

FlashVote helps you make a difference in your community

Results: Proposed Annexation and Open Space

 Survey Info - This survey was sent on behalf of City of Rancho Cucamonga to the FlashVote community for Rancho Cucamonga, CA.

<p>604 Participants 559 of 1258 initially invited (44%) Margin of error: ± 4%</p>	<p>Applied Filter: All Responses Participants for filter: 604</p>	<p></p>	<p>Started: Oct 12, 2017 12:08pm Ended: Oct 14, 2017 12:00pm Target Participants: All Rancho Cucamonga</p>
---	--	---------	--

Q1

The City of Rancho Cucamonga is working on a possible “North Eastern Sphere Annexation” of 4,115 acres (6.4 square miles) of land that is along the foothills north of Rancho Cucamonga city limits. This land is currently not within city limits/boundaries and is subject to development under San Bernardino County standards.

Prior to reading this question which best describes your knowledge of this topic?

(597 responses)

Options	Votes (597)
I didn't know about the land being unincorporated or about the possible annexation	42.5% (254)
I knew about the land being unincorporated, but not about the possible annexation	15.4% (92)
I knew about the land being unincorporated and about the possible annexation	39.5% (236)
Not Sure	2.5% (15)

Q2

This annexation plan (*see map link below*) would allow for preservation of 2,916 acres for wildlife and habitat (conservation priority area in orange) and in return, the development of approximately 1,200 acres of this land (development priority area in green), in proximity to existing development.

Which best describes your reaction to a possible designation of 2,916 acres of this land as a “conservation priority area”, which means an emphasis on habitat conservation instead of development?

(583 responses)

Options	Votes (583)
I like it	64.3% (375)
I'm neutral	12.0% (70)
I don't like it	9.6% (56)
I don't care	0.9% (5)
I'd like more information	13.2% (77)

Q3

Which of these annexation features is most important to you?
(581 responses)

Options	Votes (581)
Future development in that area is controlled by city standards	14.6% (85)
Development in that area contributes taxes for city services	9.1% (53)
Infrastructure can be improved in that area (roadways, storm drains, etc.)	3.1% (18)
The foothills area is conserved against development	61.8% (359)
Not Sure	6.9% (40)
Other:	4.5% (26)

Unfiltered responses

- The county should maintain control of that area.
- I Don't want "City Standards" to be implemented in this area whatsoever.
- develop under city not county standards and generate taxes that pay for services
- Golf Course would be nice
- Multi use park(soccer,baseball, cover eating areas)

- I like the green annex area for development, but why not let SB County keep conserved area?
- all of the above, and more
- Leave it the way it is
- preserve equestrian lifestyle and trail system.
- The additional over development of the area.
- Schools becoming even more crowded. Not enough police coverage for city to expand.
- Impacts to current residents
- Maintain the area but make it accessbile for hiking and other outdoor activities
- I'm for conservation habitat, but VERY CONCERNED about retail/housing development on the 1,200 acre
- If development occurs, it is sparse and blends with the natural condition.
- We need more water storage and treatment facilities. It would be cool if there was a big solar PV
- I like that they are doing both, building up the city and taking care of the wildlife. We all have
- Future development is to city standards AND the foothills is conserved against future development!!
- keep the lower area green and allow the higher areas to be developed with very low density.
- How can you build on a earthquake fault?
- Nothing should be built on that land at all!
- Water storage and rain/runoff collection. Solar power generation.
- We don't need to build something on every piece of open land.
- I like controlled by city dev., generates tax revenue for city, land conserved
- I think the whole foothill area should be conserved against development, not just the 2,000 acres.
- All of the above are important. Major concern re: fire & evacuation impacts in new developed area.

Q4

How important is it to you that the City of Rancho Cucamonga have local control (zoning, City Development processes and approvals, tax contributions, etc.) over this currently unincorporated land?
(577 responses)

Options	Votes (577)
Not At All Important (1)	8.0% (46)
Slightly Important (2)	7.8% (45)
Moderately Important (3)	20.8% (120)
Very Important (4)	28.2% (163)
Extremely Important (5)	28.2% (163)
Not Sure	6.9% (40)

Q5

Any other comments or suggestions about possible annexation or development of nearby land?

