

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

238



**FROM:** Transportation and Land Management Agency

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
September 4, 2003

**SUBJECT:** Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP)/General Plan -- All Supervisorial Districts and Zoning Districts/Areas, PROPOSAL: Adoption of new General Plan for all of the unincorporated area of Riverside County.

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** Tentative Approval of Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618 in accordance with the documents entitled: 1) County of Riverside General Plan, Public Hearing Draft, April 5, 2002, Volumes 1-4; 2) Exhibit I, Draft Final Changes to the RCIP Comprehensive General Plan Amendment No. 618, September 9, 2003; 3) Exhibit II, Riverside County General Plan Circulation element Revision; and 4) Area Plan Land Use Plan maps dated August 22, 2003 for the Desert Center, Eastern Coachella Valley, Eastvale, Elsinore, Harvest Valley/Winchester, Highgrove, Jurupa, Lake Mathews, Lakeview/Nuevo, Mead Valley, Palo Verde Valley, The Pass, Reche Canyon/Badlands, REMAP, San Jacinto Valley, Southwest Area, Sun City/Menifee Valley, Temescal Canyon, Western Coachella Valley Area Plans and the Eastern Desert Land Use Plan, copies of which are electronically stored in the compact disc included herewith; and Direct staff to bring back to the Board of Supervisors a resolution to adopt the General Plan.

**BACKGROUND:** The Board of Supervisors conducted a three-day public hearing on March 10, 11 and 13, 2003, regarding the proposed adoption of a new General Plan for Riverside County. On March 13, the Board closed the public hearing. Since then, the Board has provided policy direction to staff on several occasions regarding their intent for the content of the General Plan. Also, individual Board members and members of their staffs have provided Transportation and Land Management Agency (TLMA) staff with direction regarding policy matters and land use map changes affecting their supervisorial districts. The attached Exhibits I and II and the 19 Area Plan maps dated August 22, 2003 contain all proposed changes, to date, to the Public Hearing Draft of the General Plan, dated April 5, 2002.

If approved by the Board, these documents would constitute the new General Plan for the County of Riverside. Following tentative approval, staff would bring back to the Board a resolution for adoption of the General Plan. At that point, the RCIP consultant team, working with TLMA staff, would compile all the changes into the final, published version of the County's adopted new General Plan.

(Continued)

Attachments

Richard Lashbrook  
TLMA Director

REVIEWED BY: CLIVE OFFICE  
*Clive*  
DATE: 9/4/03

Dept't Recomm.:  Consent  Policy  
Per Exec. Ofc.:  Consent  Policy

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

District: All

Agenda Number:

15.1

The purpose of the September 9 public hearing is to provide the public with an opportunity to provide testimony to the Board in regard to the changes to the draft General Plan that have been proposed in response to the public input obtained earlier through the public hearing process.

As a result of public input, numerous revisions are proposed to the General Plan text and area plan land use maps. Proposed revisions to the texts of the Vision Statement, and the Land Use, Multipurpose Open Space, Safety, Noise, Air Quality, and Administration Elements, and the Technical Appendices are contained in Exhibit I. Proposed revisions to the Circulation Element maps and text are contained in Exhibit II. Proposed revisions to the area plan maps are incorporated directly into the maps, and are not separately noted. All of the aforementioned documents and maps, as well as the Public Hearing Draft of the General Plan dated April 5, 2002, are available for viewing by the public on the RCIP internet website, [www.rcip.org](http://www.rcip.org), and at the offices of TLMA and the Planning Department on both the Second and Ninth Floors of the County Administrative Center in Riverside, and in Indio and Murrieta.

Many text and map changes have been made to the proposed General Plan since the Public Hearing Draft of the document was released in April 2002. The changes resulted from public review of the document and input to the Riverside County Planning Commission during the course of the 14 public hearings conducted by that body between April 2002 and January 2003, and from public review and input during the three-day public hearing held by the Board in March 2003. The attached text and map documents cumulatively embody all of the changes under consideration, to date, by the Board as a whole, or by individual Board Members. In general, it has been determined by staff and the RCIP consultant team that the changes can be accommodated in the General Plan and maintain internal consistency between the General Plan elements.

