to annex residential areas and to change land use within 300 feet of homes to shops, industry or multifamily

- * Prohibits land use from being changed to allow homes, except by ballot measure or swap of other residential land to nonresidential. The clause likely would apply to land now designated agricultural.

LAND USE:

- * Prohibits any commercial building - except for a downtown hotel - from being more than three stories tall; prevents high-density residential buildings from being more than two stories

- * Removes exemptions that allow building anything other than residential estates on certain land once used for agriculture.

TRAFFIC:

- * Keeps San Timoteo Canyon Road two lanes

- * Prohibits new streets wider than two lanes south of Redlands Boulevard

OPEN SPACE:

- * Land with large or numerous native oak trees could be developed only if the city finds that no alternative site exists

HEALTH:

- * Permits mineral extraction only in the Santa Ana River flood plain

SOURCE: REDLANDS CITY ATTORNEY DAN MCHUGH'S IMPARTIAL ANALYSIS

LOAD-DATE: October 10, 2005

[◀previous](#) Document 4 of 6. [next▶](#)