(227 responses)



Unfiltered responses

- So long as it's not completely controlled by the Lewis family
- no more new housing, we are overpopulated as it is right now. we need more protection against crime and coyotes
- Definitely more information is needed to be able to form any kind of opinion about this issue
- Please make sure natural beauty and rural atmosphere is maintained. Don't adhere to developers who would ruin the environment.
- Only comment is for appropriate and extreme oversight in this possible annexation/development - the City must keep the high standards for any expansion.
- We don't need to develop every square foot that we see! Leave the land wild we don't need any more congestion and pollution.
- More information is needed..
- Thank you for sending out this survey, I had not known about this project.
- Conservation and development in the area are both important. Completely wiping out the habitat would be a shame to the local community and local wildlife.
- Where can I find more information on this subject?
- Before you develop ANYTHING you need to fund the development at CENTRAL PARK!!!!
- I would like more information so that I can truly understand the pros vs cons.
- We have too much traffic and congestion at present. Preserving the land is very important for animals, scenery and the overall feel of our city.
- Our City is very congested, please do not allow any more homes in our foothills
- want front country connectivity . Want more info on who will be responsible for the management of this conserved land, what uses will be allowed, or not allowed on the land
- What will the conservation area expenses be and how will they be paid for?
- STOP BUILDING AND DEVELOPING!!!! NO MORE!!!
- Will this annexation make the city limits the same as the fire district boundaries?

Rancho is big enough

Who really benefits from this annexation? Who is waiting in the wings to get the project monies in the future.

I hardly approve of a city that is interested in conserving and protecting wildlife habitats. Too many have disappeared. Well done RC

The city is overwhelming our streets with traffic coming from all this high-density development. Everything north of Banyan needs to continue to be 1/2 acre lots.

Please dont destroy our miuntains with more development. Get it and preserve it all for at least 100 yrs.

Remember we have a water shortage and have increased traffic when developments are approved. How is these developments going to impact the city's water!

Expedite the process

Stop taking up all of the vacant land and placing people and structures on it. We don't have enough water for more people. Let the wild life have their homes.

no more development... way too many houses and traffic and people here now.... stop already..

Leave the land alone. We Don't need the traffic. Rancho doesn't want to turn into Corona.

no more development, traffic is a nightmare already. Why would you want more development?

We don't want it overdeveloped.

No more development

Don't do it!

I'm glad there's a wildlife zone, and future development can't happen

Leave it as is. I feel it's just another excuse to create a bond that will be passed to the taxpayers. We ultimately pay the price for land development.

Leave the land alone. No more development is needed. Too many people already.

We need to stop developing near the foothills. The coyote problem has worsened over the last few years driving them further out.

Rancho is too crowded

Stop developing so many apartment buildings. Our city is becoming so very over crowded!

No more development up here. We need the rural to laser.

Put up a soundwall on the south bound side of I-15 to less the freeway noise and increase property values

Water supply, fire suppression, law enforcement, and traffic are all key concerns.

No.

I feel like we don't need anymore residential buildings in the city of Rancho Cucamonga.

What are the environmental impacts?

Not sure about the project, need more info

I would rather have that entire area used for wildlife conservation.

I would like to see even more open land and less developed acres.

Just make sure it works as planned.

Make damn sure the land is preserved better than the Etiwanda preserve, and don't develop any more housing.

Don't put houses together they will catch fire look at Anaheim Hills Canyon Fire 2

What will be put in up there and have they considered the fire danger up there?

Please protect nature. Thanks

I would like to see the ENTIRE AREA preserved, rather than a portion of it being developed!!!

Allow pedestrian and bicycle access to conservation area. Also have restaurants in developed area.

NO

I think we are at a point of over development. We need to preserve open space for our animals and plants native to this area. Not all areas

need to be developed. I would also like for our city to have the right to dictate what we want to do with this land, not the county who have not proven to make good decisions financially and who have thus far have not proven to be responsible for the bad decisions made in the past.

We have so little open space left I wish we could just not develop anymore. The traffic is terrible

Completely against annexation if any of the area will be used for residential or commercial development.

Annexation = We control what goes there, and we get the taxes.

Who will be the entity managing the 'preserved land'? How does it relate to the NEP area with its trail system and connectivity with the trail system being identified for the entire front country region? All groups should be at the planning table for connectivity!

As long as proper safety standards are met and as long as all the natural habitats are not threatened, I am good.

A mix of responsible development and conservation areas that are controlled by the city government vs the county gives us more control over our local area.

I need to know who owns the land and what might be done on the "to be developed" part.