However, two major areas of concern arose as a result of a re-running of the project's traffic model in order to address the cumulative effects of all of the changes. First, significant upgrades in the development potential occurred in the following two areas: 1) between I-215 and the Diamond Valley Lake reservoir (including potential recreational and tourist development in the reservoir area itself), and between Highway 74 and the French Valley area (affecting the Harvest Valley/Winchester, San Jacinto Valley, Southwest Area, and Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plans), and 2) the Oasis, Mecca, and Vista Santa Rosa areas of the Eastern Coachella Valley Area Plan. These upgrades have resulted in significant increases in traffic generation potential, assuming total buildout of all land use designations. One of the major sources of the excessive traffic generation is the relatively large amount of Commercial Retail land use acreage accommodated in the plans. It has been determined by The Planning Center that nearly three times the amount of commercially designated land is shown on the General Plan area plan maps than would be necessary to accommodate the market demand associated with theoretical ultimate buildout of all of the residential uses accommodated in the General Plan. It is reasonable to assume that over time, as both residential and commercial development occurs, the amount of commercial land that is actually developed for commercial uses will not significantly outpace the amount of residential development that occurs. A more accurate assessment of potential traffic impacts for both the residential and commercial development

would be to assume a much closer relationship between the mix of these two types of development, for the purpose of traffic analysis. Therefore, based on an analysis of this relationship, the RCIP consultant team has recommended that a policy be incorporated into the General Plan's Land Use Element that would place a cap on total overall Commercial Retail development within each area plan at a level of 40% of the designated Commercial Retail land area, unless there is a detailed analysis of market demand and traffic impacts that demonstrates both the need for the added commercial development and the ability to fully mitigate the effects of the added traffic. Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that this policy be incorporated into the General Plan Land Use Element in the manner described above. The proposed policy is shown in its entirety below:

Under the description of the Commercial Retail (CR) land use designation on Page LU-51, add the following text to the sentence "Commercial Retail uses will be permitted based on their compatibility with surrounding uses,": "and based on the amount of Commercial Retail acreage already developed within County unincorporated territory."

Also, add the following sentences:

"The amount of land designated for Commercial Retail development within the County's land use plan exceeds that amount which is anticipated to be necessary to serve the County's population at build out. This oversupply will ensure that flexibility is preserved in site selection opportunities for future retail development within the County. In order to more accurately project the actual potential for retail development within the County unincorporated areas, and the traffic and environmental impacts that would result from it, the statistical build out projections for the County assume that 40% of the area designated Commercial Retail might ultimately develop as commercial uses. It is assumed that residential uses at the Medium Density Residential range would develop on the remaining 60% of the CR designated areas."

Insert a new Policy LU 23.2 stating as follows (and renumber all of the subsequent policies as necessary):

LU 23.2: Once 40% of the area designated Commercial Retail within any Area Plan is built out, commercial retail development applications that are proposed within that Area Plan will only be considered for approval based on demonstrated market need, as well as a demonstrated ability to accommodate the traffic impacts the development will generate.

Second, the increased development potential in the area described above located within the Harvest Valley/Winchester, San Jacinto Valley, Southwest Area, and Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plans has also resulted from a combination of additional increases in primarily residential and Commercial Development in the area, plus the elimination of potential CETAP (Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process) corridors in this vicinity, since the Public Hearing Draft of the General Plan was produced in April 2002. As a result, staff proposes that two major changes be made to the proposed area plan maps and General Plan

text. First, a large area of Commercial Tourist designated land had been proposed on the lands owned by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) at Diamond Valley Lake in order to recognize the anticipated development of recreational and tourist oriented facilities on the reservoir site. When this acreage was analyzed in the rerun of the General Plan's traffic model, it showed an amount of potential traffic well beyond what would actually be expected to occur on the site. Accordingly, staff converted the Commercial Tourist-designated acreage to the Open Space – Recreation land use designation, which would be expected to accommodate much of the development that would likely be developed on the site. More intense facilities, such as hotels, that are developed would require more intense land use designations. Staff had recommended that a policy be incorporated into the texts of the three area plans that include parts of the MWD lands around Diamond Valley Lake, that would require General Plan Amendments (GPAs) in conjunction with specific plans filed in these areas that propose hotels or other uses of higher intensity, but that the GPAs not be constrained by the 5-year amendment cycle requirement of the General Plan's Certainty System, in order to allow expeditious consideration of such development proposals that would be important to the economies of the County, the City of Hemet, and other surrounding cities.

