



PO Box 9559  
Alta Loma, CA 91701

steve@montevistahomes.us

February 18, 2026

Dear Gustavo Romo:

Thank you for meeting us on February 4<sup>th</sup> to discuss our submission TTM2024-0002 for TTM 38926.

Below is a summary of the items discussed in our meeting and the status of the TTM2024-0002

- Staff found that project is consistent with the General Plan and Beaumont Municipal Code. Planning commission approved the project October 22, 2025. One public comment was received regarding access to the rear of the property at 40685 Norman Road, and Monte Vista confirmed that there will be access to this property.
- Government Code Section 65589.5(j) requires City and City Council to use objective standards when determining if a project should be approved or denied. City Council can only deny a housing project if it has a “specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety”. Staff determined TTM 38926 has met the City’s objective standards and recommended the project for approval. The code section allows for various legal remedies for violations of this.
- Monte Vista detailed the various challenges it had encountered with the City processing TTM2024-0002.
  - On Feb. 8 we received comments from the City on our pre-application submission. Once comment stated: “This proposal requires a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. As proposed, staff believes that the project will qualify for a Class 32 (In-Fill) exemption.” The City did not require any additional studies to fulfil the Class 32 exemption. On March 12, two weeks before the originally scheduled March 26, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, the Planner decided that this project is not eligible for a Class 32 exemption. After meetings with Planning and the City Manager, we determined that a Section 15183 exemption would be the correct path. We promptly prepared the studies that were requested by the City and submitted them for review. This timing brought us to an October 22, 2025 Planning Commission date. (7.5-month delay)

- Our project was sent to Planning Commission on October 22, 2025. We were told we would go to City Council a month later in November 2025. Prior to that meeting, the City let us know they made an error in public noticing. The result was a delay in our City Council hearing to January 20, 2026. (2-month delay)
- On August 13, 2025, we conducted an in-person meeting with engineering staff, Essam Dolah and Amer Jakher, to discuss various conditions from the Engineering Department. Our original submission was 46 lots with City Standard streets along the entire project. The changes to the configuration, and the addition of a private street were made based on suggestions from Essam and Amer. The City Council meeting was the first time we ever heard that the City determined this condition was based on an internal traffic opinion.

The City Council made several assertions and posed several questions during the January 20, 2026 hearing. Below we provide responses to those items.

- **Keep standards consistent in the City.**  
**“I do not like the alley concept”**  
 City Staff has determined the project meets all City Engineering and Public Safety standards.
- **Code Enforcement/Police Department do not have enforcement authority on a private driveway**  
 Code Enforcement and the Police Department absolutely can enforce no-parking in private streets. Under CVC Section 22658, the HOA has the clear legal authority to enforce parking and tow unauthorized vehicles on private streets. For extreme clarity, we can also add a clause in our CC&R’s providing Police full authority over this area.
- **Safety issue with narrowness of the road.**  
 The 26-foot road width complies with the California Fire Code and has been explicitly reviewed and approved by the Fire Department.
- **Brookside Turn Pocket and Stop Sign**  
 Per the City Engineer, the development is less than 100 units and the City does not require traffic analysis. The project is also projected to pay roughly \$160,000 in Street & Bridge Fees to the City to mitigate traffic impacts, as well as \$660,000 to WRCOG for the Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee.

- **The area is in a Flood Zone**

The project site is located in FEMA Zone X (Area of Minimal Flood Hazard).

- **Association Dues for maintaining Private Drive / Jurisdiction of Red Curb (No Parking)**

The Homeowners Association and all 49 homes would share in the cost of maintaining the private drive.

- **Lack of Parking**

The project meets the objective off-street parking requirements set forth in BMC Section 17.05.040 (2 spaces). Providing additional driveway and street parking exceeds the City's minimum mandate.

- **Near a very high fire area**

New homes are more fire resilient than old homes and fields. This project is not in a high fire zone and this development improves fire sustainability.

- **49 Residents have one exit**

The project has two methods of ingress and egress to Brookside Avenue.

Monte Vista is a homebuilder based in the Inland Empire. Many of our employees live in the City of Beaumont. We have a program we are very proud of called The Move Up Promise that helps tenants, residents, employees and subcontractors move from renters to homeowners. We deeply care for the community and our residents and do our very best to develop communities we are proud of. We have a long history of taking staff, council and residents feedback to heart and incorporating it into our designs.

The City Council is currently requesting deviations from the General Plan and approved City Standards that were not raised during the multi-year application process. We have acted in good faith, investing millions based on the City's objective standards.

We remain committed to a project Beaumont can be proud of, but we must emphasize that denial based on the subjective concerns raised at the January 20, 2026, meeting would be a direct violation of the Housing Accountability Act. We respectfully request that the Council approve the map as recommended by Staff and the Planning Commission.

Lastly, in the future may I suggest a design review committee or council oversight in the pre-application process so feedback can be gathered at a more appropriate time for projects like this. It is much easier for a developer to consider feedback at that time.

Sincerely,

*Steve Landis*