As long as there is no additional burden put upon existing residents.

NA

Development? It is so crowded here. Traffic is miserable.

No more building, please.

NEW HOMES? WOW!!

Leave the land vacant. Stop the build on every vacant parcel. Enough is enough.

Against any more development as we lose our quaint and nice neighborhood.

I would like the land not to be developed because of the existing wildlife and possible fire hazards. There is too much development going on in the city.

STOP DEVELOPING THE LAST OF OUR GREEN SPACE!! THE CITY HAS ALREADY GIVEN UP SO MUCH TO BIG DEVELOPERS (ALL FOR THEIR OWN PROFIT). LEAVE IT ALONE!!!

I am not really sure about why the city, after myself living here for 15 years, would all of a sudden want to develop or look at this area? Why now??

We have too much traffic on the few north and south-bound roadways Traffic congestion and related noise at all hours is too high currently.... That issue resolution should be of upmost importance before any more development.

Stop developing!!!!

Land in the foothills is too susceptible to brush fires. When homes are put in the foothills the cost to all residents is high due to the fire and flood danger.

Roads tru esp wilson

I would like to have more information about what type of development it would be and how the habitat would be maintained.

Wish you would listen to us the voters that we are tired with all the over development.

Should adhere to the existing Alta Loma codes for larger lot sizes. Also, should be homes, and not apartments.

I would like to see the land kept in its natural state with a US Forest Service station in the vicinity. Local woodland firefighters would be helpful.

I would like to see more of it conserved with better parking for those who wish to hike. Charge those who do not live in Rancho Cucamonga.

Please preserve open space!

Park should be built on the north side away from the HS.

Support conservation area and the development area as long as development area is not HOA homes and that a public park is included in the development area.

Preservation means preservation

Before proceeding on this new venture of annexation.... funds, resources, and priorities should be given to the completion of Central Park.

I am very much afraid that once Rancho has control over this area that it will be far too easy to change the protected status of the foothills area.

The flashvote indicated a choice I did not make. You need to have a second 'done' button!

Don't build more houses! We have enough empty ones now!

Save that land for just land, and stop building apartments!!

Don't feel we need any more houses roads or parks in this area leave it as open land and beautiful landscape

NA

None

I visit the Etiwanda Reserve quite often and hope this would not cause it to be inaccessible for hikes to the falls.

Can part of conservation area be turned into a public park with hiking trails?

Build a municipal public golf course to replace the open space loss of Empire Lakes Golf Course.

Don,t expect the county to do the right thing. The city needs ti incorporate as much surrounding land as possible.

As long as standard of living doesn't decrease, i.e., NO subsidized housing.

I like the conservation aspect, however not crazy about more development in Rancho.

Just curious what they would do with it. The area above Osos.

I would like to see minimal development and more conservation of open land.

We could use the orange area to rehome the wild animals in Central Park field area.

Leave alone and if city is going to annex portions of land, I vote for local control yet keep for habitat and environmental reasons.

The area needs to stay how it is now. We have paid big money to live in Deer Creek and we don't want more intrusion on the area.

In this area, a grocery store is needed, parks are needed, Wilson Ave. needs to be expanded from East Ave. to Etiwanda ave.

Quit developing every inch of empty land!

I have concern about what that would do to additional unincorporated areas. Do not want to see further development up the foothills.

Watch what is happening up north with the fires...consider the long fire history of this area...it is very predictable what will occur and with more development up there the more exposed people and structures are to that inevitability. Do not scrimp on fire defenses and public safety infrastructure if any development is to occur....constant vigilance, maintenance of defensible space, public education etc will be necessary....the open preserve would be a tremendous community asset.....also don't forget the history in that area including the remains of the CCC road camp that is there and the history that accompanies it.

We must consider the global demands of developing that area and the surrounding area including roads, emergency services and access, pollution, schools, etc.

Devote more to open spaces

Only wish that eye appeal coincides with the existing beauty of the City.

N/A

Limited development and no apartment complexes.

I need more information about both annexation and development.

My concern is that additional development will strain existing infrastructure which is already beyond it's limits.

Yay for development. I love my City!

None at this time.

Highly support the conservation of undeveloped foothill areas!!! So happy that this is even being suggested as an option.

I just want to keep as much of the undeveloped spaces as possible. I think we have more than enough development here.

I do not know

First develop the land within city limits that remains undeveloped.