Staff notes that the MWD was not entirely comfortable with this approach, preferring designations that closely match their currently anticipated development plans, and eliminating the GPA requirement, believing that it would hinder their project development efforts.

In light of the concerns raised by MWD, staff has revised the proposed policies for the reservoir sites as follows:

- 1) MWD staff and County staff have been in the process of discussions aimed at defining more precisely the areas of MWD's intended development on the reservoir site. This would result in a large reduction in the amount of acreage devoted to the Commercial Tourist Land Use Designation in the three affected area plans, and conversion of some of the Commercial Tourist acreage to residential usage. Staff recommends that these changes be incorporated into the three affected area plan maps.
- 2) Staff recommends that the entire Diamond Valley Lake Policy Area be brought into the Highway 79 Policy Area described below, which would establish an overall vehicle trip cap for the area from the reservoir to I-215 and from Highway 74 to French Valley.
- 3) Staff recommends that in response to MWD's concern about future General Plan Amendment requirements, that a policy be established that no General Plan Amendment would be required for future changes between General Plan designations within the Diamond Valley Lake Policy Area, including between foundational components, provided that development occurs entirely through specific plans, and provided that total development intensity does not exceed that established for the Diamond Valley Lake Policy Area at the time of the adoption of the General Plan. Only in the case where total development intensity would be increased would a General Plan Amendment be required and such GPA applications

would not be constrained by the 5-year amendment cycle requirement of the General Plan Certainty System, in order to allow for expeditious consideration of any development proposals where a General Plan Amendment application would be required.

Staff believes that the policy described above would address the concerns raised by Metropolitan Water District and still be sensitive to the needs of the County to manage traffic impacts in the General Plan. Staff also notes that any General Plan Amendment that is filed would be processed along with a specific plan and other development applications, so any General Plan Amendment application would not extend the overall time involved with processing the applications.

The proposed Diamond Valley Lake Policy Area is described in detail on page 78 of the attached Exhibit I. The three area plans that would contain the policy are: Harvest Valley/Winchester, San Jacinto Valley, and Southwest Area.

Staff also recommends that in order to adequately address traffic impacts resulting from buildout in the broadly defined area bounded by I-215, Highway 74, the City of Hemet, Diamond Valley Lake, and French Valley, a policy area be established affecting the three area plans covered – Harvest Valley/Winchester, Southwest Area, and Sun City/Meniffee Valley – that places a traffic trip cap on residential development in this area that would result in a net reduction in overall trip generation of 70,000 trips per day. The policy generally would require each residential development proposal within the policy area to reduce trip generation proportionally and to demonstrate adequate infrastructure capacity to accommodate the added growth. The policy would be called the Highway 79 Policy Area. It is shown as Policy No.C 2.6 in Exhibit R, Page 1 of 25, in the attached Exhibit II. The policy would be included in the General Plan's Circulation Element, and in the three area plans listed above. The boundaries of the proposed policy area are also shown on Figure C-2 on Page 2 of 25 of Exhibit R of the attached Exhibit II, and on the three affected area plan maps.

Finally, the Board of Supervisors will be considering soon a proposed adjustment in the boundary between Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, in the Agua Mansa area of the Jurupa Valley. If the adjustment is approved, any area added to Riverside County would be shown on the final adopted Jurupa Area Plan map. Based on information available to staff at this time, the added area should receive the Heavy Industrial land use designation, which would be compatible with the currently proposed Heavy Industrial designation in the adjacent area currently located within Riverside County.