



Staff Report

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
FROM: Steven D. Jones, Community Development Department Director
BY: Jillian Fountain, Associate Planner
DATE: March 3, 2026
SUBJECT: Public Hearing to Consider the Approval of Tentative Tract Map 38926 (TM2024-0002) to Subdivide 12.58 Gross Acres into 49 Single-Family Residential Lots

Description: A public hearing to consider Tentative Tract Map 38926 for the subdivision of approximately 12.58 gross acres into 49 single-family residential lots and four (4) lettered lots, including a retention basin, within the Residential, Single-Family (RSF) Zone on APNs 408-080-004 and 408-080-005.

Background and Analysis:

On January 20, 2026, the City Council considered Tentative Tract Map 38926 following a unanimous 5-0 recommendation of approval by the Planning Commission on October 22, 2025.

During the City Council public hearing, the following concerns were raised regarding the proposed private drive (Lot D):

- Adequacy of off – street parking
- Private drive width
- Parking enforcement
- Emergency and personal vehicle access and circulation
- Project location within flood zone
- Proximity to high fire severity zone
- Homeowners' association responsibility

Following the discussion, the City Council directed the applicant to evaluate alternative design options and consider the replacement of the private drive with a full public street. A motion to continue to date uncertain was approved for the proposed subdivision to return for further consideration.

Analysis of Council Concerns:

Adequacy of Off-Street Parking

The subdivision is proposed to satisfy the off-street parking requirements for single-family residential units as set forth in Table 17.05-1 of the Beaumont Municipal Code (BMC). Each lot is required to provide two (2) enclosed parking spaces in a code-compliant garage, and driveway parking would be accommodated.

City Council discussion centered on the potential for overflow parking along proposed Lot D and whether the project design would sufficiently discourage on-street parking. The provision of driveways with adequate width serving the required two-car garages is intended to promote on-site parking utilization. No parking would be permitted on the proposed private drive as it would also serve as a fire lane, and any vehicle loading or unloading would be temporary in nature and would not be expected to materially affect emergency access.

Conditions of approval are recommended to ensure the private drive remains clear of parked vehicles and continuously available for emergency services access.

Private Drive Width

Private drives are permitted under BMC 16.12.030, subject to compliance with City standards and Fire Department requirements.

The proposed width of Lot D meets the minimum Fire Department access requirements. However, the Council expressed concern that the roadway may be constrained for daily residential use, particularly with the elimination of street parking.

A recommended condition of approval would require that the private drive be maintained in good condition as determined by the City's Community Development Department, Community Enhancement Division and Fire Department, including required annual inspection by the homeowners' association, timely repair of any deficiencies, and ongoing maintenance consistent with applicable public right-of-way standards for all vehicle types.

Parking Enforcement

If approved as a private drive, parking restrictions within Lot D would be enforced through required recorded covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) and managed by the Homeowners' Association (HOA), rather than through City enforcement mechanisms applicable to public streets.

The concern expressed by the Council related to the long-term enforceability and consistency of enforcement. Although the City's Community Enhancement staff could respond, if necessary, primary responsibility for monitoring and enforcing parking restrictions on the private drive would rest with the HOA.

Accordingly, a recommended condition of approval would require the CC&Rs to include provisions mandating that the HOA always maintain an active contract with a towing company and install appropriate signage identifying the private drive and applicable parking restrictions and penalties.

Emergency and Personal Vehicle Access and Circulation

Council discussed circulation efficiency and the ability to exit the neighborhood if one access point is obstructed. While the design complies with subdivision standards, concerns were raised regarding emergency egress.

The required improvements to Norman Road may help address any potential access constraints during an emergency. In addition, both the Orchard Heights Avenue private drive extension and proposed Street B provide adequate ingress, egress, and emergency vehicle access, as confirmed by the Department of Public Works and the Fire Department in their clearance of the project.

A recommended condition of approval would further ensure adequate access by requiring the dedication of an easement to the public for general traffic and circulation, consistent with the General Plan Mobility Element, and to facilitate reliable emergency vehicle access.

Project Location Within Flood Zone

With the site location being within a mapped flood zone. The proposed subdivision includes a retention basin and, if approved, would be required to comply with all applicable drainage and development standards prior to final map approval and building permit issuance.

Compliance with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and City drainage requirements would be verified during plan review.

Proximity to High Fire Hazard Severity Zone

The project site is located near a designated moderate fire hazard severity zone, about 0.3 mile from the proposed project site boundary line. If approved, development would be required to comply with the applicable Fire Department standards for single-family residential development.

Homeowners' Association Responsibility

If approved, proposed Lot D would remain a private drive, maintenance responsibilities, liability, and long-term upkeep would be assigned to the HOA through recorded CC&Rs.

Council expressed concerns regarding long-term funding, governance, and maintenance responsibilities associated with privately maintained roadways. A recommended condition of approval would require oversight by a certified public accountant and/or property maintenance firm to help ensure HOA's fiscal responsibility and compliance with applicable conditions of approval prior to map recordation, as well as continued compliance with CC&Rs following recordation. Adherence to the CC&Rs would help ensure that the City assumes no undue financial or operational responsibility for privately maintained areas.

Applicant Position Regarding Redesign:

The applicant has determined that no redesign is necessary to implement full density in keeping with the California Housing Accountability Act (HAA) of 1982, which limits discretion for projects that propose to comply with local zoning code objective development standards and general plan.

Staff recommended approval of the project, in part, based on the HAA, however, during the discussion, City Council disagreed with staff's general plan consistency finding since Orchard Heights Avenue was proposed to be reduced in size and removed from public use as a private drive. Conditions of approval are recommended to help implement the general plan, along with the proposal to meet development standards.

Government Code §65589.5(j) limits a city's ability to deny housing projects to situations where objective standards are not met and where a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety can be demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence—a higher evidentiary threshold than typically applied in land-use decisions. Although concerns about fire safety could potentially support such findings, this application has already been deemed complete and the time for certain requirements passed. Given the high evidentiary burden, proceeding with the project as designed—with a private drive configuration yielding 49 lots—and applying additional conditions of approval as needed is an appropriate course of action.

Fiscal Impact:

The cost for staff review and staff report preparation is covered by the \$7,500.00 deposit required by the City of Beaumont Development Related Fee Schedule. The cost to prepare this staff report is estimated at \$200.

A supplemental deposit from the developer is now required prior to the final map process to cover the work needed to evaluate the developer's response and to prepare responsive potential conditions of approval that address the City Council concerns during the tentative map process and will be requested prior to filing final map documents.

Recommended Action:

Hold a public hearing; and,

OPTION 1–

Approve Tentative Tract Map No. 38926 (TM2024-0002), subject to the conditions of approval and direct staff to prepare a CEQA Notice of Exemption for the applicant to file with the County of Riverside Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder; or,

OPTION 2–

Remand the project back to the Beaumont Planning Commission for redesign to incorporate local streets consistent with the Beaumont General Plan.

Attachments:

- A. Applicant Response to City Council
- B. City Council Staff Report dated January 20, 2026, and attachments
- C. Tentative Tract Map No.38926
- D. Findings TTM No. 38926
- E. Proposed Conditions of Approval
- F. Proof of Publication
- G. Presentation

Incorporated herein by Reference:

- City of Beaumont General Plan
- City of Beaumont Zoning Ordinance
- Project Site's Riverside Conservation Authority Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan Informational Map
- Contents of City of Beaumont Planning Department Project File and TTM38926 Tentative Tract Map Files