STOP BUILDING. We need natural land around us.

Developed area should have low density housing and just a small local use shopping area.

Am concerned about the proposed development of more housing in an over crowded city now!

What is the purpose of this proposed annexation?

shopping areas.

Building more houses would be a strain on her fire-fighting services for when (not if) a wild-land fire eventually comes.

Leave the land alone! We already have way too many people and too many uninhabited dwellings in Rancho Cucamonga!

Do NOT develop the land please

We have too many houses! Development needs to stop.

Better to have city standards for development than county standards.

Would rather not see ANY more development in that area but would rather it ALL be protected.

I just hope that if it does get develop they use a different architect then developed Los Osos High School which is very ugly building

We do not need more development in Rancho Cucamonga. We are over populated and do not need more building.

The foothills and chaparral below them should not be built on. However, hiking, biking, and horse trails with parking access would be popular. Claremont's Foothill area is a good model. People could pay for annual parking passes to help supprpt maintenance.

County of San Bernardino does not effectively manager all of the land it currently owns, I would like it better of City of RC had control over it.

If the annexation means more property taxes I am against it.

Make sure it is for the good of the people and wild life as well. Make sure it does not create danger to both human life or wild life.

We need to preserve our natural land and the animals we share this space with!

What will be the cost to the city (i.e. the taxpayer) be?

If land is developed, emphasis should be centered on improving traffic that will increase in that area.

I hope that the city has conceded the wildlife in the area. Displacing wildlife would be a shame. There's more to lose besides tax revenues.

-

City needs to spend more money on "North Etiwanda Preserve", the hiking trail need to be improved (bathrooms, benches), also the parking lot need to be improved.

Make sure animals have sanctuary

Concerns that this area is not being maintained and is a Fire Hazard.

Too much development already in that area. No control over future fire prone area as it is. City resources already overtaxed

no

STOP BUILDING/Developing !!!

DO NOT DEVELOP ANY MORE AREAS. We are already congested, we do not need or want any more developed areas. Reserving for nature is fine, we need more green areas, not more homes, not more people, not more cars.

Too much development now. Quality of life in this City has declined ten fold for my family since moving here due to over building and shifting population along with impact of traffic on local streets.

Concerned about additional traffic, over crowding at schools, increase in crime, etc. and how annexation/development will imoactof our community. Major concern on impact to Police and Fire services and how response times will be affected. How will additional development will impact the council districts in regard to area size & population equity?

Water being a unknown quantity, we have been ask to conserve. It doesn't make sense to keep building adding more people using water. This is an ongoing concern for the future.

This is a great opportunity to build additional water storage and reclamation facilities. Make sure there are wide streets to allow for emergency vehicles in case of wild fires. Keep the residential density as low as possible.

Rancho Cucamonga has become a MONEY HUNGRY CITY, truly sad. Current homeowner's are not allowed to do with their property without the city having a say as to RV parking, Trailer parking on our driveways. Fontana is looking more promising and offers more to their residents than Rancho Cucamonga does.

I would like to see less rental development as it seems to overcrowd the area and lead to conflict of resources. Responsible ownership within this area would be appreciated

Prefer the land stay undeveloped. We already have a huge population and often times, we do not have the means to support it. I'm not sure more development would be in the city's best interest. Let's leave nature as-is!

I would like to see a larger portion of the land declared a conservation area, with the area being proposed for development reduced by half. Additionally, I think it's extremely important any development be done with City standards/control.

Development of this land for homes/businesses will tax this cities police resources which are currently not adequate. Schools are already overcrowded and don't really see how this can improve the city's overall general wellbeing.

While I do want our city to gain control in order to prevent problems, I have a concern. Our city is being developed to the point that traffic and services are being overly impacted. I wish we would slow our development down. We pay the price of overcrowded roads and schools when development is allowed at such a high rate. I do like the idea of a conservation/wildlife area. Maybe the coyotes could all move there.

NO FRICKING WAY.....RANCHO IS ALREADY MAKING VERY POOR DECISIONS ON BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT. THE CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA HAS GONE TO CRAP. STOP ALREADY. I HATE LIVING IN THIS CITY ANY MORE AND CAN'T WAIT TO LEAVE. JUST ANOTHER WAY FOR MORE COYOTES TO COME DOWN INTO OUR LIVING SPACES. CITY MANAGEMENT HAS LOST IT.

There must not be development at a later time within the preserved 2900 acres unless it is to promote the wildlife and nature of the area. Such as with the Etiwanda Preserve.

Make sure there is plenty of road access for large emergency vehicles to fight possible wild fires. Please also use this opportunity to add water storage and treatment equipment. Install a big solar array that we can all be proud of.

NO annexation. City is over populated & we don't need high density and/or low income housing. Because of the drought we are mandated by tiered water to conserve or we pay dearly from our incomes. This is all about taxation of population to subsidize the pockets of city employees. ENOUGH ALREADY! This city is crowded enough. Oh, and what about the fires that rage through the proposed areas every few years? Who pays for that? We like our city population the way it is. No more, please.

Stop referring to a conservation "priority" area. This makes it sound like the priority could change. Commit to making it a conservation area and refer to it as such. I am quite sure you would be receiving less backlash from the community. Call it an expansion of the preserve that will remain for conservation and the only thing to be developed is the area identified.

Wildlife encounter in the neighborhoods close to the foothills (Brentwood, etc) are becoming common. Possibly because lot of new development are being done encroaching into their habitat. I personally believe that more emphasis should be given to conserve the land than doing development. If development is done it has to be done with a wildlife friendly way and by preserving local flora and fauna. Also the community has to be educated about coexisting with the wildlife.

STOP ... urban sprawl ! Stop development. Enough IS Enough. Just because you Can build there .. does NOT mean you Should. Related: No One in Red Hill, East Upland and North Ontario wants the Sycamore Heights development to happen, for a myriad of valid reasons, all of which were totally ignored by the antiquated City Council members (except one) at the hearing last week. The Sycamore Heights project is totally outrageous and against the will of the PEOPLE ... who voted for the current Council members. But AS USUAL ... Follow The Money Trail. It's totally clear the City Council of Rancho Cucamonga cares nothing about the people.

Annex it and leave it as open space for now until a master plan is available so we all can see the plans. I suggest doing nothing to the land for 5 years after annexation. Step back, take a break and forget about revenue. We need a lot more open space!!!!

Resident & City Should Watch Out Over all the Land around there City - we should also leave area for the natural wildlife that lives in our mountains - so we all can Live Peaceful Together!!

Look at the 210 in the morning 7:30 to about 9:30. Bumper to bumper, all four lanes heading West. East is not quite that dense although it is close. When that traffic merges on to our streets we have frustrating delays. Our lovely town is churning out too many apartments and homes. The density is an encumbrance to our streets, parking lots and our joy in living here.

The City should not move forward with this plan. The "preservation" of open space is a sham to put lipstick on the development pig. The plan as proposed goes against the wise current zoning plan for the east side of the city. Multi-family housing should not be allowed. Lot sizes need to be minimum half acre. Developers (who don't care about our city) have been after these 1200 acres for over a decade and now they want to pack as many housing units into it as possible to stuff their pockets. All 4100+ acres are currently undevelopable open space County land. It is an alluvial plain that is necessary for flood control. Because the developers cant acquire the land without a 4/5 vote from the County BOS, they are trying an end run around the BOS by having our City fund the acquisition of the land and approve the development. If this plan goes forward, quality of life will suffer for all RC residents. Crime and traffic will increase. Dont be fooled by greedy developers.

I would prefer that all the land be conserved for wildlife and no development be done. That is best. California is burning. No more people in the foothills tempting fate. Our homes are already squeezing out wildlife to the point that bears are wandering streets and coyotes are snatching up cats and opossums are dead all over the road. Leave all of those lands alone.

Controlling growth is a primary concern, although I don't believe that has been a significant focus of the City thus far. The City's financial vitality can be assured without new high density housing and without significant new development in newly annexed areas. Keep the rural flavor that exists in some of the proposed area.

Looks like the development area makes sense

Want to see more conservation and much less development. Tired of over priced high density housing. If we have more development, I would like it to get back to basics- single story 3-4 bedroom family friendly homes with a little bit of a front/backyard. Not huge houses crammed on small plots of land being sold at ridiculous prices. The city needs to do a much better job of attracting growing families with young children. Are median age is becoming older and older. It is important not to price out young families. I would actually like see any undeveloped land at the northern end of the city stay natural and undeveloped. We have already encroached upon too much of wildlife's habitat. The coyotes have come down out of the hills and roam freely through out the streets dining on our pets. Let's leave the undeveloped land near foothills as it is.

any development should include green spaces within the properties - right now, Rancho does a very poor job of developing new areas with sufficient green space for the local resident or business and parking - the minimum requirement are not sufficient.

It appears that the land is currently owned by SB County Flood Control. If it's annexed in, will the ownership change? What zoning will be applied to that "development priority" portion?

Questions are specific with specific answers. There is too much involved for definite yes or no's. Land under city control is good only if the city follows the wishes of the people and not developers. Who is in whose pocket. Dense development in the wild. Remember the fires.

Please maintain the high standards our City has demanded in the past. Randall Lewis is nice and everything but he doesn't, and won't, live in Rancho Cucamonga. What's good for us needn't be sacrificed for what is good for the Lewis Operating Companies.

We need to conserve the wildlife areas in the north. I understand the need for growth and development in the area around Los Osos HS with a high demand for traffic infrastructure and consideration of lot size to avoid over population and density in an already heavy residential area. Traffic is a major concern with the 210 and 15 corridor and no room for lane growth on the 210. It is already heavy. So I would propose an area like San Elijo, Ca near Carlsbad which has its own commerce to limit commuting and drive local revenue and employment and offer a more exclusive residential environment which I think Rancho Cucamonga is known for.

I oppose this annexation, Rancho is too crowded already. The RCWD is always skiing us to conserve water because they do not have enough water to fill at the current needs.

If the development does not pay into city taxes for fire, police, and ems, the city should not provide it for free. This would possibly be a county problems. My taxes should not be used for those who do not pay into the funds.

There is already enough building in Rancho Cucamong. Schools over crowded, crime, traffic, etc. 3000 to 4000 HIGH DENSITY housing units at the Lakes, by Lewis, empty business rental sites. Enough building already.

Please don't continue to fill every square foot of RC with high density housing/shops/hotels. Create a plan to make a nice living area for the future. There is already enough traffic and crowding with building residences right on top of each other. Thank you for trying to safeguard the development around RC.

I live adjacent to the area that may be developed (in Haven View Estates). I do not like the idea of building and construction and mixed use literally in my backyard.

If I knew the area for conservation would remain conservation I would be for it. But our City Counsel gives a lot of exceptions that we the people don't like. I don't think they can be trusted to keep it conservation.

Protecting and preserving natural habitat is vital. We see too many Coyotes wandering into suburban areas, and we could be helping several species, by keeping native plants and animals flourishing in this space.

I am very interested in conserving open space and limiting development. From what I have read it seems like a developers dream - the open space conservations doesn't seem to be written in specific terms. And, what about environmental impact of the the development and infrastructure impacts like water and traffic?

While the proposed annexation map indicates the northern 2,900 acres to be preserved as open space, I'm not seeing how any sort of development could occur in an area where there are significant flood control facilities such as the Day Canyon and Deer Canyon washes and channels and a levee structure. If the county has not approved any developments there until now, why annex for development purposes? The entire acreage should be preserved for open space and ongoing maintenance of those flood control facilities. I would also like to see a detailed analysis of the potential ongoing costs of additional development to the city in the form of additional services and maintenance of new facilities after any estimated development fees are exhausted. Finally, potential land use designations and zoning for the area proposed to be developed need to be made public as part of any outreach effort to city residents and other stakeholders. This should proposed development densities.

This project has raised significant suspicion among residents that it is a thinly veiled boondoggle that will enable further relatively dense development in the area. Any annexation should be done so as to prohibit any future private sector development. In addition, putting this project forward as a ballot item would assure that the public has a voice that cannot be suppressed or ignored or discounted by existing officials. Of course there would need to be clear discussion of all the costs involved and their impact on the individual Rancho Cucamonga residents.

I feel the development need to be NOT small side by side house but preserve the area by only development of homes with .5 acre or more. The congestion and traffic is already too much north of 210

That section of land is known to be occupied or to have recently been occupied by listed species. Trading it in to be developed by establishing stronger protections on already protected land is wrong. All of those areas are valuable and rare, and should be a proud part of our city. We have some of the best Sage Scrub habitat left in the Inland Empire, and none of it should be developed.

I am strongly opposed to any development in this area. I'd prefer it remain undeveloped and protected as wildlife conservation. The city does not need the additional taxes, with all the continuing development in the city we, the citizens, are seeing the negative side effects. Please leave this land undeveloped!!

I am glad to see so much set aside for preservation, but would like that number increased, and the acres of development to be decreased. I am also concerned about development in an area more threatened by wildfire.

If the city does this and annexation gets approved, they will just allow more houses to be built. I am so tired of watching our once wonderful city turn into nothing more than traffic congestion, overcrowded schools, and an extreme rise in crime. Stop the building and let there be some open space. RC city council will not be happy until every square inch of bare land has a house on it. So sad.

Not knowing where either the city or the county stand, it's difficult to make the selections that best represent what I think should be done with the land - left alone and protected. People get elected to office and new people come in; I would support the strictest "no land development" rules that are actually impenetrable. Do either the city or the county support that? I haven't a clue; I'm concerned that a media relations or consulting group will be brought in to help pull the wool over the eyes of residents/voters.

The city should plan to have nice homes that would bring up the property value of the area. These new homes would definitely impact Los Osos high school, Golden Elementary and Day Creek Intermediate Schools. My concern is that the city would zone for apartments or condos and I don't think that this type of housing should be permitted. Residents would not be happy about that. These new homes or businesses would also increase the traffic on Banyan which is very slow due to the amount of cars getting their students to the schools on Banyan.

Banyan is a single lane road and a traffic light may need to be added.

Not only as a resident of Ranch Cucamonga but a resident of California, I find this plan to be irresponsible. The question is not if the hills will burn but when and this entire area is a high fire zone and I would imagine a high flood zone. Looking beyond the obvious that our city and schools are currently unable to keep up with current resident demands, this expansion will further tax our roads and community services.

Not all our open spaces need to be developed. We moved here to get away from the congestion and overdevelopment of other cities, but that is exactly what is happening here now. It needs to stop. Preserve the natural beauty of our city and stop ruining our open land!

The City of Rancho Cucamonga should work to improve services and development and of the West and South parts of Rancho Cucamonga. It is very obvious that ONLY the North East side is considered worthy of care and investment - From landscaping, parks, recreational facilities, positive policing, road maintenance, and general upkeep, those in power are creating two different Rancho Cucamongas, Shame on You.

The development of the land to include 'some businesses' as noted in the newspaper article would not be a favorable idea. Including multiunit dwellings is not a favorable idea. Both of these will distract from the area's exclusivity. I'm sure the city and developers see this taxation scheme as highly profitable. It is not about the money where WATER and TRAFFIC and CRIME issues are involved.

It is most important to me that the nature and ecological elements of this parcel be preserved. Development on this rocky slop is always going to be very unstable and susceptible to earth quakes, heavy rains and fires.

The area "designated for conservation" will never get high density, it is not financially feasible to do that in the hillside and thus it will remain relatively undisturbed. What is more important is to conserve more of the areas that are easily buildable green.

The residents of Deer Creek are against any land being developed! Our roads up here already can't handle the traffic with the schools and college. We want that land and its habitat to stay as is we will not support this project or any projects to develop uninhabited land in RC

If it's going to decrease my property taxes then I'm all for it. The property tax rate in RC is ridiculous. Fix the crime problem in our neighborhoods. No one wants to live in a home with high property taxes and constant break ins.

-I love to see the foothills conserved. They are the best part of living in Rancho Cucamonga. -I would like to see more trails be clearly designated for foot hiking. It is unclear where people are allowed on a lot of them. -Above all, please protect the area at the top of Beryl from development.

Rancho doesn't need more housing. It is too crowded in this wonderful town. All of the open fields of beauty are being developed into housing. The beautiful golf course was eaten up by development. The infrastructure is not built for the number of people that now live here. Concrete and asphalt keep in the heat from the sun during the day, so it remains our area doesn't have a chance to cool down in the evenings. Leave land open so the heat from the day can be "eaten" into the ground and cool down the evenings.

I know this area has been sought after for development for years . What about he infrastructure ?? The roads are already crowded and Los Osos HS is is near capacity. This area was also involved in wildfires about 10 years agodo we really need more development ??

It would be nice to leave the entire area undeveloped and left as habitat for indigenous plants and animals. Not all land has to be developed. Let's be a leader in the area to preserve our local flora and fauna.

I believe the priority should be to plan for land use which results in either revenue generating capital improvement or open space. While these concepts may seem in conflict, here's my rationale. Residential growth is typically more burdensome on infrastructure than the property tax revenue it generates. Additionally, unless the goal is to increase revenue generating developments which draw residents, businesses and visitors to Rancho, the emphasis should be on preserving the beauty of the foothills. I major benefit to living in RC is the still untouched 'mountainscape' and ability to quickly find a zero density hiking trail or two within minutes of home and services.

It seems most vacant land is having homes built on it. I want to see an empty field with wildlife and greenery. It's important to our children to know their adults were smart enough to protect some beautiful things in nature for them.

As time goes on and development proposals are submitted, I imagine the city will approve very dense housing which puts a strain on traffic and services. It doesn't matter what people say at public hearings, they will approve very dense housing instead of various densities. As far as conservation, I think real parks and trails are a great idea. However, the city seems to think that open space consists of 'tot lots' and a few benches where adults can gather. Has no one heard of real parks anymore?

We have too many houses and apartments as it is using up precious water and contributing to traffic, etc. More houses in foothills means more fire fighting resources having to be used. I know the city always wants more taxes so the city council can give themselves another raise. Enough is enough!

Humanity exist because of the nature we live in, that must be given respect and priority, nature, animals and alike. If given permission to build within the open space, with profit and greed, humanity will always overlook the nature and its purpose!

My concerns of adding 1,200 developed acres, residential and commercial, there WILL BE traffic nightmares. There is already constant traffic in this area. Especially when school is commencing or ending. The housing developments to the West (Deer Creek, Compass Rose, etc.) will definitely be impacted. I'm sure part of the proposal will be to allow westerly street access via Wilson & Hillside for people wanting to travel to the west. This is NOT FAIR to people who already own homes in this area. Especially Hillside Rd. I don't feel existing or even improved infrastructure will help. Traffic will be a nightmare. Our streets are already extremely crowded, as is the 210 freeway. PLEASE RETHINK PUTTING HOMES IN THIS AREA. Can't you leave it alone and make it all conservation area?? Maybe add trails and parks. Leave some area in Rancho the way it used to be. Don't continue to make it a concrete mecca. If you can't leave it alone, maybe the county would have a better plan.

The conserved land is too costly to develop, and should not be developed. I trust the SB County more not to develop the conserved land, than I do the City of Rancho Cucamonga. The planners at Rancho Cucamonga are more interested in developers and less in the citizens of the city (and that is known by experience). Plus for the city to waste tax payers money on such undevelopable land, it's like having a fire department that rapes the city for benefits, but uses the county's Sheriff department to control local crime. Why not have a county Fire Department instead. Oh, we have councilmen benefitting from the city fire department.

you must address how water rates will be affected....grandfather/roll back our rates and have new development pay higher water rates based on additional infrastructure required...

Open land areas are vital; too many housing developments are being crammed into smaller and smaller spaces which only adds to traffic and diminished natural habitats.

No more houses or shopping centers. Fill up the VACANT shopping centers first. Too many people, congestion, school crowding. Our gem of a city is not going to be a gem much longer.

A golf course even a nine hole would lead be great. All of Rancho's golfers are contributing to other cities instead of our own. Even other youth sporting activities would benefit the city. Fontana serves its citizens in parks and recreation better than Rancho Cucamonga

Dear City Council members. The Streets of Rancho Cucamonga are already crowded and congested. Why is it that every small piece of land has to be developed. Why can't the area stay in its natural state? When I moved here in 1982 this was the best place in the world to live. I can no longer say that. Take the developers cash filled hands out of your collective pockets. This response is constructive and respectful, I wonder if it will see the light of day

If annexation is accomplished, any development should be consistent with existing homes in the north west areas. Half acre properties need to remain the standard. We should not deviate from that plan and allow waivers on lot size.

Trails need to be incorporated as part of the Preserve/open space, if this land is annexed. That did not happen in the current Etiwanda Preserve area, which left significant blockages to our east-west trails in that area.

I would like to see less development in this city. We have too many people and where is all the water coming from. We are asked to conserve water but you keep adding to the population. Leave it all open land!! You don't even have money to maintain our parks now but you want to add more maintenance to your agenda. Respect the land we have and leave it alone!!

Appreciating that it is difficult to plan for a growing population, while protecting our precious natural resources, I ask that the city planners work towards achieving the best possible balance, regardless of the economic bottom line.

I am ok with development as long as there is a significant portion going to preservation of land for wildlife and as long as the follow current standards for building and developing of Rancho Cucamonga

Additional survey reports